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NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND COMMENT LETTERS
NOTICE OF PREPARATION
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING NOTICE

DATE: April 5, 2005

TO: Interested Agencies and Individuals

LEAD AGENCY: San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123

SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the San Diego County Water Authority Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure (FRS) II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project

The San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority) will be the lead agency for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and State CEQA Guidelines (CCR Title 14, §§15082(a), 15103, and 15375). The EIR will address the environmental effects of constructing and operating a flow regulatory structure and pipeline tunnel, with associated ingress/egress, within the boundaries of the Mission Trails Regional Park (MTRP), City of San Diego, County of San Diego, California. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the EIR prepared by the Water Authority when considering your permit or other approvals for the project.

The purpose of this notice is: (1) to serve as the Notice of Preparation (NOP) to potential state responsible agencies for project approval, state trustee agencies responsible for natural resources affected by the project, and federal agencies that may be responsible for project approval or funding pursuant to Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and (2) to advise and solicit comments and suggestions regarding the preparation of the EIR, environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR, and any related issues from interested parties other than those noted above, including interested or affected members of the public. The Water Authority requests that any potential responsible or trustee agency responding to this notice respond in a manner consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15082 (b).

All parties that have submitted their names and mailing addresses will be notified as part of the current project’s CEQA review process. If you wish to be placed on the mailing list or have any questions or need additional information, please contact the person identified below.

The project description, location, and potential environmental effects are provided in the attached materials. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(d), an Initial Study has not been prepared for this project.
Public Scoping Meeting: One public open house and scoping meeting will be held on the Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project. The meeting will commence promptly at the address, date and time shown below:

Date: April 19, 2005

Time: Open house: 6:30-7:00 p.m.
     Scoping: 7:00-8:00 p.m.

Place: Training Room
       San Diego County Water Authority
       4677 Overland Avenue
       San Diego, CA 92123-1233

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. Please send your written responses, including the name of a contact person, to:

Mr. Mark Tegio
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123-1233
Telephone: (858) 522-6753
Facsimile: (858) 268-7881

Project Title: Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project

Signature: [Signature]
Title: Director of Water Resources
Date: 4/1/05

Attachments

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY CLERK
San Diego County on APR 7 2005
Posted APR 7 2005
Returned to agency on

Deputy
Attachment to the Notice of Preparation for an Environmental Impact Report for the San Diego County Water Authority Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure (FRS) II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project

WATER AUTHORITY BACKGROUND

The San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority) was organized on June 9, 1944 to provide a safe and reliable water supply to its member agencies serving the San Diego Region. The Water Authority has 23 member agencies, consisting of six cities, 16 special districts and the Pendleton Military Reservation. As the regional water wholesaler, the Water Authority purchases most of its water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

A 34-member Board of Directors governs the Water Authority. The General Manager and staff implement the policies approved by the Board of Directors and handle the agency’s day-to-day operations. The Water Authority has approximately 200 employees working within 11 major functional areas of responsibility: Administrative Services, Imported Water, Finance, Water Resources, Public Affairs, Engineering, Operations and Maintenance, Right of Way, Human Resources, and Offices of General Manager and General Counsel.

The current estimated population in San Diego County is 2.9 million people, 98 percent of which live within the Water Authority’s service area. The service area lies within the foothills and coastal areas of the westerly third of San Diego County, encompassing approximately 907,634 acres.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND

The Mission Trails FRS II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project (proposed Project) was identified as a key component in the Water Authority’s draft Regional Water Facilities Master Plan (RWFMP) issued in December 2002. The RWFMP evaluated the Water Authority’s ability to meet its mission through calendar year 2030. The evaluation was based on current plans for water supply and facility improvements, with consideration of additional facility improvements and new facilities needed to cost effectively meet the Water Authority’s mission to provide a safe and reliable supply of water at the lowest possible and equitable cost to its member agencies serving the San Diego region. The RWFMP is intended to serve as a road map for implementing major capital improvements needed by the Water Authority to serve demands.

Flow regulatory storage provides flexibility in operating the aqueducts so that spills from the vents can be avoided in the event that water is rejected at a flow control facility. Current operational storage is limited to an 18 million gallon (mg) flow regulatory structure located on the treated-water pipeline of the Second Aqueduct in Mission Trails Regional Park, a one mg tank on the North County Distribution Pipeline (also treated water), and the Twin Oaks Valley Diversion Structure, which will regulate flows on the untreated-water pipelines of the Second Aqueduct. The Water Authority’s operating and engineering staff have identified five additional locations where operational storage would provide operational flexibility and system reliability.
including the proposed Mission Trails FRS II, adjacent to the treated-water FRS in Mission Trails Regional Park.

The proposed Mission Trails FRS II would provide the same operational benefit for the untreated-water system as the existing FRS provides for the treated-water system of the Second Aqueduct. The Mission Trails FRS II would protect against flow rejections causing spills, allow the Water Authority to remove existing vents in MTRP, and provide higher hydraulic service and increased capacity to the Alvarado and Perdue WTPs and the Lower Otay and Sweetwater Reservoirs.

The proposed Mission Trails FRS II would consist of an 18 mg, underground, reinforced concrete water storage tank and appurtenant facilities constructed within an approximately 5.5-acre site within the northwestern edge of the 5,800-acre MTRP. The FRS II facility would be similar in function and located near the existing Mission Trails FRS I, just east of the residential community of Tierrasanta in the City of San Diego. The structure would be approximately 336-feet square, or approximately 2.5 acres in size. The vertical dimension of the FRS II would be approximately 26 feet. The entire structure would be covered with a layer of earthen fill to a depth of approximately two feet. A relatively small access and control building, similar in size to the stone structure above the adjacent Mission Trails FRS I facility, would be constructed within the FRS II site. The access and control building would be approximately 45 feet long, 30 feet wide, and 14 feet high. With the exception of four or five small hatches for access to the valve vaults, this building would be the only visible portion of the FRS II facility, once the layer of fill material is in place.

The proposed Project would also include construction of a 96-inch-diameter pipeline to be tunneled approximately 6,000 feet from north of Elliot Vent Number 1 to south of Elliot Vent Number 5 in MTRP. The tunneled pipeline would replace existing Pipelines 3 and 4. Existing Pipelines 3 and 4 would not be removed, but would be sealed and remain in place. The existing vent structures would be removed after completion of the new facilities.

In addition to the flow regulatory and pipeline structures, the proposed Project would include the construction of an Arizona crossing of the San Diego River at approximately the same location as the existing crossing, in the southern portion of the Project site just north of Jackson Drive and Mission Gorge Road. The purpose of the Arizona crossing is to provide emergency access to the Water Authority’s and MTRP facilities during low flow river conditions. The Arizona crossing would be a concrete pad without culverts. The crossing would be approximately 20 feet wide with a length approximately equal to the width of the river.

Temporary aboveground impacts of the Project would be limited to staging and construction areas within the 5.5-acre FRS II site, two approximately one-acre tunnel portal construction sites, and existing access roads through MTRP, including the construction of a proposed Arizona crossing of the San Diego River. The tunnel would require the excavation of approximately 40,000 cubic yards (cy) of soil and the FRS II would require the excavation of approximately 200,000 cy of soil. While some of this material would be retained as cover for the FRS II, much would be hauled out of MTRP for disposal.
Permanent aboveground impacts of the proposed Project would be limited to the access and control building located above the buried FRS II; concrete access points at the two tunnel portal locations, similar in nature to existing aqueduct access points currently found within MTRP; and the improved Arizona crossing of the San Diego River.

The regional location of the proposed Project is shown on Exhibit 1. Exhibit 2 provides the site map and identifies existing Water Authority facilities and the proposed Project components.

**REGULATORY BACKGROUND**

Pursuant to Section 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Water Authority is the Lead Agency for preparation of the EIR.

Actions identified to achieve approval of the proposed Project may include, but are not limited to, certification of the EIR and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, CEQA Findings, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (if necessary); and procurement of all necessary federal, state, and local regulatory permits. At this time it is anticipated that the following permits or approvals will be required:

- 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game
- 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Section 7 Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**SUMMARY OF KEY ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

Based on a preliminary review of the proposed Project, the following key environmental issues were identified as potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR. These key environmental issues will likely be modified during the course of EIR preparation.

- Aesthetics/Visual Quality
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise and Vibration
- Paleontological Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Recreation
- Traffic/Transportation
- Utilities and Public Services
- Hydrology/Water Quality
Mineral Resources and Population and Housing have been dismissed from further review because the location of the project within a Water Authority right-of-way through a regional park would preclude the extraction of minerals or the removal or development of houses.

Additional issues that will be evaluated in the EIR include project alternatives, cumulative impacts, growth inducement, and other CEQA mandated sections. A brief discussion of each issue is provided below.

**Aesthetics and Visual Quality**

The proposed Mission Trails FRS II site is located on a ridge top characterized by expansive open space with natural grass and shrub vegetation. Man-made modifications within the project vicinity include dirt trails and roads, an existing building associated with the Mission Trails FRS I, and various vent and valve housings associated with the buried Second Aqueduct. Although the project area is approximately 0.5 mile from the Tierrasanta residential neighborhood, the majority of the FRS II site is obscured from view by intervening topography. The northern tunnel portal will be visible from the Tierrasanta community and the southern tunnel portal will be visible from the higher elevations of the Navajo community.

The proposed Project will result in temporary visual impacts associated with the excavation of the FRS II site and the two, 1-acre tunnel portals. Existing vent structures, which are tall concrete stacks that are currently highly visible within MTRP, will be replaced by ground-level access vaults. All graded areas will be revegetated with native plant species following construction to blend with the surrounding vegetation. The only permanent aboveground project feature will be concrete access vaults at the tunnel portals, concrete access vaults at the existing vent structure locations, a small building that will house control valves and will allow access to the FRS II for operations and maintenance, and the Arizona crossing at the San Diego River.

The EIR will include a visual analysis. Key observation points will be selected, photographs of existing conditions will be taken, and the location of project features will be identified within each photograph. Visual simulations of the permanent aboveground features will be provided.

**Agricultural Resources**

According to the San Diego County Important Farmland Map, much of Mission Trails Regional Park and all of the proposed project area is designated as Grazing Land. However, there are no agricultural soils or agricultural operations within the project vicinity. The location of the project within Water Authority right-of-way through a regional park precludes future use of the area for agriculture.

