County of San Diego

JEFF C. MONEDA
DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 410
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1237
(858) 694-2212
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/

October 5, 2021

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

1. Title; Project Number:

   13th Street Bridge Project, 1015839

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 Gail Getz, Environmental Planning Manager
   b. Phone number: (858) 877-0459
   c. E-mail: Gail.Getz@sdcounty.ca.gov

4. Project location:

   The project site is located on 13th Street between Main Street (SR 67) and Walnut Street, in the unincorporated community of Ramona in San Diego County (Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1152, Grid F6).

5. Project Applicant name and address:

   County of San Diego, Department of Public Works
   5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
   San Diego, CA 92123-1239

6. General Plan.
   Community Plan: Ramona

   Properties adjacent to the project are designated as:
   Land Use Designation: High Impact Industrial (I-3)

Rural Lands (RL-20)
Rural Commercial
Village Residential (VR-20)

7. Zoning.

Properties adjacent to the project are designated as:

Use Regulation:	M52 (High Impact Industrial)
	A70 (Limited Agriculture)
	C37 (Heavy Commercial)
	Rmv1/Rmv2/Rmv4
Special Area Regulation:	B, C, D2, F, and S

8. Description of project:

The proposed 13th Street Bridge Project is located on 13th Street and Maple Street between Main Street (SR 67) and Walnut Street in the unincorporated community of Ramona. The project segment of 13th Street/Maple Street is a dirt roadway, with gravel at the Santa Maria Creek culvert crossing. The existing, undersized corrugated steel culvert does not have sufficient capacity to convey the creek water during storm events; flooding at this crossing makes the roadway impassable for motor vehicles and pedestrians during portions of the rainy season.

The objective of the project is to provide an adequate and safe crossing that allows for the conveyance of water up to, and including a 100-year storm event. The project would include replacement of the existing culvert crossing with a bridge designed to meet current federal standards, with roadway improvements along 13th Street/Maple Street and Walnut Street, and the addition of stormwater conveyance and treatment features that would ultimately discharge into Santa Maria Creek.

The proposed bridge would be a 4-span cast-in-place pre-stressed, post-tensioned concrete box girder structure, approximately 480-feet long and approximately 42-feet wide with three singular-column bents and two abutments. The bridge and approaches would include two 12-foot travel lanes, 3-foot shoulders on each side, and an approximately 8-foot wide multi-use pathway to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians. In addition, three bridge barriers with a total width of approximately 4-feet, consisting of two edge deck rails and one pedestrian barrier would be installed to separate pathway users from the travel lane and creek. The pathway across the bridge would connect to the existing southern segment near the Ramona County Library and transition users across the bridge to existing and planned trail facilities north of the bridge. The grade of 13th Street/Maple Street would be raised approximately 10-feet at the Santa Maria Creek crossing to comply with current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements.

Storm drain systems are proposed directly to the north and south of the bridge to capture runoff and direct it towards the existing creek. Permeable pavement areas would be incorporated into the project as Green Street features to facilitate meeting

water quality requirements and for storm-water management. An existing bio-retention basin located south of the bridge that currently treats stormwater from the library and associated parking lot would be redesigned to also accommodate runoff associated with increased impervious areas from the proposed project.

The total quantity of cut for the project is approximately 6,200 cubic yards (cy) and the total quantity of fill and import is approximately 13,000 cy. Construction is anticipated to last approximately 12 months. During the bridge foundation construction, dewatering may be required for the project.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The proposed project area vicinity is characterized by residential, commercial, and industrial development. Single- and multi-family residences are present west of the project area along 14th Street and Brazos Street and commercial properties are present along 12th Street, Main Street, and Maple Street. Industrial properties are present along 13th Street, 14th Street, Walnut Street, and Maple Street and an equipment storage yard is located to the northeast corner of Maple Street and Walnut Street. Other surrounding area properties include the Ramona Public Library, a self-storage facility, retail gasoline filling stations, retail shopping plazas, office buildings, and a lumber yard.

Santa Maria Creek runs east to west in the vicinity of the project site and is located adjacent to (south of) Walnut Street, in the northern portion of the site. The creek corridor is largely vegetated and undeveloped both up and downstream of the project area. The multiuse pathway across the proposed bridge has been designed to provide connectivity to a potential future Santa Maria Creek Greenway trail alignment.

The County of San Diego Department of General Services is currently working on the future development of the Ramona Intergenerational Community Campus (RICC) Project (SCH# 2016121009) adjacent to the 13th Street Bridge Project site. According to the Final MND dated February 2017, the RICC would consist of multiple facilities including: 1) 12,500 square-foot senior facility; 2) 5,000 square-foot adult day care center; 3) 14,000 square-foot community gymnasium and teen café; 4) 20,000 square-foot childcare center; 5) 10,000 square-foot family resource center; 6) 3,600 square-foot community support center; 7) approximately 230 parking spaces; and 8) various infrastructure improvements to support the new facilities.

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

Permit Type/Action	**Agency**
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

404 Permit – Nationwide Permit	US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
1602 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
Section 7 - Consultation	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
De Minimus Exemption to Habitat Loss Permit Process	County of San Diego
Conditional Letter of Map Revision	Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

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

YES ☒ NO ☐

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB-52), consultation was conducted with cultural affiliated tribes. The County of San Diego Department of Public Works sent out consultation letters on October 4, 2017 and followed up twice with the tribes. The Barona Band of Mission Indians, the Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, the Jamul Indian Village, the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians requested AB-52 consultation. The Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians consulted through Sacred Lands. Per the requests made during Native American consultation, the County agreed to provide a qualified archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor during initial 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/Traffic	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities & Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Public Works Environmental Services finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Public Works Environmental Services finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Public Works Environmental Services finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Gail Getz — Signature
9/30/2021 — Date

Gail Getz — Printed Name
Environmental Planning Manager — Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ 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: Based on a site visit completed by County staff Gail Getz and Keshia Montifolca, the proposed project is located within the viewshed of a scenic vista. The vista is the riparian corridor of Santa Maria Creek that crosses 13th Street/Maple Street and is located adjacent to (south of) Walnut Street. The proposed project includes replacement of an existing culvert crossing with a bridge designed to meet current federal requirements, channel improvements, roadway improvements along 13th/Maple Street and Walnut Street, and the addition of multiple storm drain systems that would ultimately discharge into Santa Maria Creek. The proposed project would result in a noticeable change in the physical characteristics of the existing environment as the undersized culvert would be replaced by a bridge, the dirt road would be paved, the road's elevation would be raised by approximately 10 feet, a multi-use pathway and concrete barriers with chain link railings would be added to the project site, and some mature riparian vegetation would need to be removed to accommodate the bridge.

A Visual Resources Impact Assessment Memo dated May 18, 2020 was prepared by Gail Getz and Keshia Montifolca. Based on the results of the memo, the project has been determined to be compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality for the following reasons: the proposed road improvements and bridge are not anticipated to have any design elements that are inconsistent with the existing visual environment and would not be expected to have a significant impact on the community character of Ramona, which according to the Ramona Community Plan is preserving and enhancing the rural atmosphere of the Ramona community. While the concrete barriers and chain link railings would be new additions along the proposed bridge, properties surrounding the project site currently have chain link fences installed

with privacy screens and slats. In addition, concrete columns adorn property entrances on the west side of 13th Street, so the addition of the concrete and chain link bridge railings would not contrast with the current visual surroundings of the project area. While the paved road and multi-use pathway would be new additions to the project site, it would be a visual improvement as it would connect the improved roadway segments that exist north and south of the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly alter the rural character of the site. In addition, although vegetation removal would be required to construct the bridge and associated improvements, the project footprint has been minimized to the extent feasible, and the project site will be revegetated with native species to complement the existing visual character. Removal of nonnative species and revegetation with native plants would help return the site to a more natural condition, restoring the Santa Maria Creek riparian corridor and complimenting rural aesthetic of Ramona.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project, along with the cumulative list of projects listed in XXI, would not result in incompatible changes in visual character or degrade the overall visual quality of a scenic vista. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☒ 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: Based on a site visit completed by Gail Getz and Keshia Montifolca, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The project site is not within a mile of the portions of Highway 67 designated as scenic. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that

are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as mature riparian vegetation along Santa Maria Creek with various commercial, industrial and civic uses in the viewshed of the project.

The proposed project includes replacement of an existing culvert crossing with a bridge designed to meet current federal requirements, channel improvements, roadway improvements along 13th/Maple Street and Walnut Street, and the addition of multiple storm drain systems that would ultimately discharge into Santa Maria Creek. The proposed project would result in a noticeable change in the physical characteristics of the existing environment as the undersized culvert would be replaced by a bridge, the dirt road would be paved, the road's elevation would be raised by approximately 10 feet, a multi-use pathway and concrete barriers with chain link railings would be added to the project site, and some mature riparian vegetation would need to be removed to accommodate the bridge. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: while the concrete barriers and chain link railings would be new additions, properties surrounding the project site currently have chain link fences installed with privacy screens and slats. In addition, concrete columns adorn property entrances on the west side of 13th Street, so the addition of the concrete and chain link bridge railings would not contrast with the current visual surroundings of the project area. While the paved road and multi-use pathway would be new additions to the project site, it would be a visual improvement as it would connect the improved roadway segments that exist north and south of the project area. In addition, although vegetation removal would be required to construct the bridge and associated improvements, the project footprint has been minimized to the extent feasible, and the project site will be revegetated with native species to complement the existing visual character. Removal of nonnative species and revegetation with native plants would help return the site to a more natural condition, restoring the Santa Maria Creek riparian corridor and complimenting rural aesthetic of Ramona.

Considering the components of the project as just described, the viewshed of the project site would still be characterized as mature riparian vegetation along Santa Maria Creek with various commercial, industrial and civic uses, even after construction of the project.

Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact to the character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the proposed bridge project, along with the projects listed in Section XXI, would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, or result in incompatible changes in visual character, or degrade the overall quality of a scenic vista. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or 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 With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ 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 With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is located within areas designated as Urban Builtup Land and Other Lands. The project site does not contain any agricultural resources, lands designated as 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. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or

Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland) would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is within existing public road right-of-way on land that is zoned M54 (High Impact Industrial), A70 (Limited Agricultural), C37 (Heavy Commercial), Rmv1/Rmv2/Rmv4, of which a portion is considered to be an agricultural (A70). The proposed project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use because the project is a proposed bridge and roadway improvement located along the alignment of an existing dirt road and within in existing public road right-of-way. Additionally, the project would not result in any changes to the zoning of adjacent properties zoned A70 and the project site does not contain land under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no 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))?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is within existing public road right-of-way. The project site including offsite improvements do not contain forest lands or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, 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, conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is within existing public road right-of-way. The project site including any offsite improvement areas do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of offsite forest resources.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is within existing public road right-of-way. The project site and surrounding area within a radius of 1/4 mile does not contain any active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Potential impacts to air quality from the proposed project would involve primarily construction activities, which are short term and temporary. The use of construction equipment in the RAQS and Attainment Plan is estimated for the region on an annual basis, and the proposed project would not increase the regional assumptions for off-road equipment use. After construction of the proposed project, long-term operational emissions would be limited to those generated by infrequent

maintenance activities, which would not be a new source as there is currently an existing dirt road that is maintained. In addition, the proposed project would not increase population or employment in the planning area. The proposed project would also not generate new vehicle trips as it is not a trip-generating land-use, it would only redistribute the existing traffic. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the current assumptions used to develop the RAQS, Attainment Plan, and SIP. Thus, project implementation would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan on a project-based or cumulative level.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 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_{10} 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: Construction of the proposed project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions through the use of off-road equipment, heavy-duty trucks, and worker commute trips, but at levels that do not exceed any of the regional thresholds for construction. The thresholds are designed to identify those projects that would result in significant levels of air pollution and to assist the region in attaining the applicable state and federal ambient air quality standards. Projects that would not exceed the thresholds of significance would not contribute a considerable amount of criteria air pollutant emissions to the region's emissions profile and would not impede attainment and maintenance of ambient air quality standards.