**Air Quality**

The proposed Project area is located within the San Diego Air Basin under the jurisdiction of the San Diego Air Pollution Control District. San Diego County is designated as a non-attainment area for particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$), based on California Ambient Air Quality Standards. The project is expected to result in short-term significant impacts to air quality during construction. Mitigation measures to reduce the level of PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ during project construction will be developed as part of the analysis provided in the EIR.
**Biological Resources**

The proposed Project would be constructed within the West Fortuna region of MTRP. This subregion of the park contains a variety of vegetation communities including chaparral, riparian, grasslands, oak woodlands, and Diegan coastal sage scrub. Plant and wildlife species within MTRP are abundant and diverse with a number of special-status species present. Habitat within the project area will be surveyed, impacts to sensitive habitat will be quantified, and mitigation measures to offset those impacts will be recommended.

It is anticipated that significant, temporary impacts to sensitive biological resources may occur during project construction and that mitigation measures would involve restoration of habitat within the park. Permanent impacts to sensitive biological resources are likely to occur at the proposed crossing of the San Diego River, the location of the FRS II structure, and the access vaults at the tunnel portal locations. A Biological Resources Technical Report, which discusses the findings of the field studies, including recommendations for mitigation of short- and long-term project impacts, will be provided as a technical appendix to the EIR and summarized in the body of the EIR. The technical report will be used in the Section 7 consultation process with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

A wetlands delineation consistent with the 1987 ACOE Wetlands Manual will be conducted at the proposed crossing of the San Diego River. Spring surveys for sensitive plant species will be performed within the project area and immediate vicinity. In addition, protocol surveys for the California gnatcatcher, least Bell’s vireo, arroyo toad, and Quino checkerspot butterfly will be conducted. Previous information regarding vernal pools and San Diego fairy shrimp in the project vicinity will be obtained and assessed. The results of these studies will be attached to the Biological Resources Technical Report and included in the EIR discussion.

**Cultural Resources**

The proposed Project site is located in an area known to contain archaeological resources, including a low to moderate density of prehistoric milling stations, artifact scatters, and isolated finds. Historic period sites are also known from the area, including the Old Mission Dam and Flume. A cultural resources survey and Native American consultation will be conducted for the project. If sites are found within the project area, they will be evaluated for significance and mitigation recommendations will be provided. The results of the cultural resources study will be provided in a technical appendix to the EIR and will be summarized in the body of the EIR.

**Geology and Soils**

The proposed Project site is located in the Coastal Plains region in an area of volcanic and sedimentary rock consisting of sandstone, shale, and conglomerate, which is moderately to well consolidated. The northern-most extension of the Quaternary-age La Nacion fault is mapped about two miles west of the project site. This fault zone is estimated to have a maximum likely quake magnitude of 6.2 to 6.7 and the seismic hazard is considered low at this location over the next 50 years.
On-site soils are predominately from the Redding series, which consists of well-drained, undulating to steep gravelly loams that have a gravelly, clay subsoil, and a hard pan. Redding series soils have high expansion properties, severe erodibility, low plasticity, a low liquid limit, and low to moderate soil-slip susceptibility. These soils are derived from old gravelly alluvial material and have slopes of 2 to 30 percent. Geologic hazards that may be encountered during construction include unconsolidated and expansive soils, erosion, slope instability, and hard rock that may require blasting.

A geology technical report that evaluates the potential for seismic and other geologic impacts to the FRS II and the Pipeline Tunnel will be prepared and the results will be summarized in the EIR. Recommendations for FRS II and Pipeline Tunnel design features to mitigate potential geology and soils impacts will be provided.

**Land Use and Planning**

The proposed Project would be located within the Master Plan area for MTRP, adjacent to the community of Tierrasanta, within the City of San Diego. The project site is characterized by expansive open space and crossed by trails and dirt roads used primarily by park visitors. The buried Second Aqueduct crosses this portion of the park and includes vent structures and valve housings that are visible on the surface. The existing Mission Trails FRS I is a buried structure that has been covered with soil and revegetated to complement the surrounding open space and natural vegetation. One small building in a fenced enclosure is the only visible feature of the existing FRS. The EIR will evaluate the consistency of the proposed project with the park Master Plan, other adopted land use plans within the project vicinity, and current park uses within the project area.

MTRP is included within the area covered by the City of San Diego’s Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP). Although the Water Authority is not bound by the City’s implementing agreement or provided with take authorization for endangered species covered by the MSCP, conformance with the MSCP will be evaluated in the EIR as a means of evaluating potential impacts to biological resources. As will be discussed in the biological resources section, impacts to federally endangered species will require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

**Noise and Vibration**

The existing noise environment of the proposed Project site is fairly quiet, reflecting low intensity open space and recreational uses with the park setting. The EIR will evaluate potential noise and vibration impacts associated with tunneling, excavation, construction equipment, and large trucks hauling spoils out of the park during project construction. A technical report will be provided as an appendix to the EIR and the results of the study will be summarized in the body of the EIR.
Paleontological Resources

The proposed Project site is located in the Coastal Plains region and underlain by the Pomerado Conglomerate, Stadium Conglomerate, and Mission Valley formations. These formations have a moderate to high paleontological resource sensitivity because of their known potential to contain fossils. Construction of the proposed project may impact these fossil remains resulting in potentially significant impacts. The EIR will evaluate the project grading plans and recommend mitigation measures in the form of construction monitoring, salvage and curation of uncovered fossils, if appropriate.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The proposed Project will not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials and is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project area is currently parkland and there are no know hazardous waste or material present on the site. The Tierrasanta community and portions of the park, including the project site, were once used as a military training center. It is possible that unexploded ordnance may occur in the project area. The EIR will address this potential and recommend mitigation to ensure the safety of construction and maintenance personnel involved in the proposed project.

The proposed Project site is not located within two miles of an airport. Montgomery Field is located approximately four miles to the west and the closest runway at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar is over three miles to the northwest of the northern tunnel portal.

Based on a range of San Diego Fire Department classifications for the Tierrasanta community, and recent fire events in the area, the proposed site's fire hazard severity classification would be considered high. Requirements for fire protection and suppression capabilities during project construction will be included in the EIR.

Recreation

The proposed Project site is located within MTRP, one of the nation’s largest urban natural parks, which provides a wide variety of opportunities for outdoor education and recreation. Preservation of trail access, erosion control, and protection of sensitive biological and cultural resources have been identified as primary areas of concern for park staff. The EIR will evaluate the proposed project’s potential short-term impacts to recreational uses during construction and long-term physical impacts to the park, such as the proposed all-weather crossing of the San Diego River. According to the Master Plan for MTRP, a hike-in picnic area and a parking lot are planned within the project area; however, project construction would take place prior to the planned development. Also, these features were proposed in 1985 based upon the anticipated completion of Jackson Drive through MTRP. With the elimination of Jackson Drive from the City’s Circulation Element, it is likely that the development plans for this portion of MTRP will be scaled back.
Traffic/Transportation

Regional access to MTRP and the proposed Project site is provided by Mission Gorge Road via SR-52 to the north and I-15 to the west. Direct access to the project site would be from a series of unimproved maintenance roads along the existing pipeline route within MTRP. Potential ingress/egress locations have been identified at the intersection of Mission Gorge Road and Jackson Drive, the eastern terminus of Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, the intersection of Calle De Vida and Colina Dorada Drive, and near the intersection of Portobelo Drive and Via Valarta. A Traffic technical report that evaluates the project’s potential impact to area roadways and identifies several ingress/egress routes for construction traffic will be prepared. The traffic report will be a technical appendix to the EIR and will be summarized in the body of the EIR. Several construction traffic/transportation options with a recommendation for the preferred option will be provided.

The Marine Corps Air Station Miramar is approximately 2 miles northwest of the project site. No railroad lines are located in the vicinity of the project site.

Utilities and Public Services

The proposed Project would not require any wastewater service. Porta-potties would be provided for construction workers. No new stormwater facilities would be required because nearly all of the project would be constructed below ground. The City of San Diego Water Department would provide any on-site water service to the project site. The need to maintain flow through existing pipelines while the new pipeline is under construction will be identified in the EIR. SDG&E would provide any electrical power and natural gas. Information regarding high voltage power lines and poles, access roads, and easements within the project area will be presented in the EIR. The location for the disposal of excess material is the responsibility of the selected contractor and cannot be determined at this time. Excess dirt and rock may be transported to an area landfill to be used as cover material, if no other disposal site is located.

The City of San Diego would provide fire services to the project site. The first responding station would be Fire Station #39, which is located approximately 2.2 miles southwest of the site. The City of San Diego Police Department would provide law enforcement for the site. The Tierrasanta Boulevard storefront police substation, which is approximately 2.1 miles northeast of the site, is the closest station.

The nearest residential development is approximately 0.5 mile to the west of the proposed Project site and is adjacent to the proposed northern tunnel portal. San Diego City Schools serves the Tierrasanta area with the nearest school approximately 1.1 miles southwest of the project site.

The proposed Project site is located within a regional park. Construction of the project will not result in an increased demand for parkland and will have a negligible long-term effect on the use of the existing park.

All utilities and public services will be addressed in the EIR.
Hydrology and Water Quality

The proposed Project would be located within the Mission San Diego Hydrologic Subarea (HSA) in the Lower San Diego Hydrologic Area (HA) of the San Diego Hydrologic Unit (HU), Basin Area 7.0. The project location is within the MTRP on the southwest flank of Fortuna Mountain. Runoff from the project area would flow into any of three unnamed intermittent drainages that drain south-southwest to the San Diego River.

The proposed Mission Trails FRS II site is downstream of the Slaughterhouse Terminal Reservoir and the Santee HSA. There are no major water storage reservoirs downstream of the project site to the Pacific Ocean. Large intermittent drainages in the vicinity of the project site include the San Diego River, Oak Canyon, and Suycott Wash.

The Lower San Diego River is on the California impaired water bodies list as impaired by fecal coliform, low dissolved oxygen, phosphorus, and total dissolved solids (TDS). In addition, the Famosa Slough and Channel within Mission San Diego HSA is listed as impaired due to TDS concentrations, and the Pacific Shoreline in the San Diego HU is impaired for bacteria indicators. There are no beneficial uses identified for the unnamed tributaries within MTRP.

The EIR will include an analysis of potential impacts to water quality, erosion/sedimentation, and hydrology. The EIR will also address the width and materials for the proposed Arizona crossing and an analysis will be prepared to determine flood elevations and velocities at the crossing, as well as the design of the crossing to avoid upstream ponding.