An Air Quality Technical Memorandum for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated May 2020 and prepared by AECOM, quantified construction-related emissions using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.2. Project construction is anticipated to begin in 2023 and last approximately 12 months. The total quantity of cut for the project is approximately 6,200 cubic yards (cy) and the total quantity of fill and import is approximately 13,000 cy. The analysis assumed approximately 3,455 haul truck

trips would be required for the import and export of materials during project construction and there would be a maximum of 30 workers per day. The daily criteria pollutant construction emissions for the proposed project compared to the applicable CEQA thresholds are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Construction-Related Maximum Daily Criteria Pollutant Emissions

	VOC	NOX	CO	SOX	PM10	PM2.5
Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)*	5.74	59.94	41.08	0.16	10.18	5.55
CEQA Thresholds of Significance (lbs/day)**	75	250	550	550	250	100
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No	No	No

*PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions include reductions in accordance with Caltrans' Standard Specification Section 14-9.01 to comply with SDAPCD dust abatement measures.
**CEQA thresholds from County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance – Air Quality (County of San Diego 2007).
VOC = volatile organic compounds; NO_X = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{10} = particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 10microns; $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 microns; lbs/day = pounds per day

Based on the modeling completed for this analysis, the proposed project's construction emissions would not exceed the thresholds of significance. Further, operation of the proposed project would be generally similar to existing conditions, as it would only redistribute existing traffic and periodic maintenance would remain similar to current. Therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM10, or any O_3 precursors.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ 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.

Less Than Significant Impact: The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: multi-family residences located approximately 550 feet to the southwest of the project site. Other receptors located near the project site include recreation visitors in the project vicinity, such as trail users and

library visitors. However, these receptors would be transient users and would not be exposed to construction-related emissions for an extended period of time. The RICC is expected to be developed and occupied after construction of the proposed 13th Street Bridge Project, and would not be considered a sensitive receptor to the proposed project's construction-related emissions.

Construction activities are anticipated to last approximately 12 months and would cease following completion of the proposed project. Therefore, the total exposure period for construction activities would be less than five percent of the total exposure period used for typical residential health risk calculations (i.e. 30 years). There is a considerable buffer distance to the nearest sensitive receptors and construction of the proposed project would not exceed the County of San Diego mass emissions thresholds. As discussed in greater detail in the 13th Street Bridge Project Traffic Impact Analysis dated October 2013 and prepared by Linscott Law & Greenspan, and the 13th Street Bridge Data Validation Memorandum dated February 2019 and prepared by Chen Ryan Associates, implementation of the proposed project would not generate new vehicle trips, the proposed improvements would decrease intersection delay along Main Street due to the redistribution of traffic resulting in a slight reduction in vehicle miles traveled and vehicle hours traveled, and operational emissions would remain similar to or less than existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial construction toxic air contaminants concentrations, and air quality impacts on sensitive receptors during construction would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

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 (CDFW) and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a Natural Environment Study for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated October 2020, prepared by AECOM, a Biological Assessment for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated October 2020, prepared by AECOM, a Conceptual Mitigation Plan for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated July 6, 2021, prepared by AECOM, and focused surveys for the Least Bell's Vireo (LBVI) conducted in 2012 by ICF International and in 2018 by Sage Wildlife Biology, three sensitive or listed species were identified in the area. One nesting pair of LBVI, which is a federal and state-listed endangered species, was detected within the project area during the 2018 protocol surveys. Yellow warbler, a CDFW Species of Special Concern, Cooper's hawk, a CDFW Species of Special Concern, and orange-throated whiptail, a CDFW Watch List species, were detected during the 2018 LBVI protocol surveys. In addition, wet and dry season focused protocol surveys were conducted in 2013 by Helm Biological Consulting and in 2018 by AECOM for San Diego fairy shrimp, a federal-listed endangered species and Riverside fairy shrimp, a federal-listed endangered species. No San Diego or Riverside fairy shrimp were detected during the focused protocol surveys.

Section 7 consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) via Caltrans was initiated on October 7, 2020, as the proposed project would impact riparian habitat occupied by LBVI, consisting of southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest and southern willow scrub. Through consultation, the design was minimized to reduce impacts to potential vireo habitat; impacts to southern willow scrub were removed and permanent impacts to southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest were reduced from 0.10 acre to 0.04 acre. These updated impact acreages and associated mitigation were included in the Conceptual Mitigation Plan, which was prepared after the Natural Environment Study and Biological Assessment were finalized. Table 2 below presents how the proposed project would result in 0.04 acres of permanent impacts and 0.76 acres of temporary impacts to suitable habitat for LBVI (southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest).

Table 2. Permanent and Temporary Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities

Vegetation Community	**Permanent Impact (acres)**	**Temporary Impact (acres)**	**Total Impacts (acres)**
Disturbed Wetland	-	0.11	**0.11**
Southern Cottonwood-Willow Riparian Forest	0.04	0.76	**0.80**
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	0.05	-	**0.05**
Non-Native Grassland	1.13	3.25	**4.38**
Total	**1.22**	**4.12**	**5.34**

While there would be impacts to occupied LBVI habitat, the proposed project would result in a biological benefit to the area as a dirt road and low-water crossing on fill would be replaced with a bridge. Since there would be approximately 8.5 feet and 15 feet of

clearance underneath the bridge, this new area can be planted with low-growing shade-tolerant native riparian habitat. In addition, all temporarily impacted areas would be restored. On-site mitigation for permanent impacts to southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest is proposed at a 3:1 ratio which would result in an increase in restored riparian habitats that is suitable for LBVI nesting, and the habitat restoration planting is expected to result in an overall benefit to LBVI.

A Biological Opinion (BO) was issued for the project on March 25, 2021 (FWS-SDG-20B0242-21F0057), and the conditions in the BO would be adhered to. The conditions in the BO are summarized and condensed below for simplicity.

BIO-1 Biological Monitor and Employee Education Program
A qualified biologist approved by the Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office (CFWO) will be on site: a) during all vegetation clearing; and b) weekly during project construction within 500 feet of LBVI habitat to monitor compliance with all measures. The biologist will supervise construction activities, including installation of exclusion fencing, construction and grading activities, and contractor education. The biologist will be available during pre-construction and construction phases to address protection of sensitive biological resources, monitor ongoing work, and maintain communications with construction personnel to facilitate the appropriate and lawful management of issues relating to biological resources.

An employee education program will be developed and implemented by the biologist. Each employee (including temporary, contractors, and subcontractors) will receive a training/awareness program prior to working on the proposed project. They will be advised of the potential impact to the listed species and the potential penalties for taking such species. 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 project area.

BIO-2 Mitigation of Impacts to Sensitive Habitat, Vegetation Communities, and Jurisdictional Resources
All permanent and temporary direct impacts to sensitive habitat, vegetation communities, and jurisdictional wetlands or waters will be mitigated on-site consistent with the ratios in the County's Guidelines and through coordination with the resource agencies. A Conceptual Mitigation Plan was prepared to address the mitigation requirements associated with the project impacts. A total of 0.80 acres of impacts to LBVI habitat, 0.11 acres of impacts to disturbed wetland, 0.80 acres of impacts to southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest, 0.05 acres of impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub, 4.38 acres of impacts to non-native grassland, 0.03 acres of impacts to non-wetland waters of the U.S. and State/unvegetated streambed, 0.24 acres of impacts to wetland waters of the U.S. and

State/vegetated streambed, and 0.36 acres of impacts to California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) streambanks and associated riparian canopy will be mitigated on-site.

Temporary impacts to LBVI habitat will be mitigated in place at a 1:1 ratio, temporary impacts to vegetation communities will be mitigated in place at a 1:1 ratio (with the exception of non-native grassland at a 0.5:1 ratio) through onsite restoration, and temporary impacts to jurisdictional resources will be mitigated in place at a 1:1 ratio, via restoration following construction.

Permanent impacts to LBVI habitat will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio, permanent impacts to southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio, permanent impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio, permanent impacts to non-native grassland will be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio, and permanent impacts to jurisdictional resources will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio, through restoration or creation of wetland or riparian habitats.

Based on these mitigation ratios, a total of 0.88 acres of LBVI habitat, 0.11 acres of disturbed wetland, 0.88 acres of southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest, 0.05 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub, 2.20 acres of non-native grassland, 0.03 acres of non-wetland waters of the U.S. and State/unvegetated streambed, 0.24 acres of wetland waters of the U.S. and State/vegetated streambed, and 0.46 acres of CDFW streambanks and associated riparian canopy will be required to be mitigated onsite to offset project impacts.

A Mitigation Monitoring Plan will be prepared pursuant to regulatory agency standards to address the project's onsite mitigation requirements.

Additionally, the project would involve the removal of vegetation, which could result in the accidental destruction of nests or nest abandonment if construction were to occur during the combined bird breeding season of LBVI and other avian species (February 15 – September 15). Implementation of the following measures would avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential impacts to local, state, and federally listed species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, to less than significant:

BIO-3 Least Bell's Vireo Preconstruction Surveys
Prior to initiating project work, three preconstruction surveys will be conducted within all suitable LBVI habitat in or within 500 feet of the project footprint, within 30 days prior to initiation of vegetation removal activities, to verify that no more than 1 LBVI pair will be harmed as a result of the project. A map showing the distribution of LBVI relative to the project footprint and an estimate of the number of LBVI that will be impacted by the project, or confirm in writing that the number of pairs that will be impacted by the project remains correct. The CFWO will be notified of the area of LBVI habitat cleared within 30 days of completing removal of LBVI habitat.

BIO-4 Avoidance and Minimization of Impacts to Least Bell's Vireo and Nesting Birds During Clearing and Grubbing Activities
The clearing and grubbing of native habitats for the project will be conducted between September 16 and February 14 to avoid the combined LBVI (March 15-August 31) and avian species (February 15-September 15) breeding season (or sooner than September 16 if the biologist demonstrates to the satisfaction of the CFWO that all nesting is complete).

If work is proposed to start during the breeding season, a pre-activity nesting bird survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist within 7 days prior to starting work to identify any nesting birds within 500 feet of the project area. If work stops for more than 7 days, the pre-activity survey will be repeated before restarting 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 will be allowed to proceed.

If nesting birds are found, the qualified biologist will flag the active nests and project activities will avoid active nests until nesting behavior has ceased, nests have failed, or young have fledged and/or the biologist determines that no impacts are anticipated to the nesting birds or their young. Project activities within 300 feet of a nest (500 feet for raptors) that could generate noise in excess of 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA) or ambient sound level, if it is higher than 60 dBA, at the edge of occupied habitat, will 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 sound level. Buffer distances may be adjusted as recommended by the qualified biologist depending on the sensitivity of the species**.**

BIO-5 Avoidance and Minimization of Impacts to Least Bell's Vireo and Nesting Birds During Noise Generating Activities
If project construction is necessary during the combined LBVI and avian species breeding season (February 15–September 15) that will generate noise in excess of 60 dBA hourly Leq, or ambient noise levels, whichever is greater, within LBVI active nesting habitat, measures will be implemented to reduce noise disturbance to LBVI. A noise abatement plan will be submitted to the CFWO for review and approval 30 days prior to commencing project work. The qualified biologist will oversee implementation of the noise abatement plan and may conduct noise monitoring and LBVI surveys as needed, based on their judgment and knowledge of the species, site, and proposed activities, to minimize noise impacts to LBVI.

Impacts to local, state, and federally listed species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species and their habitat would be less than significant with implementation of the above mitigation measures. In addition, detailed landscape restoration plans, installation specifications, and a mitigation monitoring plan will be prepared closer to final

project design. Therefore, no potentially significant project level or cumulative level substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, would occur to any of these species as a result of this project.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a Natural Environment Study for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated October 2020, prepared by AECOM, a Biological Assessment for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated October 2020, prepared by AECOM, and a Conceptual Mitigation Plan for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated July 6, 2021, prepared by AECOM, it was determined that the proposed project would result in permanent and temporary impacts to the following sensitive vegetation communities: Southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest, Disturbed wetland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, and Non-native grassland and shown in more detail in Table 2.

Mitigation will be required for all permanent and temporary impacts to sensitive vegetation communities. Tables 3 and 4 from the Conceptual Mitigation Plan prepared for this project provide the updated acres of mitigation that would be required as a result of permanent and temporary impacts to the vegetation communities within the project area. Mitigation ratios for permanent impacts to vegetation communities are based on the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements Biological Resources (County of San Diego 2010) (Table 3). Temporary direct impacts would be mitigated in-place at a 1:1 ratio (with the exception of non-native grasslands at 0.5:1 ratio) through on-site restoration (Table 4). Implementation of **BIO-2** would mitigate direct impacts to vegetation communities.

Table 3. Mitigation for Permanent Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities

Vegetation Community	**Permanent Impact (acres)**	**Mitigation Ratio**	**Mitigation Acreage**
Southern Cottonwood-Willow Riparian Forest	0.04	3:1	0.12
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub* **	0.05	1:1	0.05
Non-Native Grassland**	1.13	0.5:1	0.57
Total	**1.22**		**0.74**

*The County's Guidelines mitigation ratios for coastal sage scrub habitat types are subject to the NCCP Process guidelines and are typically 1:1 to 3:1 depending on habitat value for long-term conservation. The

habitat within the project area is very small and surrounded by non-native grasslands and has a low value for long-term conservation, which argues for a lower mitigation ratio.
** Mitigation for Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland may be out of kind through enhancement and/or restoration of riparian and wetland communities.

Table 4. Mitigation for Temporary Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities

Vegetation Community	Temporary Impact (acres)	Mitigation Ratio	Total Impacts (acres)
Disturbed Wetland	0.11	1:1	0.11
Southern Cottonwood-Willow Riparian Forest	0.76	1:1	0.76
Non-Native Grassland*	3.25	0.5:1	1.63
Total	**4.12**		**2.50**

* Mitigation for non-native grassland may be out of kind through enhancement and/or restoration of riparian and wetland communities.

The proposed project has been designed to avoid and minimize adverse impacts to biological resources. **BIO-1** will be implemented to minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources. The following best management practices (BMPs) are recommended to further minimize impacts especially indirect impacts:

AMM-1: All native or sensitive habitats outside and adjacent to the construction limits will be designated as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) on project maps. ESAs will be temporarily fenced during construction with orange plastic snow fence, orange silt fencing, or in areas of flowing water, with stakes and flagging. Signage will be posted identifying the excluded areas as ESAs. No personnel, equipment, or debris will be allowed within the ESAs. Temporary ESA fencing and flagging will be installed in a manner that does not impact habitats to be avoided and such that it is clearly visible to personnel on foot and operating heavy equipment. If work occurs within LBVI habitat beyond the fenced or demarcated limits of impact, all work will cease until the problem has been remedied to the satisfaction of the CFWO. Temporary ESA fencing and markers will be maintained in good repair until the completion of project work and removed upon completion of project work.

AMM-2: A construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and soil erosion and sedimentation plan will be developed to identify BMPs that will be implemented during construction to minimize erosion, prevent sediment and debris from entering drainages, and maintain water quality. Sediment will not be stockpiled in areas where material could be washed into drainages by rainfall. Erosion and sediment control devices used for the proposed project, including fiber rolls and bonded fiber matrix, will be made from biodegradable materials such as jute, with no plastic mesh, to avoid creating a wildlife entanglement hazard. In addition, the project has incorporated storm drain systems to facilitate meeting water quality requirements and for stormwater management, which will minimize erosion and degradation of habitat downstream of the bridge.

AMM-3: Standard fugitive dust BMPs, e.g., a water truck, are recommended to reduce effects of construction-generated erosion and sedimentation into the adjacent ESAs. Impacts from fugitive dust will be minimized through watering and other appropriate measures. All equipment maintenance, staging, and dispensing of fuel, oil, coolant, or any other such activities will be restricted to designated areas located within previously disturbed upland. They will be located such that runoff from the designated areas will not enter vireo habitat. The project site will be kept as clear of debris as possible. All food-related trash items will be enclosed in sealed containers and regularly removed from the site. Project personnel will be prohibited from bringing domestic pets to construction sites to ensure that domestic pets do not disturb or depredate wildlife in adjacent native habitats. Fire suppression equipment, including extinguishers and shovels, will be available on-site during construction.

AMM-4: During project construction all invasive species included on the National Invasive Species Management Plan, the State of California Noxious Weed List, and the California Invasive Plant Council's Invasive Plant Inventory list (Cal-IPC 2006) found growing within the project impact area will be identified and removed at least once a month. Special care will be taken during transport, use, and disposal of soils containing invasive weed seeds and all weedy vegetation removed during construction will be properly disposed of to prevent spread into areas outside of the construction area. All heavy equipment will be washed and cleaned of debris prior to entering a new area to minimize the spread of invasive weeds.

BMPs will be implemented to ensure invasive plant material is not spread from the project site to other areas by disposal off-site or by tracking seed on equipment, clothing, and shoes. Equipment/material imported from an area of invasive plants must be identified and measures implemented to prevent importation and spreading of non-native plant material within the project site. All construction equipment will be cleaned with water to remove dirt, seeds, vegetative material, or other debris that could contain or hold seeds of noxious weeds before arriving to and leaving the project site. Weeds removed will be appropriately bagged and disposed of in a sanitary landfill.

Southern tarplant was also present within the project area. Approximately 27 southern tarplant individuals were located in the permanent impact area and approximately 25 southern tarplant individuals were located in the temporary impact area. This species is an annual species, meaning the number of individuals within the impact areas will vary from year to year. Permanent and temporary direct impacts to non-native grassland (where the species is present) as detailed in Table 2 provide a better representation of the direct impact that may occur as a result of construction activities. Indirect impacts could arise from fugitive construction dust and trampling from construction activities. Most of the occurrences are already subjected to high levels of human-generated dust from the normal traffic along 13th and Walnut Streets. Once the bridge is constructed, it is expected to result in a net benefit to this species as the removal of the existing dirt road would

eliminate generated dust that currently affects this species. Implementation of **AMM-1** through **AMM-4** would avoid and minimize impacts to species. Compensatory mitigation for permanent and temporary impacts to southern tarplant would be implemented through habitat-based mitigation for impacts to non-native grassland per **BIO-2** (see Tables 3 and 4).

The proposed project would result in impacts to sensitive vegetation communities, however, impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant with the implementation of the mitigation measures listed above. In addition, detailed landscape restoration plans, installation specifications, and a mitigation monitoring plan will be prepared closer to final project design. Therefore, no potentially significant project level or cumulative level substantial adverse effect would occur on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on the Aquatic Resources Delineation Report for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated October 2020, prepared by AECOM, the following jurisdictional resources are present in the project area: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdictional wetlands and non-wetland waters of the U.S., California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) jurisdictional streambed and associated riparian habitat, and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdictional waters of the state.

The proposed project would result in permanent and temporary impacts to potential jurisdictional waters, wetlands, and riparian areas shown in Table 5. Since the project would result in permanent and temporary impacts to USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW resources, the following permits will be required: A 404 Nationwide Permit from the USACE, a Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFW, and a 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB.

Mitigation will be required for all permanent and temporary impacts to potential jurisdictional resources. A Conceptual Mitigation Plan for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated July 6, 2021, prepared by AECOM, outlines the proposed mitigation for these impacts. Table 5 below also provides the mitigation acreages that would be required as a result of permanent and temporary impacts to the potential jurisdictional resources within the project area. Mitigation of jurisdictional impacts will implemented through **BIO-**

2. Temporary impacts to jurisdictional resources will be mitigated in place at a 1:1 ratio, via restoration following construction. Permanent impacts to jurisdictional resources will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio, through restoration or creation of wetland, waters, or riparian habitats. The mitigation requirement for permanent impacts to jurisdictional resources will be accomplished through removal of the existing crossing, which includes a culvert and fill for the roadbed; removal of these developed features will open up the area under the bridge for natural streamflow and restoration with appropriate shade-tolerant native species. Final mitigation ratios will ultimately be determined through coordination with the resource agencies during the permitting process.

Table 5. Mitigation for Permanent and Temporary Impacts to Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. and State

Type of Potential Jurisdictional Aquatic Resources	Permanent			Temporary			Total Mitigation Acreage Required
	Impact Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Acreage	Impact Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Acreage	
Potential Jurisdictional Aquatic Resources of the U.S. and State (USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB)							
Non-Wetland (Ordinary High Water) / Unvegetated Streambed	-	-	-	0.03	1:1	0.03	0.03
Wetland (Active Floodplain) / Vegetated Streambed	<0.01*	3:1	<0.01	0.24	1:1	0.24	0.24
Potential Jurisdictional Aquatic Resources Exclusively CDFW							
Streambanks and Associated Riparian Canopy	0.05	3:1	0.15	0.31	1:1	0.31	0.46
Total	***0.05***	***-***	***0.15***	***0.58***	***-***	***0.58***	***0.73***

*66 square feet

With the above avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands, waters, or riparian areas as impacts can be reduced to a level of less than significant. In addition, the proposed project, along with other current and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not have a significant cumulative impact to state or federally protected wetlands, waters, or riparian areas after implementation of mitigation measures.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and the Natural Environment Study for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated October 2020, prepared by AECOM, it was determined that the Santa Maria Creek riparian corridor provides habitat and cover for movement of wildlife species.