However, stormwater runoff from the site may be directed toward unnamed streams in the project vicinity, including an adjacent stream corridor with steep slopes, increasing the potential for erosion and downstream flooding.

Cumulative Impacts

As required by CEQA, potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Project when added to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity will be addressed as part of the EIR analysis.

Project Alternatives

As required by CEQA, the EIR will evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Project that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. At this time it is anticipated that alternative locations for the FRS II structure and several alternative ingress/egress routes will be addressed in the EIR.

Other issues for inclusion in the Draft EIR may be identified as a result of scoping or agency input.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

Following completion of the 30-day Notice of Preparation review period, the Water Authority will incorporate relevant information into the Draft EIR, including results of public scoping and technical studies. The Draft EIR will be circulated for public review and comment for the required 45-day public review period. All individuals that have requested, in writing, will be placed on a Notice of Availability list for the Draft EIR. In addition, the Draft EIR and related materials will be available for review at the San Diego County Water Authority offices located at 4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA.

Following receipt of all written comments on the Draft EIR, the Water Authority will prepare Responses to Comments as part of the Final EIR, which will be considered and acted upon by the Water Authority’s Board of Directors at a noticed public meeting. The Water Authority will provide notification of future public meetings for this project to individuals that have requested to be included on the project interest list.

Should you have any questions or comments regarding this Notice of Preparation, please contact Mr. Mark Tegio, San Diego County Water Authority, Water Resources Specialist, at (858) 522-6753 or call the toll-free project information line at (877) 682-9283, Ext. 7004.
EXHIBIT 1
SDCWA MISSION TRAILS FRS II PROJECT
PROJECT LOCATION
Notice of Preparation

April 6, 2005

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project
SCH#: 2005041025

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Mr. Mark Tegio, Jr
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Associate Planner, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado River Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald R. Zimmerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseanne Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Forestry &amp; Fire Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Donaldson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Noah Tighman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Stewardship Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeeDee Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Edelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve McAdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadel Gayou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Koch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banky Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Flocerke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Lautermil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chadwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrina Gatchel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region 6 I/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo/Mono, Habitat Conservation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Shaffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Food and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depart. of General Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of General Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Sleppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Rameriz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Health/Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Commissions/Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Protection Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Eddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Ceccarelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s Office of Planning &amp; Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Clearinghouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Heritage Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Treadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County: San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel &amp; Lower LA Rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Rosander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin River Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Sarino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lands Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pagano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Orso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hasnand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans - Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Pencovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Olejnik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Special Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Policy Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Eagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Pulverman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Sable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Birnbaum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl J. Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathleen Hudson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast Region (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Region (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Region (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Region (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 5S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Region (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 5F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Region (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 5R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Region (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahontan Region (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 6V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahontan Region (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado River Basin Region (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana Region (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Region (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hockenberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Herrera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Water Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Toxic Substances Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Tracking Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Pesticide Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Updated on 3/11/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 4, 2005

Mr. Mark Tegio, Jr.
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, California 92123-1233

Comments on the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project (SCH# 2005041025)

Dear Mr. Tegio,

The California Department of Fish and Game (Department) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project in the City of San Diego (City), County of San Diego. The San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) proposes the construction and operation of an 18 million gallon flow regulatory structure (i.e., water storage tank, FRS), a 6,000-foot long tunneled pipeline, and an Arizona crossing in the San Diego River, and demolition of existing vent structures. The facilities would be built within Mission Trails Regional Park (MTRP), which is within the City’s Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP).

The FRS and appurtenant facilities would occupy 5.5 acres, near an existing FRS, just east of a residential community of Tierrasanta. The FRS would be below ground and would be covered with a layer of earthen fill to a depth of approximately two feet. The 96-inch diameter pipeline would be tunneled approximately 6,000 feet between existing pipeline vents along the SDCWA’s right-of-way. The new pipeline would replace two existing pipelines which would be abandoned and sealed in place. The project would require permits/agreements from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department.

The Department is a Trustee Agency and a Responsible Agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Sections 15366 and 15381, respectively. As a Trustee Agency, the Department reviews CEQA documents on proposed projects, comments on the project impacts, and determines whether the mitigation measures or alternatives proposed are feasible and appropriate. Pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and Section 1802 of the Fish and Game Code, the Department is responsible for the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants (including rare, threatened, and endangered species), and the habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species. The Department also administers the Natural Community Conservation Planning Program.
To enable the Department to adequately review and comment on the proposed project from the standpoint of the protection of plants, fish and wildlife, we recommend that the DEIR include the following information and/or address the following issues.

1. A complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed project, including all staging areas and access routes to the construction and staging areas.

2. A discussion about the feasibility of decommissioning the existing Arizona crossing at the San Diego River, restoring the riparian area, and using alternative access to the SDCWA’s facilities in the project area.

3. A complete list and assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying State or federally listed rare, threatened, endangered, or proposed candidate species, California Species of Special Concern and/or State Protected or Fully Protected species, and any locally unique species and sensitive habitats. Specifically, the DEIR should include:

   a. A thorough assessment of Rare Natural Communities on site and within the area of impact, following the Department’s Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Rare Plants and Rare Natural Communities (Attachment 1; revised May 8, 2000). The Department considers these communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance.

   b. A current inventory of the biological resources associated with each habitat type on site and within the area of impact. The Department’s California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) in Sacramento should be contacted at (916) 327-5960 to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat, including Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and Game Code. Please note that absence of a record of a species in the CNDDB within a project’s area of potential effect does not indicate absence of the species (i.e., it means only that no records of observations have been submitted to the CNDDB).

   c. Detailed discussions, including both qualitative and quantitative analyses, of the potentially affected listed and sensitive species (fish, wildlife, plants), and their habitats on the proposed project site, area of impact, and alternative sites, including information pertaining to their local status and distribution.

   d. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in consultation with the Department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. As the project is located within the MHPA, we recommend that surveys for MSCP-covered species for which there is suitable habitat within and around the project construction and staging areas, be conducted within the project footprint and the project’s area of potential effect at the appropriate time of year for each species. These surveys should occur in preparation of the DEIR, and if timing necessitates, no more than one year prior to the initiation of project construction within the area of impact to the species. If detected, appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures should be implemented for any
covered species to maintain consistency with the MSCP.

e. An inventory of rare, threatened, and endangered species on site and within the area of impact. Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition (see CEQA Guidelines, § 15380).

f. Discussions regarding seasonal variations in use by sensitive species of the project site as well as the area of impact on those species.

3. A thorough discussion of direct, indirect (e.g., lighting, noise, dust during and after construction), and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources. All facets of the project should be included in this assessment. Specifically, the DEIR should provide:

a. Information regarding the regional setting to assist in an assessment of environmental impacts, with emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15125(c)].

b. Specific acreage and descriptions of the types of wetlands, coastal sage scrub, and other sensitive habitats that will or may be affected by the proposed project or project alternatives. Maps and tables should be used to summarize such information.

c. The anticipated or real impacts of the project on listed and sensitive species and habitats. As to plants species, all plants included on CNPS’ List 1B and List 2 meet the definitions of Section 1901, Chapter 10 (Native Plant Protection Act) or Sections 2062 and 2067 (California Endangered Species Act) of the Department’s Fish and Game Code and are eligible for listing. As such, the List 1B and List 2 species must be fully considered in environmental documents prepared pursuant to CEQA as required by Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines.

d. Project impacts should be analyzed relative to their effects on off-site habitats. Specifically, this should include nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, and riparian ecosystems. Impacts to, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitat in adjacent areas should be fully evaluated and provided.

e. A discussion of potential conflicts resulting from wildlife-human interactions, potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, vibration, human activity, changes in drainage patterns, polluted runoff, hazardous materials spills, soil erosion and/or sedimentation, with mitigation measures proposed to alleviate such impacts, must be included.

f. If applicable, the document should include an analysis of the effect that the project may have on completion and implementation of regional and/or subregional conservation programs. Under Sections 2800-2840 of the Fish and Game Code, the Department, through the NCCP program, is coordinating with local jurisdictions, landowners, and the Federal Government to preserve local and regional biological diversity.

g. An analysis of cumulative effects, as described under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130.
General and specific plans, and past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed concerning their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.

4. Mitigation measures for adverse project-related direct and indirect impacts on sensitive plants, animals, and habitats. The DEIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect Rare Natural Communities (Attachment 2) from project-related impacts.

Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance, and where avoidance is infeasible, reduction of project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, off-site mitigation through acquisition and preservation of the affected habitats in perpetuity should be addressed. The Wildlife Agencies generally do not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts on rare, threatened, or endangered species. Studies have shown that these efforts are experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.

Include measures to perpetually protect the targeted habitat values where preservation and/or restoration is proposed. The objective should be to offset the project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of wildlife habitat values. Issues that should be addressed include restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, increased human intrusion, etc. Plans for restoration and revegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in southern California ecosystems and native plant revegetation techniques. Each plan should include, at a minimum: (a) the location of the mitigation site; (b) the plant species to be used; (c) a schematic depicting the mitigation area; (d) time of year that planting will occur; (e) a description of the irrigation methodology; (f) measures to control exotic vegetation on site; (g) success criteria; (h) a detailed monitoring program; (i) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and (j) identification of the entity(ies) that will guarantee achieving the success criteria and provide for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity.

5. Descriptions and analyses of a range of alternatives to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated. The analyses must include alternatives that avoid or otherwise reduce impacts to sensitive biological resources. Specific alternative locations should be evaluated in areas of lower resource sensitivity where appropriate.

6. If the proposed project has the potential to “take” any federally listed species, either directly or indirectly (i.e., foraging, reduction in habitat) over the life of the project, “take” authorization will need to be obtained from the Service through section 10 or section 7 of the Act. Regardless of whether project-related incidental take of federally-listed species is addressed through section 7 or 10 of the Act, it is essential that the Department be involved in all regulatory discussions about those species that are state listed under CESA. This is particularly important for take of any federally and state listed plant species, because the Service does not provide authorization for take of plant species.