Santa Maria creek and its associated riparian vegetation provide an east-west wildlife linkage which provides cover for wildlife to move from expanses of undeveloped land to the east and west of the proposed project area. However, the project site is surrounded by developed and disturbed land to the north and south, and the existing development and roads crossing Santa Maria Creek may limit terrestrial species from using the riparian corridor to disperse to open space habitat. In addition, the project area is part of the Pacific Flyway, a major migration route for birds that travel north and south, and the Santa Maria Creek likely provides stop-over habitat for these migrant species. Avian species may use the riparian corridor to move through Ramona and rural residential development.

The proposed project would not impede the riparian corridor as the impacts would be temporary and restored post-construction. The proposed project would result in a biological benefit to the corridor as a dirt road and low-water crossing on fill would be replaced with a bridge with native habitat and more natural hydrology underneath. There would be approximately 8.5 feet and 15 feet of clearance underneath the bridge, which would make it easier for terrestrial species to move throughout the corridor. In addition, on-site restoration is proposed at a 3:1 ratio and there would be an increase in restored riparian habitats that would be beneficial to migrant avian species. The natural areas (i.e. Santa Maria Creek) occurring outside of the project area would not be affected by the proposed project activities and would continue to function as wildlife corridors during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species, or any wildlife corridors, or impede the use of any wildlife nursery sites.

e) 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located within the boundaries of the Draft County of San Diego North County Multiple Species Conservation Program (draft North County Plan). The North County Plan would extend the County's MSCP program into the northwestern areas of the County but was still draft at the time of preparation of this Initial Study. The proposed project would not conflict with the draft North County Plan

as it is not located within a Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA), not part of a regional wildlife corridor, all feasible avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project, and the project would not preclude preserve design of the North County Plan because it is within an existing dirt road and County road right-of-way. In addition, all impacts from the proposed project were minimized to the extent feasible, all permanent and temporary impacts would be restored on-site with native vegetation on site including up-tiering of habitat, and vegetation clearing will occur outside the bird breeding season to the extent feasible along with monitoring by a qualified biologist.

The proposed project is subject to the Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance (HLP) due to the impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub, however, based on project documentation, it was determined that the project qualifies for a *de minimus* exemption to HLP process. The project qualifies for the *de minimus* HLP exemption as the project's very minor impacts (0.05 acre) to low quality Diegan coastal sage scrub would not exceed the five percent guideline, the site is not occupied by the California gnatcatcher due to the small, isolated nature of onsite Diegan coastal sage scrub habitat, and would not support species dependent on Diegan coastal sage scrub. The Diegan coastal sage scrub and adjacent non-native grassland habitat onsite has been heavily disturbed over the past 20 years and is considered to be of low value due to the developed setting and ongoing disturbance. The proposed project would not preclude connectivity between areas of high habitat values, would not preclude the preparation of the subregional Natural Communities Conservation Plan, would not preclude preserve design of the North County Plan, and is located outside the proposed PAMA. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the goals of the HLP.

In addition, the project would not interfere with preparation of a future Habitat Conservation Plan or reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of listed species in the wild as all feasible avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project, and all impacts from the proposed project would be mitigated at appropriate ratios on-site with native vegetation to ultimately provide improved habitat on-site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of any Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved conservation plan, politics 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records obtained from the South Coastal Information Center on February 13, 2018 and a survey of the project area by County of San Diego

approved archaeologist Lauren Downs, M.A., RPA and Theodore Cooley M.A., RPA, accompanied by Native American Monitor Jenna Growingthunder on February 21, 2018, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources. Further refinement of the project APE resulted in an additional survey by County of San Diego approved archaeologist Marcos Ramos-Ponciano, M.A., RPA, accompanied by Native American Monitor Banning Taylor on November 16, 2018, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to historical resources. The results of the survey are provided in a historical resources report titled, Historical Property Survey Report for the Proposed 13th Street Bridge Project, Ramona, San Diego County CA, prepared by AECOM, dated July 2020.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of records obtained from the South Coastal Information Center on February 13, 2018 and a survey of the project area by County of San Diego approved archaeologist Lauren Downs, M.A., RPA and Theodore Cooley M.A., RPA, accompanied by Native American Monitor Jenna Growingthunder on February 21, 2018, it has been determined that no cultural resources were identified within the project site. Further refinement of the project APE resulted in an additional survey by County of San Diego approved archaeologist Marcos Ramos-Ponciano, M.A., RPA, accompanied by Native American Monitor Banning Taylor on November 16, 2018, no cultural resources were observed within the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to archaeological resources. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, Archaeological Survey Report for the 13th Street Bridge Project, Ramona, San Diego County CA, prepared by AECOM, dated July 2020.

On January 17, 2013, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a Sacred Lands Search; no sacred resources had been noted in the project vicinity. On February 1, 2013, the NAHC provided a contact list of local Native American tribes, bands, or individuals with potential concerns or interests in the cultural resources of the proposed project. The County sent consultation letters, emails and phone calls to the tribes identified on the NAHC contact list on March 12, 2013. The project was subsequently placed on hold until 2017. The County received an updated NAHC Sacred Lands records search on October 4, 2017 and the County sent letters to identified tribal representatives on November 20, 2017; and followed up via emails and phone calls on December 8, 2017 and December 22, 2017. The Barona Band of Mission Indians, the Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, the Jamul Indian Village, the San Pasqual Band of Mission

Indians, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians requested AB-52 consultation. The Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians consulted through Sacred Lands.

Per the requests made during consultation, a qualified archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor shall be present during initial grading activities in previously undisturbed soils.

> **CR-1 Cultural Resources Avoidance and Minimization Efforts**
> A qualified archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor will be provided during initial project-related ground disturbing activities. If inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources are made, the County, project archaeologist, and appropriate Native American representative shall divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to assess the significance of the resources and confer regarding the appropriate treatment (i.e., preservation, avoidance, and/or mitigation for the resources). As part of the objectives, criteria, and procedures required by Section 21082 of the Public Resources Code, a lead agency shall make provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources inadvertently discovered during construction.
>
> Consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(b) and Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014), avoidance shall be the preferred method of preservation for cultural resources. Work could continue in other parts of the project site while historical or unique archaeological resource mitigation takes place. The project archaeologist, in consultation with the County staff archaeologist, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the archaeologist and approved by the County staff archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods.

Therefore, due to the previously disturbed nature of the site and inclusion of a qualified archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor during initial project-related ground disturbing activities, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA §15064.5.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records obtained from the South Coastal Information Center on February 13, 2018 and a survey of the project area by County of San Diego approved archaeologist Lauren Downs, M.A., RPA and Theodore Cooley M.A., RPA,

accompanied by Native American Monitor Jenna Growingthunder on February 21, 2018, 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. Further refinement of the project APE resulted in an additional survey by County of San Diego approved archaeologist Marcos Ramos-Ponciano, M.A., RPA, accompanied by Native American Monitor Banning Taylor on November 16, 2018, and no cemeteries were identified. Therefore, the project would not disturb human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, Archaeological Survey Report for the 13th Street Bridge Project, Ramona, San Diego County CA, prepared by AECOM, dated July 2020.

Although it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered during construction, per the requests made during Native American consultation, the County has agreed to provide a qualified archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitoring during initial project-related ground disturbing activities.

CR-2 Human Remains Avoidance and Minimization Efforts
A qualified archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor will be provided during initial project-related ground disturbing activities. If human remains are encountered, consistent with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin of the remains. Further, consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), human remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made.

If the County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be contacted within twenty-four (24) hours. The NAHC shall immediately identify the "most likely descendant(s)" (MLD) and notify them of the discovery. The MLD shall make recommendations within forty-eight (48) hours after being allowed access to the site, and engage in consultations with the landowner concerning the treatment of the remains. The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further construction activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted. Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed.

Therefore, due to the previously disturbed nature of the site and inclusion of a qualified archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor during initial project-related ground disturbing activities, the project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project does not propose any energy consumption during operation. During project construction there would be a temporary consumption of energy resources for the movement of equipment and materials, but the duration is only limited to the construction phase. Compliance with local, state, and federal regulations, which limit engine idling times and require recycling project-related debris, would reduce short-term energy demand during the project's construction and maintenance to the extent feasible and thus the project would not result in a wasteful or inefficient use of energy. Therefore, the project will not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during the project's maintenance activities.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project does not propose any energy consumption during operation and energy consumption will be only required during the project construction phase. The regulations at the state level intended to reduce energy include the California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11–California Green Building Standards. The proposed project's construction and maintenance methods are consistent with these state regulations and the goals and measures in the County's General Plan. Additionally, the project is consistent with other County plans including the Comprehensive Strategic Plan to Reduce Waste. The proposed project would be consistent with the County's Strategic Plan to Reduce Waste through compliance with the Construction and Demolition Ordinance, which would comply with waste diversion requirements of the California Green Building Standards Code. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

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.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: To ensure the structural integrity of the bridge, the proposed design improvements are based on the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Load and Resistance Factor Design (2012) with California Amendments. In addition, the bridge design is based on Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria (SDC 1.7) and Structural Design principles. The geometric design is dictated by the AASHTO minimum design standards as interpreted and implemented by Caltrans Headquarters Design. The foundational structure design is based on the recommendations provided in the Foundation Report for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated May 30, 2017, and updated June 9, 2018, prepared by Allied Geotechnical Engineers, Inc. The proposed project improvements are designed to resist the effects of seismic ground motions based on the USGS Earthquake Hazards Program. The proposed project would consist of a cast-in-place pre-stressed, post-tensioned concrete box girder bridge supported on Cast-In-Drilled-Hole (CIDH) pile foundations that transfer the foundation loads into the underlying granitic bedrock. The potential for damage to the bridge from seismic loads is very low. The project site is relatively flat, therefore, the risk

of lateral spread displacement during a seismic event is considered remote. Therefore, the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. However, the proposed project would replace an undersized culvert with a bridge designed to meet federal requirements, and the proposed bridge improvements are based on AASHTO Load and Resistance Factor Design (2012) with California Amendments. In addition, the bridge design is based on Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria (SDC 1.7) and Structural Design principles. The foundational structure design is based on the recommendations provided in the Foundation Report for the 13th Street Bridge Project over Santa Maria Creek, County of San Diego, dated May 30, 2017, and updated June 9, 2018, prepared by Allied Geotechnical Engineers, Inc. The proposed project improvements are designed to resist the effects of seismic ground motions based on the USGS Earthquake Hazards Program. The proposed project would consist of a cast-in-place pre-stressed, post-tensioned concrete box girder bridge supported on CIDH pile foundations that transfer the foundation loads into the underlying granitic bedrock. Therefore, the potential for damage to the bridge from seismic loads and ground liquefaction is very low. The project site is relatively flat, therefore, the risk of lateral spread displacement during a seismic event is considered remote, and the proposed project would improve conveyance of flood waters and make the roadway crossing safer. Therefore, there will 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.

iv. Landslides?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Fallbrook sandy loam (9 to 15 percent slopes, eroded), Fallbrook sandy loam (15 to 30 percent slopes, eroded), Riverwash, Visalia sandy loam (0 to 2 percent slopes), and Placentia sandy loam (2 to 9 percent slopes) that has a soil erodibility rating of “moderate” and/or “severe” as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- A Storm Water Quality Management Plan has been prepared for the project. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site during construction: silt fencing along the perimeter of the temporary impact area, temporary stabilized construction access, energy dissipater outlet protection, fiber rolls (straw wattles), gravel and sand bags, and storm drain inlet protection. Post-construction, all areas where vegetation would be removed would be revegetated with appropriate native species.

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.

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 replace an undersized culvert with a bridge designed to meet federal requirements. The proposed project involves 6,200 cubic yards of grading for the proposed bridge and roadway that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill, and the project site is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone. The proposed bridge improvements are based on AASHTO Load and Resistance Factor Design (2012) with California Amendments. In addition, the bridge design is based on Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria (SDC 1.7) and Structural Design principles. The foundational structure design is based on the recommendations provided in the Foundation Report for the 13th Street Bridge Project over Santa Maria Creek, County of San Diego, dated May 30, 2017, and updated June 9, 2018, prepared by Allied Geotechnical Engineers, Inc. The proposed project improvements are designed to resist the effects of seismic ground motions based on the USGS Earthquake Hazards Program. The proposed project would consist of a cast-in-place pre-stressed, post-tensioned concrete box girder bridge supported on CIDH pile foundations that transfer the foundation loads into the underlying granitic bedrock. Therefore, the potential for damage to the bridge from seismic loads and ground liquefaction is very low. The project site is relatively flat, therefore, the risk of lateral spread displacement during a seismic event is considered remote, and the project site is not located in an area that is susceptible to landslide hazards. Since the project was designed to meet federal requirements and were based on the recommendations provided in the Foundation Report, the potential for impacts due to the project 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Fallbrook sandy loam (9 to 15 percent slopes, eroded), Fallbrook sandy loam (15 to 30 percent slopes, eroded), Riverwash, Visalia sandy loam (0 to 2 percent slopes), and Placentia sandy loam (2 to 9 percent slopes) that has a soil erodibility rating of “moderate” and/or “severe.” The proposed project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). Therefore, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property. This was

confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts to septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

The project area is located on quaternary alluvium which has a low sensitivity rating for containing paleontological resources. The project also involves approximately 6,200 cubic yards of grading. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, as a minimization measure, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

GEO-1 Paleontological Resources Avoidance and Minimization Efforts

A monitoring program implemented by the excavation/grading contractor will be required. Equipment operators and others involved in the excavation should watch for fossils during the normal course of their duties. In accordance with the Grading Ordinance, if a fossil or fossil assemblage of greater than twelve inches in any dimension is encountered during excavation, all excavation operations in the area where the fossil or fossil assemblage was found shall be suspended immediately, the Resident Engineer and the County's Environmental Planning Manager shall be notified, and a Qualified Paleontologist shall be retained by the applicant to inspect the find to determine if it is significant. A Qualified Paleontologist is a person who has:

- A Ph.D. or M.S. or equivalent in paleontology or closely related field (e.g., sedimentary or stratigraphic geology, evolutionary biology, etc.);
- Demonstrated knowledge of southern California paleontology and geology; and
- Documented experience in professional paleontological procedures and techniques.

If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that the fossil or fossil assemblage is significant; a mitigation program involving salvage, cleaning, and curation of the fossil(s) and documentation shall be implemented. If no fossils or fossil assemblages of greater than 12 inches in any dimension are encountered during excavation, a "No Fossils Found" letter will be submitted to the County Department of Public Works identifying who conducted the monitoring and that no fossils were found. If one or more fossils or fossil assemblages are found, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a report documenting the mitigation program, including field and laboratory methodology, location and the geologic and stratigraphic setting, list(s) of collected fossils and their paleontological significance, descriptions of any analyses, conclusions, and references cited.

Therefore, with the implementation of the above project requirements during project grading operations, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant. Furthermore, the project will not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that propose any amount of significant grading would be subject to the requirements for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The State of California has developed guidelines to address the significance of climate change impacts based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, which contains two significance criteria for evaluating greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of a project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 states that the "determination of the significance of greenhouse gas emissions calls for a careful judgment by the lead agency consistent with the provisions in Section 15064. A lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project."

Section 15064.4(b) further states that a lead agency should consider the following nonexclusive list of factors when assessing the significance of GHG emissions:

1. The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;

2. The extent to which project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project; and

3. The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement statewide, regional, or local plans for the reduction or mitigation for GHG emissions.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(1) states that "the lead agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable." A cumulative impact may be significant when the project's incremental effect, though individually limited, is cumulatively considerable.

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, hydrofluorocarbons, and nitrous oxide, among others. Human-induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources.

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would involve the replacement of the existing culvert crossing with a bridge designed to meet current federal standards, with roadway improvements along 13thStreet/Maple Street and Walnut Street, and the addition of stormwater conveyance and treatment features. The impacts associated with GHG emissions generated by the proposed project are related to emissions from construction. Off-road equipment, materials transport, and worker commutes during construction of the proposed project would generate GHG emissions. Emissions from the proposed project would be limited to the construction activities and would not involve land use development that would generate long-term operational impacts. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary, and localized and would cease once the project is constructed.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as Assembly Bill 32, which set the GHG 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 GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions. The State subsequently passed Senate Bill 32, which set an additional GHG emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2030, state emissions must be reduced to 40 percent below 1990 levels by reducing GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

The County of San Diego and the San Diego Air Pollution Control District have not adopted thresholds for evaluating GHG emission from construction activities. The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) developed a white paper titled “CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act.” The CAPCOA white paper provides a methodology used for jurisdictions across the state to identify a screening level for GHG emissions (CAPCOA 2008).

CAPCOA developed a 900 MT CO2E per year screening threshold by analyzing the capture of 90 percent or more of future discretionary development for residential and commercial projects across the state. As compared to similar mass emissions thresholds adopted by other regional air districts the CAPCOA 900 MT CO2E threshold is relatively conservative and could be used to support cumulative impact determination beyond 2020. Direct and cumulative impacts would be potentially significant and require further analysis If the project results in emissions that exceed 900 MT CO2E beyond current baseline emissions. However, the proposed project is anticipated to begin construction in 2023, therefore, construction related GHG emissions should also be analyzed in the SB 32 statewide framework (which established a 2030 GHG emissions reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels). CAPCOA has not recommended a threshold of significance consistent with SB 32 goals. To put the project-generated GHG emissions in the appropriate statewide context, the GHG analysis assumes that a 40 percent reduction in the CAPCOA’s existing threshold (resulting in 540 MT CO2e) is necessary to achieve the State’s 2030 GHG reduction goal (which is a 40 percent reduction below 1990 GHG emissions levels).

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) has identified an annual threshold of 1,100 MT CO2e for the construction phase of all project types. The SMAQMD recognizes that, although there is no known level of emissions that determines if a single project will substantially impact overall GHG emission levels in the atmosphere, a threshold must be set to trigger a review and assessment of the need to mitigate project GHG emissions. The threshold set by the SMAQMD was developed considering the AB 32 and SB 32 reduction goals.

Direct comparison of construction GHG emissions with long-term thresholds would not be appropriate because these emissions cease upon completion of construction. Other districts (e.g., SMAQMD 2020; South Coast Air Quality Management District 2008) recommend that GHG emissions from construction activities be amortized over a project’s operational lifetime for comparison with long-term GHG emissions significance

thresholds. In California, many bridges were designed for a 50-year lifespan, therefore, construction emissions were amortized over 50 years for comparison to the thresholds. Using this approach, if the proposed project does not exceed the adjusted SB 32 threshold of 540 MT CO2e per year or the SMAQMD threshold of 1,100 MT CO2e per year, then the GHG emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable.

A Greenhouse Gas Technical Memorandum for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated October 2020 and prepared by AECOM, quantified construction-related emissions using the California Emissions Estimator Model. The total estimated construction-related GHG emissions are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. GHG Construction-Related Emissions

Description	MT CO2e/year
Total Construction Emissions	744
Amortized Emissions (a)	15

Notes:
(a) Total project construction emissions divided over the project lifetime (conservatively assumed to be 50 years).
MT = metric tons, CO2e = carbon dioxide equivalents

The total GHG emissions resulting from construction of the proposed project would be approximately 744 MT CO2e and the amortized construction-related GHG emissions would be approximately 15 MT CO2e per year. The proposed project would not generate any new traffic and would only redistribute background traffic, which would result in a slight reduction in vehicle miles travelled as well as vehicle hours of travel. The proposed project would provide transportation infrastructure improvements without changing the traffic carrying capacity of the project area and is not anticipated to generate new vehicle trips or substantially increase operational emissions relative to existing conditions. Therefore, the project's construction-related GHG emissions would not exceed the adjusted SB 32 threshold of 540 MT CO2e per year, or the SMAQMD threshold of 1,100 MT CO2e for the construction phase of projects and GHG impacts from construction of the project would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as Assembly Bill 32, which set the GHG 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 GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions. The State subsequently

passed Senate Bill 32, which set an additional GHG emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2030, state emissions must be reduced to 40 percent below 1990 levels by reducing GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

To implement State mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local general plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The County's General Plan incorporates various climate change goals and policies. These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets.

As described above in this Initial Study, the impacts associated with GHG emissions generated by the proposed project are related to emissions from construction. Off-road equipment, materials transport, and worker commutes during construction of the proposed project would generate GHG emissions. Emissions from the proposed project would be limited to the construction activities and would be minimal, temporary, and localized and would cease once the project is constructed. The total GHG emissions resulting from construction of the proposed project would be approximately 744 MT CO2e and amortized construction-related GHG emissions would be approximately 15 MT CO2e per year. In addition, the proposed project would not generate any new traffic and would only redistribute background traffic within the project area, which would result in a slight reduction in vehicle miles travelled as well as vehicle hours of travel. The proposed project would provide transportation infrastructure improvements without changing the traffic carrying capacity of the project area. The proposed project is not anticipated to generate new vehicle trips and would not substantially increase operational emissions relative to existing conditions. The project's incremental contribution to cumulative GHG emissions is determined to not be cumulatively considerable because emissions are far below relevant numerical thresholds.

AB 32 establishes regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions and establishes a cap on statewide GHG emissions. The Scoping Plans contain the main strategies California will implement to achieve the required GHG reductions required by AB 32. The Scoping Plan updates include measures that would indirectly address GHG emissions associated with construction activities, including the phasing in of cleaner technology for diesel engine fleets and low-carbon fuel standard. However, the implementation of these measures depends on the development of laws and policies at the state level. As such, none of these statewide plans or policies constitute a regulation to adopt or implement a regional or local plan for reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions. In addition, it is assumed that any requirements formulated under the mandate of AB 32 and SB 32 would be implemented consistent with statewide policies and laws.

The project would be consistent with Scoping Plan strategies for increasing waste diversion from landfills and with the County of San Diego General Plan Policy COS-17,

which requires recycling, reduction, and reuse of construction and demolition debris. The proposed project would comply with the County Construction and Demolition Ordinance and would not conflict with the Scoping Plan strategies or the County of San Diego General Plan.