7. A CESA Permit (Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code) or, if applicable, a Consistency Determination (Section 2080.1 of the Fish and Game Code), must be obtained if the project has the potential to result in “take” of species of plants or animals listed under CESA, either during construction or over the life of the project. Early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to a project and mitigation measures may be required to obtain a
Mr. Mark Tegio

CESA Permit. Revisions to the Fish and Game Code, effective January 1998, may require that the Department issue a separate CEQA document for the issuance of a 2081 permit unless the project CEQA document addresses all project impacts to listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of a 2081 permit. The Department, acting as a Responsible Agency under CEQA, may adopt the lead agency’s CEQA document for the project. For these reasons, the following information is requested.

a. An analysis and discussion demonstrating that: 1) each impact has been minimized and fully mitigated, 2) all mitigation measures are capable of successful implementation, and 3) adequate funding is ensured for implementation, and for monitoring compliance with, and effectiveness of, the mitigation measures.

b. The analysis of the impacts of the taking must include all impacts on the species.

c. An evaluation of the impacts that includes a discussion of the potential to jeopardize the continued existence of the species. This shall include consideration of the species’ capability to survive and reproduce, and any adverse impacts of the taking on those abilities in light of: 1) known population trends, 2) known threats to the species, and 3) reasonably foreseeable impacts on the species from other related projects and activities.

d. Biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA Permit.

e. A Department-approved Mitigation Agreement and Mitigation Plan is required for plants listed as rare under the Native Plant Protection Act.

8. The Department cannot authorize take of State Fully Protected Species. The DEIR should identify the locations of these species within the project’s footprint and area of potential effect, and address how potential impacts will be avoided, including specific measures that will be implemented to ensure this.

9. The Department has responsibility for the conservation of wetland and riparian habitats. It is the policy of the Department to discourage development in or conversion of wetlands. We oppose any alteration, development, or conversion of a waterbody that would result in a reduction of wetland acreage or wetland habitat values, unless, at a minimum, project mitigation assures there will be “no net loss” of either wetland habitat values or acreage. Development and conversion include but are not limited to conversion to subsurface drains, placement of fill or building of structures within the wetland, and channelization or removal of materials from the streambed. All wetlands and watercourses, whether intermittent or perennial, should be retained and provided with substantial setbacks which preserve the riparian and aquatic values and maintain their value to on-site and off-site wildlife populations.

If appropriate, a jurisdictional delineation of lakes, streams, and associated riparian habitats should be included in the DEIR, including a wetland delineation pursuant to the Service definition (Cowardin 1979) adopted by the Department. Please note that wetland and riparian habitats subject to the Department’s authority may extend beyond the jurisdictional...
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limits of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

10. The proposed project may require a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA). The Department has direct authority under Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et. seq. regarding any proposed activity that would divert, obstruct, or affect the natural flow or change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake. The Department’s issuance of a SAA for a project that is subject to CEQA requires CEQA compliance actions by the Department as a Responsible Agency. As a Responsible Agency under CEQA, the Department may consider the SDCWA’s (Lead Agency’s) CEQA documentation. To minimize additional requirements by the Department pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. and/or under CEQA, the documentation should fully identify the potential impacts to the lake, stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and reporting commitments for issuance of the agreement. A LSAA notification form may be obtained by writing to the Department of Fish and Game, 4949 Viewridge Avenue, San Diego, California 92123-1662, or by calling (858) 636-3160, or by accessing the Department’s website at www.dfg.ca.gov/1600. The Department’s SAA Program holds regularly scheduled pre-project planning/early consultation meetings. To make an appointment, please call our office at (858) 636-3160.

The Department finds that the proposed Project would not be de minimis in its effects on fish and wildlife per section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please contact Libby Lucas at (858) 467-4230 if you would like to discuss this response to the NOP.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Donald R. Chadwick
Habitat Conservation Planning Supervisor
California Department of Fish and Game

cc: Department of Fish and Game (David Mayer)
State Clearinghouse
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Chris Otahal)

References

Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities

State of California
THE RESOURCES AGENCY
Department of Fish and Game
December 9, 1983
Revised May 8, 2000

The following recommendations are intended to help those who prepare and review environmental documents determine when a botanical survey is needed, who should be considered qualified to conduct such surveys, how field surveys should be conducted, and what information should be contained in the survey report. The Department may recommend that lead agencies not accept the results of surveys that are not conducted according to these guidelines.

1. Botanical surveys are conducted in order to determine the environmental effects of proposed projects on all rare, threatened, and endangered plants and plant communities. Rare, threatened, and endangered plants are not necessarily limited to those species which have been "listed" by state and federal agencies but should include any species that, based on all available data, can be shown to be rare, threatened, and/or endangered under the following definitions:

A species, subspecies, or variety of plant is "endangered" when the prospects of its survival and reproduction are in immediate jeopardy from one or more causes, including loss of habitat, change in habitat, over-exploitation, predation, competition, or disease. A plant is "threatened" when it is likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future in the absence of protection measures. A plant is "rare" when, although not presently threatened with extinction, the species, subspecies, or variety is found in such small numbers throughout its range that it may be endangered if its environment worsens.

Rare natural communities are those communities that are of highly limited distribution. These communities may or may not contain rare, threatened, or endangered species. The most current version of the California Natural Diversity Database's List of California Terrestrial Natural Communities may be used as a guide to the names and status of communities.

2. It is appropriate to conduct a botanical field survey to determine if, or to the extent that, rare, threatened, or endangered plants will be affected by a proposed project when:

a. Natural vegetation occurs on the site, it is unknown if rare, threatened, or endangered plants or habitats occur on the site, and the project has the potential for direct or indirect effects on vegetation; or
b. Rare plants have historically been identified on the project site, but adequate information for impact assessment is lacking.

3. Botanical consultants should possess the following qualifications:

a. Experience conducting floristic field surveys;
b. Knowledge of plant taxonomy and plant community ecology;
c. Familiarity with the plants of the area, including rare, threatened, and endangered species;
d. Familiarity with the appropriate state and federal statutes related to plants and plant collecting; and,
e. Experience with analyzing impacts of development on native plant species and communities.

4. Field surveys should be conducted in a manner that will locate any rare, threatened, or endangered species that may be present. Specifically, rare, threatened, or endangered plant surveys should be:

a. Conducted in the field at the proper time of year when rare, threatened, or endangered species are both evident and identifiable. Usually, this is when the plants are flowering.
When rare, threatened, or endangered plants are known to occur in the type(s) of habitat present in the project area, nearby accessible occurrences of the plants (reference sites) should be observed to determine that the species are identifiable at the time of the survey.

b. Floristic in nature. A floristic survey requires that every plant observed be identified to the extent necessary to determine its rarity and listing status. In addition, a sufficient number of visits spaced throughout the growing season are necessary to accurately determine what plants exist on the site. In order to properly characterize the site and document the completeness of the survey, a complete list of plants observed on the site should be included in every botanical survey report.

c. Conducted in a manner that is consistent with conservation ethics. Collections (voucher specimens) of rare, threatened, or endangered species, or suspected rare, threatened, or endangered species should be made only when such actions would not jeopardize the continued existence of the population and in accordance with applicable state and federal permit requirements. A collecting permit from the Habitat Conservation Planning Branch of DFG is required for collection of state-listed plant species. Voucher specimens should be deposited at recognized public herbaria for future reference. Photography should be used to document plant identification and habitat whenever possible, but especially when the population cannot withstand collection of voucher specimens.

d. Conducted using systematic field techniques in all habitats of the site to ensure a thorough coverage of potential impact areas.

e. Well documented. When a rare, threatened, or endangered plant (or rare plant community) is located, a California Native Species (or Community) Field Survey Form or equivalent written form, accompanied by a copy of the appropriate portion of a 7.5 minute topographic map with the occurrence mapped, should be completed and submitted to the Natural Diversity Database. Locations may be best documented using global positioning systems (GPS) and presented in map and digital forms as these tools become more accessible.

5. Reports of botanical field surveys should be included in or with environmental assessments, negative declarations and mitigated negative declarations, Timber Harvesting Plans (THPs), EIR's, and EIS's, and should contain the following information:

a. Project description, including a detailed map of the project location and study area.

b. A written description of biological setting referencing the community nomenclature used and a vegetation map.

c. Detailed description of survey methodology.

d. Dates of field surveys and total person-hours spent on field surveys.

e. Results of field survey including detailed maps and specific location data for each plant population found. Investigators are encouraged to provide GPS data and maps documenting population boundaries.

f. An assessment of potential impacts. This should include a map showing the distribution of plants in relation to proposed activities.

g. Discussion of the significance of rare, threatened, or endangered plant populations in the project area considering nearby populations and total species distribution.

h. Recommended measures to avoid impacts.

i. A list of all plants observed on the project area. Plants should be identified to the taxonomic level necessary to determine whether or not they are rare, threatened or endangered.

j. Description of reference site(s) visited and phenological development of rare, threatened, or endangered plant(s).

k. Copies of all California Native Species Field Survey Forms or Natural Community Field Survey Forms.

l. Name of field investigator(s).

m. References cited, persons contacted, herbaria visited, and the location of voucher specimens.
ATTACHMENT 2

Sensitivity of Top Priority Rare Natural Communities in Southern California

Sensitivity rankings are determined by the Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database and based on either number of known occurrences (locations) and/or amount of habitat remaining (acreage). The three rankings used for these top priority rare natural communities are as follows:

S1.# Fewer than 6 known locations and/or on fewer than 2,000 acres of habitat remaining.
S2.# Occurs in 6-20 known locations and/or 2,000-10,000 acres of habitat remaining.
S3.# Occurs in 21-100-known locations and/or 10,000-50,000 acres of habitat remaining.