The proposed project would involve the replacement of the existing culvert crossing with a bridge designed to meet current federal standards and would not change the traffic carrying capacity of the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions and the impact would be less than significant.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on the analyses of the Initial Site Assessment for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated May 2020 and a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and Aerially Deposited Lead Survey Report dated April 2021 for the 13th Street Bridge, both prepared by AECOM, it was determined that the shallow soils within the proposed project area were not impacted with aerially deposited lead (ADL) and no further action with ADL is required. Low-level organo-chlorine pesticides (OCPs) are present in shallow soils throughout the proposed project at concentrations well below any action levels to be protective of worker safety, therefore, excess shallow soils generated during project construction are suitable for reuse within the project area boundary. The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on the analyses of the Initial Site Assessment for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated May 2020 and a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and Aerially Deposited Lead Survey Report dated April 2021 for the 13th Street Bridge, both prepared by AECOM, it was determined that the shallow soils within the proposed project area were not impacted with aerially deposited lead (ADL) and no further action with ADL is required. Low-level organo-chlorine pesticides (OCPs) are present in shallow soils throughout the proposed project at concentrations well below any action levels to be protective of worker safety, therefore, excess shallow soils generated during project construction are suitable for reuse within the project area boundary. Relatively minor concentrations of total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) and other metals were detected in deeper soils in the vicinity of the bridge footings, but they were well below any actions levels to be protective of worker safety. Therefore, the deeper soils do not warrant special handling and may be reused within the proposed project area boundary. No volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were detected in the groundwater samples collected, and relatively minor concentrations of TPH were detected in the groundwater sample, but based on the low concentrations detected, the impacts would not be significant.

Dewatering may be conducted during the proposed project. If groundwater will be generated over a period of several days or weeks that will require disposal or other handling, then a dewatering study should be conducted prior to the start of construction:

> **HAZ-1 Dewatering Study**
> A dewatering study will be conducted and depending on the results, groundwater generated during construction may require treatment prior to disposal. Prior to conducting site dewatering activities, all necessary permits should be filed with the RWQCB and/or other state or local governing agencies prior to the start of construction.

Should impacted materials be encountered during construction of the proposed project, the following avoidance and minimization measure will be implemented:

> **HAZ-2 Impacted Material Procedures**
> If impacted material is encountered during construction, the excavated materials should be handled and disposed in accordance with applicable regulations, and the appropriate health and safety measures should be implemented prior to and during construction to ensure the safety of field personnel handling impacted materials. Procedures for handling any impacted material (including soil) shall be described in the project's Health and Safety Plan and Soil Management Plan prepared by the contractor prior to construction and provided to the Department of Public Works' project engineer.

Based on the potential for the existing yellow thermoplastic paint traffic striping and/or pavement marking within the roadway to contain lead or other heavy metals at hazardous concentrations, the following avoidance and minimization measure will be implemented:

HAZ-3 Debris Containment and Removal Work Plan & Lead Compliance Plan
A Debris Containment and Removal Work Plan and Lead Compliance Plan will be completed prior to commencement of the 13th Street Bridge Project, which should include a discussion and procedures for the removal, containment, storage, and disposal of any painted surfaces within the proposed project area.

The following avoidance and minimization measures will be implemented during construction:

HAZ-4 Treated Wood Waste Procedures
Treated wood waste such as roadside wooden utility poles and signposts should be handled properly in accordance with applicable regulations and may require removal, handling, and disposal.

HAZ-5 Lead-Based Paint Procedures
Suspect lead-based paint associated with painted curbs and protective bollards within the proposed project area boundary should be sampled and handled in accordance with applicable regulations to ensure worker safety and for classification purposes.

HAZ-6 Trash Disposal
Illegally dumped materials and trash within the project area should be removed and properly disposed during project construction activities.

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. Implementation of the above avoidance and minimization measures **HAZ-1** through **HAZ-6** would help prevent the creation of a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

d) 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on the Initial Site Assessment for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated May 2020 and prepared by AECOM, a total of 44 sites within the American Society for Testing Materials-specified search distances of the proposed project area, were listed in regulatory agency databases. The following sites that the proposed project area crosses or that have the potential to affect the proposed project, are discussed in more detail below.

The Ramona Material Recovery Facility and Transfer Station, Ramona Recycling; San Diego County Ramona PHHWCF is located at 324 Maple Street and is situated in the northwestern corner of the proposed project area boundary. It is listed in the Solid Waste Facility/Landfill, Solid Waste Recycling (SWRCY), Aboveground Storage Tank (AST), San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division (HMMD), California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) haz-waste, CERS tanks, and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), and the California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) databases. This property operates as a large-volume transfer and processing facility, with a permitted volume of up to 700 tons of waste per day and an AST is registered at this facility. The majority of the database listings associated with this facility are compliance-related and are not indicative of a subsurface release. This facility has been in operation since the advent of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulations and the proposed project area only includes shallow excavation around the perimeter of this property. Therefore, the proposed project activities on this property will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

The SDG&E, SDG&E Ramona C&O, Ramona Disposal Service, Jemco Equipment Corp. is located at 110 14th Street and is situated in the southwestern portion of the proposed project area boundary and is listed in several databases, including RCRA small quantity generator, Facility Index System (FINDS), Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO), California hazardous waste manifest information (HAZNET) database, AST, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST), and San Diego County HMMD. Petroleum products and hazardous materials are used and stored at this facility, and hazardous wastes are generated. This facility uses a parts washer, and an AST is registered for this property. In 2008, a small spill (less than 1 gallon) of diesel fuel was released into an on-site storm drain; the spill was cleaned up and the case was closed. Based on the groundwater flow direction, groundwater is expected to flow to the west-northwest, away from the proposed project area, therefore, the proposed project activities on this property

will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Additionally, a LUST and San Diego County Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) case exists for a former occupant of this property; however, the actual location of the identified release is in the western half of the property, and not within the proposed project area boundaries. Therefore, the proposed project activities on this property will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

The Lakeside Furniture Manufacturing, Inc., Homestead Supply, Homestead Products is located at 114 14th Street and is located adjacent to the southwestern boundary of the proposed project area, south of the SDG&E property and is listed in the LUST, San Diego County SAM, San Diego County HMMD, Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System (SWEEPS) UST, Hist CORTESE, San Diego County Local Oversight Program (LOP), and CERS databases. A LUST was identified at this facility in 1988 and was removed, and the case closed in 1989. Three underground storage tanks (USTs) were present on this property: a 4,000-gallon diesel UST, a 550-unleaded gasoline UST, and a 550-gallon leaded gasoline UST. Only soils were affected during this UST closure; however, no groundwater information is available. Based on the expected groundwater flow direction determined for other properties in this area of the proposed project area (west), this facility is expected to be downgradient of the proposed project area. The case was closed with Department of Environmental Health (DEH) concurrence. The proposed project area boundary in this area lies entirely within the existing roadway and does not encroach onto this parcel, therefore, the proposed project activities located adjacent to this property will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

The Ramona Maintenance Station, Caltrans T0191 is located at 203 at 12th Street. This property is situated to the southeast of the proposed project area, east of the Ramona Library and is listed in the LUST, the San Diego County SAM, San Diego County HMMD, SWEEPS UST, Hist CORTESE, San Diego County LOP, and CERS databases. Two USTs, one 1,000-gallon gasoline and one 550-gallon diesel, were removed from this property in 1986, and various stages of remediation and groundwater monitoring have been completed at this property, and the case was closed in 2006. Therefore, the proposed project activities on this property will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Ramona Texaco, Ramona Chevron, Ramona Valero located at 1210 Main. This facility is not located within the project site, but across Main Street, approximately 640 feet southeast of the southernmost boundary of the proposed project area and is listed in the historical underground storage tank (HIST UST), UST, San Diego County SAM and HMMD databases, LUST, AST, SWEEPS UST, San Diego County LOP, CERS, Hazardous Waste Tracking System (HWTS), EMI, and HAZNET databases. A release was discovered at this facility in 1998 during the removal and upgrade of the previous USTs located at this property. Approximately 260 tons of gasoline-impacted soil were excavated at the time the USTs were removed. A documented gasoline (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes [BTEX] and methyl-tert-butyl ether [MTBE]) contaminant plume extended off-site and beneath several properties to the west and across Main Street to the north. According to a contaminant plume map from June 2017

provided in the October 2017 Corrective Action Plan, the benzene contaminant plume boundary terminated near the southern side of the Ramona Library building, approximately 250 feet southeast of proposed project area. The benzene concentration in this area was estimated at 1 part per billion (ppb) in groundwater, which is equal to the federal maximum contaminant level (MCL) for benzene. The MTBE plume extended beneath most of the Ramona Library building and was estimated to terminate in the vicinity of 14th Street and the vacant parcel south of the Cavalry Chapel property at 114 14th Street, approximately 100 to 150 feet south of the proposed project area. The plume map from this time period indicated that MTBE was estimated at 5 ppb in this area, which is below the MCL of 13 ppb for MTBE.

A DEH letter of concurrence was issued in January 2018 stating that the DEH was in agreement with the course of action proposed in the Corrective Action Plan, which was remediation by natural attenuation for this property. On September 12, 2018, the DEH issued a case closure letter stating that no further action (NFA) was required for this site, and a NFA letter was issued by the DEH on April 17, 2019. The extent of the plume associated with this property is well defined and remediation has been completed, and the case is closed. The source of these impacts was removed and although residual groundwater impacts (benzene, MTBE) still exist in this area, the contaminant concentrations at the time of site closure were below state and federal action levels. With no ongoing source of impacts, contaminant concentrations are expected to attenuate further over time and impacts associated with this off-site contaminant plume are not expected to have a direct impact on the proposed project area. If groundwater pumping is conducted as part of future dewatering activities associated with the proposed project, the potential that this off-site contaminant plume could be pulled toward the proposed project area at hazardous concentrations is minimal. Therefore, the proposed project activities located near this property will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Daniel's Liquor is located at 1350 Main Street is situated approximately 590 feet south-southwest of the proposed project area and is listed in several databases, including the UST, LUST, SWEEPS UST, HIST UST, Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups (SLIC), CERS, CERS Hazwaste, CERS Tanks, HWTS, and San Diego County SAM and HMMD databases. A release associated with two 10,000-gallon gasoline USTs was discovered in 1998, and subsequent remediation and groundwater monitoring were conducted. The case was closed with DEH concurrence in 2013. Therefore, the proposed project activities located near the property will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and Aerially Deposited Lead (ADL) Survey Report dated April 2021 for the 13th Street Bridge, prepared by AECOM, determined that the shallow soils within the proposed project area were not impacted with ADL and no further action with ADL is required. Low-level organo-chlorine pesticides (OCPs) are present in shallow soils throughout the proposed project at concentrations well below any action levels to be protective of worker safety, therefore, excess shallow soils generated during project construction are suitable for reuse within the project area boundary.

Relatively minor concentrations of total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) and other metals were detected in deeper soils in the vicinity of the bridge footings, but they were well below any actions levels to be protective of worker safety and the deeper soils do not warrant special handling and may be reused within the proposed project area boundary. No volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were detected in the groundwater samples collected, and relatively minor concentrations of TPH were detected in the groundwater sample, but based on the low concentrations detected, the impacts would not be significant.