The number to the right of the decimal point after the ranking refers to the degree of threat posed to that natural community regardless of the ranking. For example:

S1.1 = very threatened
S2.2 = threatened
S3.3 = no current threats known

Sensitivity Rankings (February 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Community Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>Mojave Riparian Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonoran Cottonwood Willow Riparian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mesquite Bosque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elephant Tree Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crucifixion Thorn Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allthorn Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizonan Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern California Walnut Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainland Cherry Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Bishop Pine Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torrey Pine Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desert Mountain White Fir Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Dune Scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Coastal Bluff Scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maritime Succulent Scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riversidean Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Maritime Chaparral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley Needlegrass Grassland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Basin Grassland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mojave Desert Grassland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pebble Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Sedge Bog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cismontane Alkali Marsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S1.2
Southern Foredunes
Mono Pumice Flat
Southern Interior Basalt Flow Vernal Pool

S2.1
Venturan Coastal Sage Scrub
Diogen Coastal Sage Scrub
Riversidean Upland Coastal Sage Scrub
Riversidean Desert Sage Scrub
Sagebrush Steppe
Desert Sink Scrub
Mafic Southern Mixed Chaparral
San Diego Mesa Hardpan Vernal Pool
San Diego Mesa Claypan Vernal Pool
Alkali Meadow
Southern Coastal Salt Marsh
Coastal Brackish Marsh
Transmontane Alkali Marsh
Coastal and Valley Freshwater Marsh
Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest
Southern Willow Scrub
Modoc-Great Basin Cottonwood Willow Riparian
Modoc-Great Basin Riparian Scrub
Mojave Desert Wash Scrub
Engelmann Oak Woodland
Open Engelmann Oak Woodland
Closed Engelmann Oak Woodland
Island Oak Woodland
California Walnut Woodland
Island Ironwood Forest
Island Cherry Forest
Southern Interior Cypress Forest
Bigcone Spruce-Canyon Oak Forest

S2.2
Active Coastal Dunes
Active Desert Dunes
Stabilized and Partially Stabilized Desert Dunes
Stabilized and Partially Stabilized Desert Sandfield
Mojave Mixed Steppe
Transmontane Freshwater Marsh
Coulter Pine Forest
Southern California Fellfield
White Mountains Fellfield

S2.3
Bristlecone Pine Forest
Limber Pine Forest
April 29, 2005

Mr. Mark Tegio, Jr.
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Ave.
San Diego, CA 92123

Re: Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project
SCH# 2005041025

Dear Mr. Tegio:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The Commission was able to perform a record search of its Sacred Lands File for the project area, which failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The absence of specific site information in the Sacred Lands File does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.

Early consultation with tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries once a project is underway. Enclosed is a list of Native Americans individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. The Commission makes no recommendation of a single individual or group over another. Please contact all those listed; if they cannot supply you with specific information, they may be able to recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe or group. If you have not received a response within two weeks' time, we recommend that you follow-up with a telephone call to make sure that the information was received.

Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude the existence of archeological resources. Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in Section 15370 of the CEQA Guidelines, when significant cultural resources could be affected by a project. Provisions should also be included for accidentally discovered archeological resources during construction per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code §15064.5 (f). Health and Safety Code §7050.5; and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandate the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery and should be included in all environmental documents. If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 653-6251.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Carol Gauhatz
Program Analyst

Cc: State Clearinghouse
Native American Contacts
San Diego County
April 29, 2005

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
Rhonda Welch-Scalco, Chairperson
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
ewe@barona.org
619) 443-6612

Kumeyaay Cultural Historic Committee
Ron Christman
56 Viejas Grade Road
Alpine, CA 92001
(619) 445-0385

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
\TTN: David Baron
095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
619) 443-6612

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Steve Banegas, Spokesperson
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
(619) 443-6612
(619) 443-0681 FAX

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
\TTN: EPA Specialist
095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
ewe@barona.org
619) 443-6612

San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians
Allen E. Lawson, Chairperson
PO Box 365
Valley Center, CA 92082
(760) 749-3200
(760) 749-3876 Fax

Coastal Gabrieleno Diegueno
im Velasques
776 42nd Street
Riverside, CA 92509
(909) 784-6660

Sycuan Band of Mission Indians
Danny Tucker, Chairperson
5459 Dehesa Road
El Cajon, CA 92021
sycuan.com
619 445-2613
619 445-1927 Fax

amul Indian Village
bon Acevedo, Chairperson
.O. Box 612
amul, CA 91935
amulrez@pacbell.net
619) 669-4785
ax: (619) 669-4817

Viejas Band of Mission Indians
Anthony Pico, Chairperson
PO Box 908
Alpine, CA 91903
dagullar@viejas-nsn.gov
(619) 445-3810
(619) 445-5337 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and
sity Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resource assessment for the proposed
eson Trails Flow REgulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunnel and Vent Demolition Project, BCHP 2005041025, San Diego County.
May 6, 2005

Mr. Mark Tegio, Jr.
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123

MISSION TRAILS FLOW REGULATORY STRUCTURE II, PIPELINE TUNNEL, AND VENT DEMOLITION PROJECT
SCH NUMBER 2005041025

Dear Mr. Tegio:

The Drinking Water Field Operations Branch (DWFOB) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation of a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Mission Trails flow regulatory structure II, pipeline tunnel, and vent demolition project. The transmittal seeks DWFOB’s areas of concern and statutory responsibilities regarding the project to ensure such concerns are addressed appropriately in the development of the EIR.

The DWFOB appreciates the opportunity to review the document. As the project consists primarily of the construction of an untreated water 18 MG storage reservoir and 96-inch diameter pipeline, DWFOB’s primary area of concern will be the proximity of the proposed facilities to potable water lines. Specifically, DWFOB would like to review and comment on any plans where the proposed facilities will be within ten feet horizontally, less than one foot vertically, or at the same elevation or higher than potable water lines.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please call Mike McKibben at (619) 525-4023 or me at (619) 525-4497.

Sincerely,

Brian Bernados, P.E.
District Engineer

cc: San Diego County Environmental Health Services

H:\Systems\San Diego County Water Authority\Plans\EIR\Mission Trails FRS SDCWA Ltr 5-2005.doc
May 4, 2005

Mark Tegio, Sr.
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123

COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE MISSION TRAILS FLOW REGULATORY STRUCTURE II, PIPELINE TUNNEL AND VENT DEMOLITION PROJECT CEQA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE SCH# 2005041025

Dear Mr. Tegio:

The County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has received and reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) dated April 5, 2005 for the above-named project and appreciates the opportunity to comment.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

As a co-permittee in the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and owner of land in Mission Trails Regional Park (Park), the County, as a public agency under CEQA Section 15379, has comments on potentially significant environmental issues that may affect County lands and the MSCP, as well as reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures that should be further discussed in the Environmental Impact Report, EIR.

DPR requests to be included on the distribution list of the Draft EIR for review and comments. General comments on the NOP center on the proposed project’s temporary and permanent impacts to biological resources, aesthetics and recreation sections of the EIR, and alternatives available to protect species from impacts.
SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

1. Since the MSCP was implemented in 1998, many properties have been added to the baseline preserve area, including 266 acres of Fortuna Mountain and canyons to the west of it that are designated part of the MSCP preserve. Fortuna Mountain is immediately east of the proposed project and canyons that are part of the MSCP preserve ring the proposed project. DPR is concerned that the core biological areas established by preserving these lands will be disrupted by construction on this project and requests this issue to be addressed in the DEIR.

2. This area is a biological core area and supports sensitive and endangered species. For that reason, the DEIR alternatives should discuss the avoidance of significant effects or a potential disturbance or take, in order to protect MSCP covered, narrow endemics and sensitive avian species and any other species considered rare. Temporary impacts from construction should be included in these analyses.

3. The DEIR should discuss avoidance of construction during nesting season in order to protect sensitive avian species.

4. Disturbance of wildlife corridors within the MSCP by the proposed project should be analyzed in the DEIR.

5. As the owner of land within the Park, DPR is concerned of potential visual impacts for park and trail users of the Park. The DEIR should identify these issues.

6. Recreational impacts to Park and trail users should be addressed in the DEIR. Project proponents should also address these issues with staffs from the City of San Diego Department of Park and Recreation and County DPR.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Mary Niez at the Department of Parks and Recreation at (858) 495-5138.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
RENEÉ E. BAHL, Director
Department of Parks and Recreation

cc: Ellen Oppenheim, Director, City of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation
April 11, 2005

Mr. Mark Tegio
Water Resources Specialist
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, California 92123

Subject: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the San Diego County Water Authority Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure (FRS) II, Pipeline Tunnel and Vent Demolition Project
SWA Gen. File: San Diego County Water Authority

Dear Mr. Tegio:

Sweetwater Authority (Sweetwater) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation for the subject project and has no comments at this time. We thank the County Water Authority for proceeding with this project in a timely manner, and look forward to the new facilities. The Mission Trails FRS and the associated pipeline tunnel will improve the raw water delivery system to Sweetwater and other neighboring agencies for years to come. This will allow Sweetwater to continue to supply treated water to its customers and reduce the demand on the Skinner service area.

Once again, thank you for your diligent work on this project. Sweetwater looks forward to the additional raw water it will deliver and the added reliability to the system.

If you any questions, or require additional information, please contact Mr. Michael Garrod at (619) 409-6752.

Sincerely,

Sweetwater Authority

James L. Smyth
Director of Engineering

JLS:MEG:jg

Pc: Mr. John Economides, San Diego County Water Authority
May 3, 2005

Mr. Mark Tegio
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123-1233

Subject: City of San Diego Comments on the Notice of Preparation for an Environmental Impact Report for the San Diego County Water Authority Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure (FRS) II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project

Dear Damon Schamu:

The City of San Diego’s Metropolitan Wastewater Department offers the following comment on the Notice of Preparation for an EIR for the San Diego County Water Authority Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure (FRS) II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project:

Metropolitan Wastewater Department – Laura Ball (858-292-6417)

The environmental section of the Metropolitan Wastewater Department has reviewed the Notice of Preparation for the San Diego Water Authority Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure (FRS) II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition Project. The proposed Arizona crossing appears to be to the north of the Junipero Serra Trunk Sewer. Care should be taken, however, to ensure that impacts to the trunk sewer and manholes are avoided by the design and during project construction.

Please contact the above-named individual if you have any questions on this comment. We ask that you please address this issue and please provide us with a copy of the draft.

Sincerely,

Chris Zirkle
Assistant Deputy Director
Land Development Review Division

Development Services
1222 First Avenue, MS 501 • San Diego, CA 92101-4155
Tel (619) 446-5460
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.
Environmental Review Committee

11 April 2005

To: Mr. Mark Tegio
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, California 92123-1233

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report
Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunner,
And Vent Demolition Project

Dear Mr. Tegio:

Thank you for the Notice of Preparation for the subject project, received by this Society last week.

We are pleased to note the inclusion of cultural resources in the list of subject areas to be addressed in the DEIR, and look forward to reviewing it during the upcoming public comment period. To that end, please include us in the distribution of the DEIR, and also provide us with a copy of the cultural resources technical report(s).

SDCAS appreciates being included in the County's environmental review process for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson
Environmental Review Committee

cc: SDCAS President
File
15 Apr 05
Al & Lorah Lehman
5186 Abuela Dr
San Diego, CA 92124

To S.D. County Water Authority,

We are in favor of the Mission Trails Flow Key, Structure 11, Pipeline Tunnel + weir demolition.

We have lived in Teresina for over 30 years. I am the Trails 2-3 days a week (move),
We contribute each year to NTRP.

Sincerely,

Al Lehman

Alvin N & Lorah R Lehman
5186 Abuela Dr
San Diego CA 92124-2021
FAX COVER SHEET
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To:  MARK TEGIO, SR  268-7881

From:  FRED ZUCKERMAN
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Subject:  MISSION TRAILS PROJECT

Comments:

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
Fred Zuckerman

From: "Fred Zuckerman"<ZuckermanF@sbcglobal.net>
To: <mtegio@sdcwa.org>
Cc: "Fred Zuckerman" <zuckermanf@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2005 3:29 PM
Subject: CEQA Comments - Mission Trails Project

5/5/2005
SD County ater Authority
Mark Tegio, Sr
via email

Please address the following details in the EIR:

1. Estimate the number of cubic yards of dirt to be removed from the site.
   Give estimated error percentage (ie: +/- 10%).
   Provide the estimate and error percentage for each of the alternatives,
   including:
   a) FRS2 - sited adjacent to FRS1
   b) FRS2 - sited appx 1 mile south
   c) FRS2 - other evaluated sites

   d) Tunnel project - aligned slightly to the east of existing pipeline
   e) Tunnel project - aligned underneath existing pipeline
   f) Tunnel project - other evaluated alignments and lengths

2. Estimate the number of cubic yards of concrete to be imported to the site.
   Give estimated error percentage (ie: +/- 10%).
   Provide estimates for each alternative (see 1a thru 1f above)

3. Provide the estimated yards of dirt removed and yards of concrete imported when FRS1 was completed.

4. Discuss the relationship between number of cubic yards and number of dump truck trips through the community

5. Discuss how the number of truck trips might vary under the following two scenarios:
   a) the tunnel is constructed from poured concrete (ie: cement mixers driving to the site)
   b) the tunnel is constructed from precast concrete pieces (ie: flat bed trucks driving to the site)

6. Provide the estimated total number of vehicle trips thru the community of vehicles exceeding 10,000 lbs gross vehicle weight.

7. The construction of FRS1 significantly impacted the roadbed of community streets that were used (ie: potholes, dips, buckles, etc). Discuss how you
will take an inventory of street roadbed health before, during, and after the construction project.

8. During the previous project (FRS1), the contractor adjusted the truck schedules to minimize truck activity during school start and stop times. Also, the contractor even provided crossing guard assistance at key points along the truck routes. This project should require the contractor to do the same.

9. Describe how surface trail accessibility in the park will be affected during the tunneling phases. In other words, will all of the trails be closed to the public above the area of the tunneling? Will trails only be closed directly above the tunneling point (i.e.: a moving closure area that will advance a little each day)? How large an area might that be? Or will the entire area be closed to the public during the entire project?

10. During the previous project (FRS1), the contractor made provisions for their onsite workers to car pool to the site. This minimized both daily trips thru the community and the amount of parking area needed at the construction site. These measures should be required on this project, too.

Thank You,
Fred Zuckerman
4502 Via Palabra
San Diego, CA 92124
(858) 565-4472 Days
ZuckermanF@sbcglobal.net
April 29, 2005

Mr. Taglio,

This is regarding the Proposed Water Facilities in Mission Trails Regional Park. We live on Seda Drive facing the canyon where your project will be developed, and therefore have some serious concerns:

1. Dirt and air pollution.
   Having only recently gone through the ordeal of the Cedar Fire, we are only too aware of the effects of blowing dirt and pollution in our home, especially when there is an east wind blowing.

2. Noise.
   Your project will be working directly across a small canyon from our home and I can assure you that noise travels easily across that gap. This is especially true of the weird noise that trucks make when backing up. And, of course, helicopter noise is even worse.

3. Parking and traffic.
   We understand that there will be no truck traffic on Seda Drive connected with this project; is this correct? But how about workers parking their vehicles along Seda in order to access the work site?

Consequently, we would ask that you consider the following steps:

- Use water spray to keep down dust and air-borne particulates
- Cover all truck loads of dirt
- Do not start work before 8am.
- Try to avoid using helicopters
- Have employees park their vehicles in the area at the end of Clairmont Mesa Blvd.

My husband and I are in our mid seventies. We moved to our home on Mission Trails Park because it promised to be quiet and serene, qualities that are dearly prized when you get to your twilight years. We know that your project is important for the future well-being of San Diego; we’re simply asking that you be considerate of the people who may be directly affected by the work.

Thank you,

LeeAnn Franco
4885 Seda Dr.
San Diego, CA

[Signature]
Subject: Mission Trails Scoping Comments via email

Date: 5/9/2005 1:00:07 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time

From: mtegio@sdcwa.org

To: PAmberg@sdcwa.org, TierraEnv@aol.com

Here's all the comments I received via email during the scoping period.

Mark

Mark V. Tegio, Sr.
Water Resources Specialist
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 522-6753
mtegio@sdcwa.org
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Thread-Topic: CEQA Comments - Mission Trails Project
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From: "Fred Zuckerman" <ZuckermanF@sbcglobal.net>
To: "Tegio, Mark" <mtegio@sdcwa.org>
Cc: "Fred Zuckerman" <zuckermanf@sbcglobal.net>

5/5/2005
SD County ater Authority
Mark Tegio, Sr
via email

Please address the following details in the EIR:

1. Estimate the number of cubic yards of dirt to be removed from the site.
   Give estimated error percentage (ie: +/- 10%).
   Provide the estimate and error percentage for each of the alternatives, including:
   a) FRS2 - sited adjacent to FRS1
   b) FRS2 - sited appx 1 mile south
   c) FRS2 - other evaluated sites
   d) Tunnel project - aligned slightly to the east of existing pipeline
   e) Tunnel project - aligned underneath existing pipeline
2. Estimate the number of cubic yards of concrete to be imported to the site. Give estimated error percentage (i.e. +/- 10%). Provide estimates for each alternative (see 1a thru 1f above).

3. Provide the estimated yards of dirt removed and yards of concrete imported when FRS1 was completed.

4. Discuss the relationship between number of cubic yards and number of dump truck trips through the community.

5. Discuss how the number of truck trips might vary under the following two scenarios:
   a) the tunnel is constructed from poured concrete (i.e. cement mixers driving to the site)
   b) the tunnel is constructed from precast concrete pieces (i.e. flat bed trucks driving to the site)

6. Provide the estimated total number of vehicle trips thru the community of vehicles exceeding 10,000 lbs gross vehicle weight.

7. The construction of FRS1 significantly impacted the roadbed of community streets that were used (i.e. potholes, dips, buckles, etc.). Discuss how you will take an inventory of street roadbed health before, during, and after the construction project.

8. During the previous project (FRS1), the contractor adjusted the truck schedules to minimize truck activity during school start and stop times. Also, the contractor even provided crossing guard assistance at key points along the truck routes. This project should require the contractor to do the same.

9. Describe how surface trail accessibility in the park will be affected during the tunneling phases. In other words, will all of the trails be closed to the public above the area of the tunneling? Will trails only be closed directly above the tunneling point (i.e. a moving closure area that will advance a little each day)? How large an area might that be? Or will the entire area be closed to the public during the entire project?

10. During the previous project (FRS1), the contractor made provisions for their onsite workers to car pool to the site. This minimized both daily trips thru the community and the amount of parking area needed at the construction site. These measures should be required on this project, too.

Thank You,
Fred Zuckerman
4502 Via Palabra
San Diego, CA 92124
(858) 565-4472 Days
ZuckermanF@sbcglobal.net
Mark,

I'm concerned that the number of trucks hauling dirt from the project might use the Calle de Vida and Colina Dorada Drive intersection gate to exit the park. It sounds like you will be moving a lot of dirt. The impact to the neighborhood from the noise, the dust, and the increased traffic could be problematic. I would rather see the dirt hauling trucks exit the park at Clairemont Mesa Blvd. but, I am uncertain if the bridge has sufficient strength to handle loaded dirt trucks.

Secondly, I've noticed the water authority trucks periodically access Mission Trails Park at the intersection of Calle de Vida and Colina Dorada Drive. When we get rainfall the clay soils in the park become sticky. At times, muddy tracks from CWA trucks are left on the pavement just outside the park gate. It is also unfortunate that the park roads when wet and soft from rainfall must be driven on by the CWA trucks. Deep ruts in the dirt roads often last for many months. Would it be possible to limit the CWA vehicles on the park roads when they are wet and soft.

B. Winans
P.O. Box 421366
San Diego, CA 92142
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   "Tegio, Mark" <mtiegio@sdca.org>

<<Brueland.doc>>
Mark and Habib,
I'm sending you this record of a conversation I had with a grieving mother in Tierrasanta who worries that polluted soil in Camp Elliott could contaminate the water supply. Her young son died recently of brain cancer and she suspects environmental triggers. In case she comes to future meetings or happens to call you, it will be helpful for you to know of her concerns. Habib, I'll follow up with you soon on soil testing for our project so I can respond to this issue.

Thanks,
Gina
Mark,

I am an environmental consultant specializing in habitat restoration who lives in Tierra Santa. I have frequently observed the poor results of the revegetation work associated with the first Flow Regulatory Structure built in Mission Trails Park. It is obvious if one visits the first underground flow structure that revegetation of the site has never established in a healthy or vigorous fashion. I believe this is due to three factors.

1) Fill soils over the structure are too shallow. The 2 to 3 feet of soil placed over the first flow regulatory structure did not leave sufficient soil depth to establish the intended coastal sage scrub species. It is obvious if you visit the site this depth of cover over the underground structure is insufficient for vegetation to establish in any way resembling natural cover. To this day the vegetation remains stunted and sparse over the structure.

2) Reliance on only a seed mix to revegetate the site meant that evergreen shrub species common to the area like Rhus integrifolia, Malosma laurina, and Adenostema fasciculatum which do not germinate easily from seed did not establish on the older structure.

3) It appears only natural rainfall was used to establish cover from a hydroseed mix. Depending on natural rainfall to germinate seed mixes in the field is undependable since precipitation varies too much from year to year here in S.D. As a result you get highly variable and undependable germination of the sort we see at the regulatory structure.

To remedy these problems, I recommend:

1) CWA design any new underground storage or pipe structures in the park with at least 6 feet of soil cover and that the top 30 inches of fill not be compacted. In addition, during construction the surface 12 inches of top soil should be stockpiled and reapplied to the surface of the fill once construction is complete.