Through implementation of the above avoidance and minimization measures **HAZ-1** through **HAZ-6** (described in detail in IX b) above), which consists of a dewatering study, impacted material procedures, debris containment and removal work plan and lead compliance plan, treated wood waste and lead-based paint procedures, and trash disposal, would help prevent the creation a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, although properties discussed above were listed in the regulatory agency databases, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment because all site remediation and clean up has occurred and will not contribute to a project-level or cumulatively considerable impact.

e) 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located within the Airport Influence Area 2 for the County of San Diego Ramona Airport. However, the proposed project will not result in hazards to airport safety or surrounding land uses for the following reasons:

- The project does not propose any distracting visual hazards including but not limited to distracting lights, glare, sources of smoke or other obstacles or an electronic hazard that would interfere with aircraft instruments or radio communications.
- 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.
- The project does not propose any artificial bird attractor, including but not limited to reservoirs, golf courses with water hazards, large detention and retention basins, wetlands, landscaping with water features, wildlife refuges, or agriculture (especially cereal grains).

Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐ 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.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project is a bridge replacement project. The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge and not facilities or structures that may interfere with public access to fire escape routes. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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 Consolidated Fire Code.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste,

such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

☐ 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 replace an existing undersized culvert with a bridge, which requires a NPDES General Permit for discharges of storm water associated with construction activities. This permit will be obtained prior to construction to demonstrate that the project will comply with all requirements of the NPDES General Permit. A Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) has been prepared and the following construction BMPs would be implemented to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: temporary fiber rolls on graded areas, a temporary stabilized construction entrance, and silt fences and gravel and sand bags will be installed where storm water flow exits the roadway and along the perimeter of the project impact area. In addition, general site management including waste management, concrete waste management, solid waste management, sanitary waste management, hazardous waste management and spill prevention and control would be implemented.

These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by Order Nos. R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and BMP Design Manual (BMP DM).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and BMP DM, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a bridge replacement project and does not propose any use of groundwater. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a 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;

☐ 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 replace the existing undersized culvert and associated fill with a bridge designed to covey the 100-year design storm. The creek would be temporarily altered during construction and may involve stream diversion and dewatering, however, post-construction, removal of the dirt road and elevating the crossing to a bridge would result in a reduction of indirect impacts such as erosion and sedimentation and would restore the creek hydrology to a more natural condition.

Storm drain systems are proposed directly to the north and south of the bridge to capture runoff and direct it towards the existing creek. Permeable pavement areas would be incorporated into the project as Green Street features to facilitate meeting water quality requirements and for storm-water management. An existing bio-retention basin located south of the bridge that currently treats stormwater from the library and associated parking lot would be redesigned to continue treating those existing areas in addition to the proposed paved roads south of Santa Maria Creek.

A portion of the project site falls within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) defined floodplain for Santa Maria Creek. A request for a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) for the project was submitted to FEMA on July 5, 2018 to revise

Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panels 06073C1117G and 06073C1136G for San Diego County, along Santa Maria Creek to reflect the proposed construction activity associated with the 13th Street Bridge Project and include grading within the floodplain and floodway. The floodway shall be revised from approximately 340 feet east (upstream) of where 13th Street/Maple Street crosses Santa Maria Creek to approximately 450 feet west (downstream) of where 13th Street/Maple Street crosses Santa Maria Creek. The proposed project and the associated fill area within the Santa Maria Creek floodplain would result in no increases in water surface elevation between the corrected effective condition and proposed condition model for the 100-year event.

A Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) has been prepared and the following construction BMPs would be implemented to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: temporary fiber rolls on graded areas, a temporary stabilized construction entrance, and silt fences and gravel and sand bags will be installed where storm water flow exits the roadway and along the perimeter of the project impact area. In addition, general site management including waste management, concrete waste management, solid waste management, sanitary waste management, hazardous waste management and spill prevention and control would be implemented.

These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by Order Nos. 2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWQMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VII., Geology and Soils, Question b.

ii.) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would replace the existing undersized culvert with a bridge designed to covey the 100-year design storm. Storm drain systems are proposed directly to the north and south of the bridge to capture runoff and direct it towards the existing creek. Permeable pavement areas would be incorporated into the project as Green Street features to facilitate meeting water quality requirements and for storm-water management. An existing bio-retention basin located south of the bridge that currently treats stormwater from the library and associated parking lot would be redesigned to continue treating those existing areas in addition to the proposed paved roads south of Santa Maria Creek.

A Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) has been prepared and the following construction BMPs would be implemented to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: temporary fiber rolls on graded areas, a temporary stabilized construction entrance, and silt fences and gravel and sand bags will be installed where storm water flow exits the roadway and along the perimeter of the project impact area. In addition, general site management including waste management, concrete waste management, solid waste management, sanitary waste management, hazardous waste management and spill prevention and control would be implemented.

These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by Order Nos. 2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWQMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VII., Geology and Soils, Question b.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would replace the existing undersized culvert with a bridge designed to convey the 100-year design storm. Storm drain systems are proposed directly to the north and south of the bridge to capture runoff and direct it towards the existing creek. Permeable pavement areas would be incorporated into the project as Green Street features to facilitate meeting water quality requirements and for storm-water management. An existing bio-retention basin located south of the bridge that currently treats stormwater from the library and associated parking lot would be redesigned and upsized to continue treating those existing areas in addition to the proposed paved roads south of Santa Maria Creek. The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Currently, 13th Street south of Santa Maria Creek is an unpaved dirt road. Storm water runoff from this portion of 13th Street generally sheet flows into the adjacent Santa Maria Creek. Maple Street, north of Santa Maria Creek is a paved road with runoff flowing in the southerly direction and into an existing storm drain system which ultimately outlets into the creek. Walnut Street, which runs adjacent to Santa Maria Creek, is partially paved and runoff from the paved portion is collected into an existing storm drain system which outfalls into the creek while the unpaved portion sheet flows directly into the creek.

The proposed project would replace the existing undersized with a bridge designed to covey the 100-year design storm. Storm drain systems are proposed directly to the north and south of the bridge to capture runoff and direct it towards the existing creek. Permeable pavement areas would be incorporated into the project as Green Street features to facilitate meeting water quality requirements and for storm-water management. An existing bio-retention basin located south of the bridge that currently treats stormwater from the library and associated parking lot would be redesigned to continue treating those existing areas in addition to the proposed paved roads south of Santa Maria Creek.

The proposed project would have the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities. However, the following construction BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: temporary fiber rolls on graded areas, a temporary stabilized construction entrance, silt fences will be installed where storm water flow exits the roadway and along the perimeter of the project impact area. In addition, general site management including waste management, concrete waste management, solid waste management, sanitary waste management, hazardous waste management and spill prevention and control would be implemented. Refer to X Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information. Therefore, the project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity 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?

☐ 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 improve conveyance of flood waters by replacing the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge designed to convey the 100-year storm event through Santa Maria Creek, which is mapped as a FEMA 100-year flood plain. The proposed project would not place structures, access roads or other improvements which will impede or redirect flood flows in these areas. The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. Construction BMPs would be implemented to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from washing down during construction or from entering into the creek: temporary fiber rolls on graded areas, and silt fences and gravel and sandbags will be installed where storm water flow exits the roadway and along the perimeter of the project impact area. In addition, general site management including waste management, concrete waste management, solid waste management, sanitary waste management, hazardous waste management and spill prevention and control would be implemented. The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche. The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated. The project site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. 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?

☐ 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 replace the existing undersized with a bridge designed to covey the 100-year design storm. The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego includes the

following: San Diego Region, Order No. R9-2013-0001 (as amended by Order Nos. R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100); Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO); County Stormwater Standards Manual. The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. The Watershed Protection Ordinance has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the introduction of new major infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. While a new bridge would be constructed, this structure would replace an existing dirt road and undersized culvert. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Ramona Community Plan. According to the Land Use Policies and Recommendations of the community Plan, the community vision is to preserve the "rural ambiance while accommodating and managing economic and residential growth" and Land Use Goal 1.1 states "the rural atmosphere of the Ramona community is preserved and enhanced, while encouraging a balance of land uses that are compatible with a country lifestyle". The proposed project would replace the existing undersized and structurally deficient steel culvert with a 4-span cast-in-place post-tensioned concrete box girder structure that would convey the 100-year design storm and install Green Street features to facilitate meeting water quality requirements and for storm-water management. The proposed project is not anticipated to have any design elements that would be expected to have a negative impact on the Ramona community, and it is expected that the proposed project would complement the visual character desired by the Ramona community. After construction, the project area would be revegetated with native species that would complement the rural aesthetic of the Ramona community and remain consistent with the community plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site has been 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 of "Potential Mineral Resource Significance" (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by densely developed land uses including industrial, rural commercial, village residential, and public/semi-public facilities land uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ 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. Therefore, 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 will 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 excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an undersized culvert and dirt road with a new bridge capable of conveying the 100-year storm event. The existing dirt road currently provides access to industrial areas. The proposed project is not traffic generating, there will be no additional lanes, and the project would not change the traffic capacity of the road. The land surrounding the site can be characterized as industrial, commercial and civic (automotive body repair, towing yards, propane sales, wrecking yard, solid waste collection/transfer and public library) uses, and the undeveloped areas of the Santa Maria Creek corridor. Beyond these areas are single family residential, horse keeping and minor agricultural uses.

A Noise Screening Memo for the 13th Street Bridge Project dated April 21, 2020 was prepared by AECOM; this study conducted noise measurements and modeling within the project area and determined that the proposed bridge project may result in a 3 A-weighted decibels (dbA) increase in noise levels due to a change in traffic volumes within the project area. This minimal increase in noise is generally considered a just barely detectable change to the average person and is not considered a substantial increase. The existing traffic noise and the potential increase due to the proposed bridge project would be negligible.

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, a bulldozer, trucks, a driller, 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 expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive 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 . This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours). Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area. Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports for the Ramona Airport. However, this is a bridge infrastructure project and not a development project proposing structures that people would occupy, and the project implementation is not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours). The location of the project is outside of the CNEL 60 dB(A) contours for the airport.

In addition, based on the list of past, present and future projects there are no new or expanded public airports projects in the vicinity that may extend the boundaries of the CNEL 60 dB noise contour. Refer to XXI Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise on a project or cumulative level.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. The proposed project would not displace a substantial number of people or any existing housing since the site is currently a bridge.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

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 proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobilehome 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:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. The proposed bridge would include an approximately 8-foot wide multi-use pathway to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians and provide connectivity to existing and planned trail facilities. Sensitive riparian habitat exists within the project area, specifically along the Santa Maria Creek. Protocol surveys for LBVI were conducted in spring 2018 and detected the endangered species on both sides of 13th Street along the Santa Maria Creek corridor; two nests were built immediately east of the proposed bridge location by the same pair and the second nest was successful. As an alternative to the pathway proposed along the new bridge, building a trail adjacent to or under the bridge structure would impact the sensitive habitat along the creek corridor and would put additional development pressure on the LBVI. With these considerations in mind, the preferred location for the pathway is across the bridge. Furthermore, the proposed pathway and overall bridge width has been minimized to the extent feasible to accommodate bridge users. In addition, all temporary impacts would be restored on-site with native vegetation, all permanent impacts would be mitigated on-site with native vegetation, and vegetation clearing will occur outside the bird breeding season to the extent feasible along with monitoring by a qualified biologist. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities across the proposed bridge would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☒ 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 consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge and would not result in an increase of traffic. There will be no additional lanes, therefore, once the project is constructed, the new bridge would result in no additional motor vehicle trips and would have no impact on 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.