2) Based on research conducted for Tim Cass at CWA (BEC 2001, 2002, 2003) at East Miramar just north of the site, I strongly recommend the use of deep 1-gallon container plantings (4"X4"X15") of Rhus integrifolia, Adenostema fasciculatum, and Malosma laurina be used to revegetate in addition to the seed mix used. These establish much more dependably than the usual 1-gallon plantings of these species.

3) I recommend irrigating the revegetation effort for at least two years after installation to establish it.

Brad Burkhart
Burkhart Environmental Consulting
Dear Sir,

Questions:

1- Do proposed treatment plants include wastewater and sewer?

2- What are the impacts on the quality of life of Tierrasanta residents and on the property value in the community? 1 mile from a school yard and 1/2 mile from a residential home is too close.

3- What are the impacts on the flow of the San Diego River (contamination, narrowing of river bed?)

4- Air pollution?
   Noise pollution?
   Traffic congestion?
   This area is getting very dense, especially once the housing project is complete

5- What are the investigated alternatives?
   I cannot find an analysis of impacts on residents?

Thank you

D Nguyen

---
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We'd love to be added to the distribution list for this publication (draft, final, etc.) as the parts become available.
Thank you.

Gary

Gary Klockenga
Government Publications Librarian
San Diego Public Library
820 E Street
San Diego CA 92101

gklockenga@sandiego.gov
Open House & Scoping Meeting

for the Environmental Impact Report
for the Mission Trails Project
April 19, 2005

6:30 to 7 p.m.  Open House
• Meet with project team members for informal question and answer session

7 to 7:10 p.m.  Welcome to Scoping Meeting
• Patricia Tennyson, facilitator

7:10 to 7:30 p.m.  Staff Presentation
• Habib Hariri, engineering project manager
• Mark Tegio, environmental project manager

7:30 p.m.  Public Comments
MISSION TRAILS PROJECT

FLOW REGULATORY STRUCTURE ♦ PIPELINE TUNNEL ♦ VENT DEMOLITION

Purpose of Project
To enhance the operation of pipelines 3 and 4 so they can supply additional untreated water to water treatment plants that are expanding
- Remove hydraulic bottlenecks in pipelines 3 and 4 in the Water Authority’s Second Aqueduct
- Improve operation of the pipeline when increased or decreased flows are required

Design Update
- Consultants has been hired to design the pipeline tunnel and the flow regulatory structure

Environmental Impact Report
- Field work has begun for environmental studies for both components
- Notice of Preparation of the environmental impact report was released on April 5, 2005
- Environmental scoping meeting held on April 19, 2005
- Draft environmental impact report slated for release and public comment in fall 2005
- Final environmental impact report scheduled to be certified by Water Authority board of directors in early 2006

Construction
- Begins early 2007 and ends early 2009

Community Outreach
- Project team will host an information booth for Explore Mission Trails Day at Mission Trails Regional Park on May 21, 2005
- Public Working Group being formed to gather community input on potential project impacts and suggestions for minimizing or avoiding these impacts
  - First meeting May 19, 2005
- Additional outreach activities include community meetings, information kiosks in the park, letters to the community, newsletters, fact sheets and a toll-free project information line

Mission Trails Project
Toll-free Project Information Line
(877) 682-9283 Ext. 7004
Staff returns calls within one business day.
www.sdcwa.org
Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunnel and Vent Demolition Project

Scoping Meeting

April 19, 2005

San Diego County Water Authority
Welcome

- Moderator’s role
- Scoping meeting purpose
- Water Authority staff will explain:
  - Project description
  - Environmental Impact Report process
Meeting Layout

- Open house/speaker sign up
- Meeting guidelines
- Purpose of court reporter
- Staff presentation
- Public comments
Administrative Points

- Please sign up at registration table for public comments
- Written comments can be turned in today or mailed
- Written comments must be received by May 5, 2005
About the San Diego County Water Authority

Mission Statement

To provide a safe, reliable water supply to support the region’s $142 billion economy and the quality of life of more than 3 million residents.
About the San Diego County Water Authority

- Region’s water leader for 60 years
- Wholesale water agency serving 23 member agencies
- Provides 75-90 percent of county’s water supply
  - Imports water from Colorado River and Northern California
  - Develops local sources of water
Supplying the Region

- **Pipelines**
  - Nearly 300 miles
  - 119 service connections

- **Service area**
  - 909,000 acres
  - 97 percent of county’s population
Capital Improvement Program

- 78 projects -- $3.1 billion
- Major components
  - Emergency Storage Project
  - Seawater desalination
  - Water treatment plant
- Meet regional water demands through 2030
  - Mission Trails Project
    - Flow Regulatory Structure II
    - Pipeline Tunnel
    - Vent Demolition
Mission Trails Project
Flow Regulatory Structure II
Pipeline Tunnel & Vent Demolition

- **Purpose**
  - Eliminate hydraulic bottlenecks
  - Increase water delivered to water treatment plants
  - Improve pipeline operations
Anticipated Project Timeline

- Complete preliminary design: Fall 2005
- Release Final EIR: Early 2006
- Complete final design: Late 2006
- Construct project: Early 2007 - early 2009
Mission Trails Project

Environmental Process

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
- Opportunities for public input
Environmental Impact Report Contents

- Detailed project description
- Analysis of potential impacts to the environment
- Mitigation measures to avoid or minimize impacts
- Analysis of alternatives
- Analysis and discussion of other CEQA mandated issues
Potentially significant impacts

- Aesthetics/visual quality
- Agricultural resources
- Biological resources
- Cultural resources
- Geology and soils
- Hazards
- Hazardous materials
- Hydrology/water quality
- Land use/planning
- Noise and vibration
- Paleontological resources
- Traffic/circulation
- Utilities and public services
Environmental Impact Report

- Less than significant impacts
  - Mineral resources
  - Population/housing

- Other CEQA-mandated issues
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Process for San Diego County Water Authority Capital Improvement Projects

- Project Description Defined
- Notice of Preparation
- Scoping Meeting
- Publish Draft EIR for Public Review
- Conduct Public Hearing on Draft EIR
- Publish Final EIR and Response to Comments
- Commenting Agencies and Public Review Final EIR and Response to Comments
- Water Authority Board of Directors Makes Decision on Certification of Final EIR
- Water Authority Board of Directors Adopts Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program
- Water Authority Board of Directors Issues Notice of Determination

Denotes opportunity for public involvement
To Make Oral Comments

- Fill out speaker card
- You will have 3 minutes to offer your comments
- Comments are recorded by court reporter and audio tape
Written Comments

- Hand in prepared comments tonight
- Use written comments sheets and turn them in tonight
- Mail in written comments
- Comments must be received by May 5, 2005
Questions?

Toll-free Project Information Line
(877) 682-9283, Ext. 7004

www.sdcwa.org
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING

RE: MISSION TRAILS FLOW REGULATORY STRUCTURE II, PIPELINE TUNNEL AND VENT DEMOLITION

CEQA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE SCH# 2005041025

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

APRIL 19, 2005

REPORTED BY KERSTEN SONG, CSR NO. 12796
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING,

commencing at the hour of 7 p.m., on Tuesday, April 19, 2005,
at 4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, California, before Kersten
Song, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of
California.

IND EX

SCOPING MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welcome to Scoping Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By: PATRICIA TENNYSON, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF PRESENTATION:

| By: Habib Hariri, Engineering Project Manager | page 7 |
| By: Mark Tegio, Environmental Project Manager | page 12 |

Public Comments | page 19
WELCOME TO SCOPING MEETING

(A discussion off the record is held.)

MS. PATRICIA TENNYSON: So I said a little bit about what my role is tonight.

The purpose of the scoping meeting, really, is for you to tell the Water Authority what you think should be included in the EIR. And I told you that Habib and Mark are going to make a presentation in just a few minutes.

And this really isn't a question-and-answer forum. I just want to underscore that, because sometimes people want to ask questions. But this is just not the meeting to do that. The Water Authority staff will stay afterwards and they will answer more questions in that same open house area or perhaps in this room.

And there will be lots of other opportunities throughout the course of this project to talk to the Water Authority staff to get input.

This is not your last opportunity. This is really, almost, your first opportunity to discuss anything with the Water Authority. In this case, we're
talking about what should be in the EIR.

Okay. I said this a little bit earlier, but for those of you who just came in, if you want to make an oral comment tonight, we'd like you to fill one of these slips out. And there's some over there. My colleague Rachel will be able to pass them out. And right after the presentation ends, but before the comment period starts, we'll offer you these again.

There's another thing you can do. You can write the Water Authority a little note. So here's some forms on which you can do this. Some of you may want to write a more formal letter, but the address and information is right here about where you need to send this.

Here's the important thing about writing. In order for you to tell the Water Authority what you think needs to be included in this EIR, you have to get your written comment back to them by May 5th. Okay? So May 5th of 2004. That's the deadline. And that's written on this form, and, hopefully, clearly on there. It's in bold.

Tonight, I just want to go over a couple of guidelines again for this particular meeting.

I've already said to fill out a speaker request
slip. We will call the speakers in the order in which we get the slip.

If you would, please speak clearly and loudly and slowly. The court reporter here tonight is going to be taking down everything that you say. We want to be sure, because this is a formal process, that we accurately capture your comments. So she is here to do that.

And that's also the purpose of an audio recording. We have a little audio machine here, and it's also picking up what you say so that we make sure we've got it correctly.

The staff presentation will just explain a little bit more about the project and will help you know what you might want to say later on.

I think that we've already been through some of this with the written comment. And you can turn those in today or you can mail them. And we'll go back over some of this information right before we start.

I want to tell you just a little bit about the Water Authority. Some of you may be very familiar with the Water Authority, others are not. The Water Authority's mission is to provide a safe and reliable water supply to support
the regions -- and that's an important word "regions" -- $142 billion economy, and the quality of life for more than three million residents. The reason I said that "Water Authority" and "region" are important ties is because the Water Authority has been providing water for people in this region for over 60 years. They are the wholesale water agency. They work through their member agencies. So you may never see a bill from the Water Authority, but you get your bill from the City of San Diego or Helix Water District or some other agency who's a member of the Water Authority. The other thing interesting thing about San Diego and the Water Authority is that almost all of the water used here in a year is imported. It has to come from somewhere outside of this county. Even when it's been raining until we're almost sick of it, like this year, we're still going to import 75, 80 percent of the water used here, maybe even more, which is hard to believe, but true. And they've got all the records to prove it. The other thing the Water Authority's doing, though, in addition to looking at importing water and improving getting an additional supplier besides the Metropolitan Water District is they're
also taking opportunity to diversify local water
supplies so we have more of that water we need right
here within this county. The Water Authority's a
very large service area.
They have nearly 300 miles of pipelines
throughout the County. They have 119 service
connections. Their service area is over 900,000
acres, as you can see. That comprises 97 percent of
the population in this County. So it's truly a
regional agency. And the projects that the Water
Authority does, for the most part, serve the region.
Habib is going to talk to you now a
little bit about specifics about the Water
Authority's capital improvement program and this
particular project.