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

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

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge and would not result in an increase of traffic. The project is not traffic generating and there will be no additional lanes, therefore, once the project is constructed, the new bridge would result in no additional motor vehicle trips and would have no impact on any additional vehicle trips. The project would not change the traffic capacity, or result in an increase of vehicle miles traveled. Based on the 13th Street Project Traffic Impact Assessment dated October 1, 2013 prepared by Linscott, Law, & Greenspan, 13th Street Bridge Data Validation Memorandum dated February 28, 2019 prepared by Chen Ryan Associates, and the 13th Street Bridge Traffic Impact Analysis Addendum dated May 21, 2020 prepared by the County of San Diego Department of Public Works, it is expected that traffic would be redistributed due to the proposed bridge project. It is estimated that average daily traffic volumes would shift from 10th Street and Main Street to 13th Street and Maple Streets. While the traffic patterns would be redistributed, the reduction in traffic volumes from the redistribution of traffic from 10th Street and Main Street to 13th Street and Maple Street would result in improved traffic operations. Therefore, the project would not conflict or be inconsistent 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)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. The proposed bridge and approaches would include two 12-foot travel lanes, 3-foot shoulders on each side, and an approximately 8-foot wide multi-use pathway to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians. In addition, three bridge barriers with a total width of approximately 4-feet, consisting of two edge deck rails and one pedestrian barrier would be installed to separate pathway users from the travel lane and creek. Based on the 13th Street Bridge Traffic Impact Analysis Addendum dated May 21, 2020 and prepared by the County DPW Transportation Division, it was determined that the proposed project improvements were designed in compliance with all County Public Road Standards and County Private Road Standards, as applicable. The design plans show allowable slopes, vertical curves, and horizontal geometry based on the applicable road standards. In addition, the proposed project is considered an

operational improvement and would redistribute background traffic and not generate new traffic because the improvement of 13th Street/Maple Street from a dirt road to a paved road provides a significant increase in operational safety and capacity for the segment.

The proposed bridge improvements are designed to County and Federal Highway Administration requirements. The proposed bridge improvements are based on AASHTO Load and Resistance Factor Design (2012) with California Amendments. In addition, the bridge design is based on Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria (SDC 1.7) and Structural Design principles. The foundational structure design is based on the recommendations provided in the Foundation Report for the 13th Street Bridge Project over Santa Maria Creek, County of San Diego, dated May 30, 2017, and updated June 9, 2018, prepared by Allied Geotechnical Engineers, Inc. The proposed project improvements were also designed to resist the effects of seismic ground motions based on the USGS Earthquake Hazards Program.

The proposed roadway improvements on 13th Street/Maple Street and Walnut Street are based on a design speed of 30 MPH per the County Public Road Standards. The roadway improvements were designed to maximize sight distance so there would be no increased hazards. For example, the horizontal roadway curves of the project have a radius greater than or equal to 800 feet, which is acceptable based on the 30 MPH design speed; this would allow vehicles to turn at a gradual rate. The vertical roadway curves have lengths and grade differences based on the 30 MPH design speed, and the proposed roadway sections show an acceptable cross section of 2%; this would allow for a smooth transition between roadway grades at a gradual rate. There would be no creation or increased risk of hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. In addition, the proposed project roadway improvements will tie into existing roadways that conform to the current County Public Road Standards, as applicable. The dirt road will become paved and include accessible pedestrian facilities where none existed previously. Bridge barriers rails, American with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramps, signing, striping, and stop control, will improve visibility conditions by better delineating the movements of, vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians. The proposed project will be providing significant upgrades to the roadways. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to design features, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impedes adequate site distances on a road.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Construction of the proposed project would result in the closure of 13th Street during construction, but access to the adjacent neighborhoods and businesses would be

maintained during construction. Two potential detour alternatives have been identified for the single stage construction of the 13th Street Bridge Project. Detour Alternative 1: from Main Street, go north onto Montecito Road and continue west on Montecito Road, turn north on Alice Street, and turn east on Walnut Street. Detour Alternative 2: from Main Street, go north on 10th Street/Pine Street, turn west on Olive Street, and turn south on Maple Street/13th Street. The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. The County of San Diego Department of Public Works sent out consultation letters on November 26, 2019 and followed up via emails and phone calls on December 11, 2019 and December 30, 2019. The Barona Band of Mission Indians, the Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, the Jamul Indian Village, the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians requested AB-52 consultation. The Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians consulted through Sacred Lands. No tribal cultural resources were identified during consultation. As such, the project would result in no impact to tribal cultural resources. However, per the requests made during Native American consultation, the County has agreed to provide a Kumeyaay Native American monitor during project-related initial ground disturbing activities.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. No tribal cultural resources were identified during consultation. Therefore, there would be no impacts to tribal cultural resources. However, per the requests made during Native American consultation, the County has agreed to provide a Kumeyaay Native American monitor during project-related initial ground disturbing activities.

XVIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects. Specifically, refer to Sections IV Biological Resources and X Hydrology & Water Quality for more information.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve or require water services from a water district. The project is for the replacement of an existing undersized culvert with a new bridge that does not rely on water service for any purpose.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge and will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. The proposed project 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new 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.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. The project will not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. Therefore, the project would not result in an impact to emergency plans.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. Therefore, the project would not add or increase occupants, or exacerbate wildfire risks thereby exposing 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. Therefore, the project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing undersized culvert with a new bridge. Therefore, the project would 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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 and Geology and Soils. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation

includes mitigating impacts to sensitive vegetation communities and jurisdictional resources through on-site restoration, avoidance of the LBVI and avian breeding season to the extent feasible, three pre-construction nesting surveys for LBVI within 30 days prior to initiation of vegetation removal, pre-construction nesting surveys during the breeding season, an employee education program, biological monitoring during construction as needed, delineation of environmentally sensitive areas, and stormwater and construction best management practices would be included to reduce the effects to a level below significance. A paleontological monitoring program will be implemented to avoid impacts to previously undiscovered paleontological resources to a level below significance. Cultural Resources has been evaluated and the project would result in a less than significant impact, but as a minimization and avoidance measure, the County will provide a qualified archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor during initial project-related ground disturbing activities to avoid impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources. Hazards and Hazardous Materials has been evaluated and the project would result in a less than significant impact, however, a dewatering study will be conducted prior to construction, a debris containment and removal work plan and lead compliance plan will be prepared prior to construction, if impacted materials, treated wood waste, or lead-based paint are encountered during construction, they would be handled in accordance with applicable regulations, and illegal dumped materials and trash will be properly disposed to avoid and minimize impacts from hazards and hazardous materials. No additional mitigation under Mandatory Findings of Significance is requited. 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:

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

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP/SCH NUMBER
Elliott Pond	PDS2018-IC-18-020
Creekside at Village Walk	PDS2018-LP-18-032
Sprint DO Marco 880258	PDS2018-ZAP-00-009W1M2
Aldi Ramona	PDS2018-STP-18-021

Montecito LLA	PDS2018-BC018-0040
Ramona Intergenerational Community Campus Project	SCH No. 2016121008

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:

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, VII. Geology and Soils, IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, X Hydrology and Water Quality XIII. Noise, XIV. Population and Housing, and XVII. Transportation. 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 Department of Public Works, 13th Street Bridge Project Visual Impact Memo, May 18, 2020.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPIP), 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/legsregs/nhsdatoc.html)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AIR QUALITY

AECOM, Air Quality Technical Memorandum for the 13th Street Bridge Project, May 2020.

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

AECOM, 2018 13th Street Bridge Project, Listed Branchiopod Species 90-Day Report of Protocol Wet-Season Surveys, Ramona, San Diego County, California, June 16, 2018.

AECOM, 13th Street Bridge Project Aquatic Resources Delineation Report, October 2020.

AECOM, 13th Street Bridge Project Biological Assessment, October 2020.

AECOM, 13th Street Bridge Project Conceptual Mitigation Plan, July 6, 2021.

AECOM, 13th Street Bridge Project Natural Environment Study, October 2020.

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.

Helm Biological Consulting, Dry Soil Analysis for the Direction of Federally-Listed Large Branchiopods at the 13th Street Bridge Project, Ramona, San Diego County, California, August 2018.

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.

ICF International, 13th Street Bridge, Dry Season Protocol Survey for Listed Fairy Shrimp, Ramona, County of San Diego, December 2013.

ICF International, 13th Street Bridge, Wet Season Protocol Survey for Listed Fairy Shrimp, Ramona, County of San Diego, California, August 2013.

ICF International, Results of Least Bell's Vireo Surveys for the 13th Street Bridge Project in Ramona, California, August 2012.

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.

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)

Sage Wildlife Biology, Least Bell's Vireo Survey Report for the 13th Street Bridge Project, Ramona, San Diego, California, August 2018.

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. Biological Opinion for the 13th Street Bridge over Santa Maria Creek, Ramona, California. FWS-SDG-20B0242-21F0057. March 25, 2021.

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

AECOM, 3th Street Bridge Project Historic Property Survey Report, July 2020.

AECOM, Archaeological Survey Report 13th Street Bridge Project, July 2020.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GEOLOGY & SOILS

Allied Geotechnical Engineers, Inc. Foundation Report 13th Street Bridge Project over Santa Maria Creek County of San Diego. May 30, 2017, Updated June 9, 2018.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

AECOM, Greenhouse Gas Technical Memorandum for the 13th Street Bridge Project, October 2020.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/CAPCOAWhite-Paper.pdf, January 2008.

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

AECOM, Initial Site Assessment for 13th Street Bridge Project, May 2020.

AECOM, Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and Aerially Deposited Lead Survey Report for 13th Street Bridge Project, April 2021.

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.sdcounty.ca.gov/, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcounty.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.sdcounty.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)

Rick Engineering Company. Request for a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) for a Portion of Santa Maria Creek Located in the County of San Diego, California 13th Street Bridge. July 5, 2018.

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

AECOM, 13th Street Bridge Project Land Use and Community Impacts Technical Memorandum, October 2020.

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.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Department of Public Works, Memo Prepared for Caltrans to Facilitate 4(f) Analysis for the Proposed 13th Street Bridge Project, February 15, 2015.

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

AECOM, 13th Street Bridge Project Noise Screening Technical Memorandum, April 2020.

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

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.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf)

County of San Diego Department of Public Works, 13th Street Bridge Traffic Impact Analysis Addendum, May 21, 2020.

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

Chen Ryan, 13th Street Bridge Data Validation Memorandum, February 28, 2019.

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

Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers, Traffic Impact Analysis 13th Street Bridge Project, October 1, 2013.

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)