MR. HABIB HARIKI: Thank you, Patsy.

Good evening.
Okay. Well, let's talk about the CIP
program Water Authority has. It started about 1989.
It's about a $3.1 billion program. It is basically
designed to improve the agency's water distribution
system. It is to increase operational flexibility,
and, most importantly, it is to meet the growing
water demand in the region to the year 2030.
It consists of about 78 projects. And
major component of the CIP is the emergency storage project, which basically the title speaks for itself. It consists of a number of projects, includes very large pipelines, reservoirs, pump stations, and so forth. And the purpose of the emergency storage project is to combine six months of water supply to the San Diego region in the event of emergency. It could be an earthquake or what have you.

Seawater desalination is another major component of this project. That alone is about over a billion-dollar program.

Water treatment plant. The board did approve the Water Authority to begin design, eventually construction, of its first water treatment plant, which will be in Twin Oaks, San Marcos.

And the Mission Trails is one of the CIP projects. And it basically consists of three components: Flow Regulatory Structure II, Pipeline Tunnel, and Vent Demolition. I'll get into more details of it in a couple of slides ahead.

The purpose this is to eliminate the hydraulic bottlenecks. What that means is we have existing pipelines in the Mission Trails that can't
meet the future water demands. They're just too small. And we need to go in there and basically replace those pipelines with a large tunnel which will provide additional capacity for the City treatment plants, particularly Alvarado treatment plan, which is in Lake Murray, and Otay Water treatment plant. Alvarado existing capacity is about 120 MDG, and the City is increasing it to 200 million gallons per day. It's part of that growing water demand in the region. And also improves pipeline operations.

Well, it's the main purpose of the flow regulatory structure, is to really to do that, improve pipeline operations. Tunnel will basically take care of the -- eliminating the hydraulic bottlenecks and provide that increased capacity.

I'm going to get into some of the specifics here, if I can figure this out. You can barely see it, but there it is.

This is one of the sites that is being considered for the flow regulatory structure. What you will see here is basically just a planning phase map, or the drawing. Two sites were identified in the planning state that the Water Authority put together. This is one of them, which is right
across the existing flow regulatory structure, which
is in the park. FRS1, we call it. This flow
regulatory structure is for the treated water
system, and the one we'll be building is for the
untreated system. And we're still evaluating the
final site for the flow regulatory structure, which
will be based on hydraulics and environmental
constraints and, basically, cost.

And we haven't figured that out yet. We
just got two consultants on board. They just
started working on it, and we're hoping to get some
preliminary design completed maybe by late June,
early July. We'll have a better idea where the flow
regulatory structure is going to be. The tunnel
alignment is not really shown in this drawing. We
don't exactly know how the alignment is going to
work. We're hoping that, hopefully, we can maintain
it within our existing easement. But again, that's
another question we don't know yet. We're thinking
the tunnel may be as long as 6,000 feet in length
and 96-inch diameter in terms of its capacity.
There's a possibility we might be able to shorten
the tunnel, but, again, we won't know. That's
something we are working on.

Access points to the construction.
Clairemont Mesa is one possibility, which is the preferred possibility at this point. There's existing bridge that was built as part of the FRS1. Mission Gorge is another possibility that we'll be looking at. And as part of improving access through Mission Gorge, there will be some improvements on the San Diego River crossing, which also will be part of this project, potentially.

Tunnel portals. Let's talk about that. What they are is basically access to the tunnel site. What we're foreseeing is that there will be two portals. One in the south, one in the north. And the north portal will be close to the Del Sur community.

The access, again, is part of the San Diego River we're going through. It could be this area here. The south portal access will most likely be through Clairemont Mesa. But, again, it's part of the study. We're trying to find out what's the best access to the tunnel site and also the FRS.

Anticipated project time line. Completed preliminary design in fall of 2005, which is not far away. Sometime probably in September we'll be done with the preliminary design, September/October time line.
Final EIR will be released in 2006. And
Mark will get into that in more detail. We'll
complete the final design in late 2006, and

You'll see a lot of early and late
because, again, we're not exactly sure how long this
construction project is going to take. We're
thinking about somewhere between 20 to 24 months'
construction. But as we go into design, we'll have
a better idea how long it's going to take. So
that's why some of these dates are kind of little
broad.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to
Mark, and he'll go over the environmental process.

MR. MARK TEGIO: Thanks, Habib.

So, you know, now that we have this
preliminary design, we move on to the next phase of
planning process, which is the environmental
process, which is why we're here tonight.

As part of the Water Authority's planning
process, the project's required to go through a
comprehensive environmental impact analysis where we
look at a wide range of potential environmental
impacts, according to the California Environmental
Quality Act, or CEQA, for short. That law outlines
this formal process that we have to go through to
disclose any environmental impacts that may occur if
we approve the project.

In the case of this project, an
environmental impact report is the specific document
that will be prepared, type of document that will be
prepared.

Notice of Preparation, or NOP, of draft
ER for this project was mailed out on April 5th.
Additional copies of that NOP will be available
here, right in the back, if you need a copy. And
it's also available on our web site. A mailing
regarding this NOP and this meeting tonight was
mailed out to about 8,000 people in the community.

Now, throughout the CEQA process, there's
going to be several opportunities to comment.
Tonight is just the first of the many. And I'll
explain that in a few minutes.

Now, first I want to talk about just give
an overview of what's included in an environmental
impact report. Some of the points are detailed on
this slide.

First off, there's a project description
that talks about -- it's a detailed information with
the project, and more detailed than we're able to
give tonight. And it includes things like comprehensive description of the project components, construction methods, and any of the operation and maintenance things that will be required to take place if the project is approved. And the EIR also includes a thorough analysis of the impacts to the physical environment, and it presents mitigation measures to minimize or avoid those impacts. There's also alternatives analysis which talks about alternatives to the project. And there's other mandatory CEQA issues.

Now, we did as part of the NOP process, we did a preliminary assessment that kind of gave us an idea of what potentially significant impacts will occur, and this is a list of those. The Notice of Preparation includes summary of each one of these topics and why it's going to be included in the environmental impact report.

The EIR will also include an explanation as to why certain environmental issues will not be included, and those two issues are mineral resources, and population and housing.

Other CEQA mandated issues to be covered in the EIR are cumulative effects, and that is the effects of this project combined with other projects
going on in the area. And there is growth inducement, and like I said before, alternatives to the proposed project.

Now, this slide's a little tough to see. It's not too bad, but there's handouts of this slide available. And this kind of outlines what the CEQA process is. If you would like a copy of that, Rachel has a stack there.

Now, as I mentioned earlier, CEQA provides several opportunities for public input. And we're kicking that off tonight with the scoping meeting. And it's really the first opportunity for public input to address areas outlining the environmental analysis of the project. And for those speaking tonight and submitting comments, we ask again that you please keep your comments based on the environmental aspects of the project, and, you know, environmental concerns.

Now, once the scoping period closes on May 5th. All comments received will be considered during the preparation of the draft EIR. And once the draft EIR is complete, it will be released for a 45-day public review period, to public agencies and to the public to give more comment. Copies of the draft EIR will be available on our web site,
available here at our office, and will be mailed out
to the usual agencies that we send them to and to
those requesting them, requesting them in writing.

During that period, the Water Authority
will receive written comments on draft EIR and hold
another public hearing at the regular scheduled
meeting of the board which is -- oops, wrong button,
right here in the process. And verbal comments will
also be received at that point.

Then the last point in the process for
public participation is when the board considers the
final EIR. At the public meeting, there will be a
chance for the public to speak.

And with that, that concludes the staff
presentation. I'll hand it back over to Patsy.

MS. PATRICIA TENNYSON: Okay. Again, I
want to refer to these meeting guidelines for those
of you who do want to speak tonight.

Again, this is a formal scoping meeting,
and so we're going to ask you to fill out a
speaker's request form. We're going to call your
name in order. Ask you to come over here to this
podium. That way, if you have notes or anything you
wanted to rest on there, you can. And just speak
clearly and loudly so that our recorder can get that
down.

You'll have three minutes to offer your comments. And Jill's getting in place here. That's got a timer, and she's going to time you. So when you get to one minute, when you've used two minutes of your time, she's going to hold up a yellow card. You will be able to see that. She'll hold a yellow card up. When you have finished three minutes, she's going to hold a red card up, and we're going to ask you to wrap it up then.

Now, if you have something more to say, because we don't have 200 people in here tonight, if you want to come back and say something else, I'll be glad to let you do that. But again, one really good way to deal with this is also to submit a form in writing or write a letter to the Water Authority. This is oral and written comments. Both get equal attention. So, you know, either way you go tonight, you're fine.

And the other thing to remember is that, confine your comments to the EIR. There may be lots of other interesting things that you want to say to the Water Authority, and they'd love to hear it, but tonight's just for scoping.

And again I want to remind you that May
5th is the cutoff for the written comments. So
don't miss that date if you want to turn a written
comment in. I think that's about two weeks from
now?

MR. MARK TEGIO: Yep.

MS. PATRICIA TENNYSON: I think.

And without further adieu, let me leave
this slide up here, because if you want more
information about this project, here's the number
you can call, (877) 682-9283, and then dial
extension 7004. And you can leave your question
there. They'll get back to you. So that's one way.

Other way to contact the Water Authority
or get information from them is on their web site,
www.sdcwa.org. They have a very good web site, and
they have lots and lots of information, and they'd
love for you to go to their web site. That will
stay up there so you can read that.

Now, anybody else need a speaker card
because you want to say something tonight that has
not had one of these filled out already? Rachel is
standing right over there ready to give it to you.

(There is a pause.)

MS. PATRICIA TENNYSON: I do have a card
from Lyle Cocking.
PUBLIC COMMENTS

MR. LYLE COCKING: Right.

MS. PATRICIA TENNYSON: Lyle, if you can come up here, again state your name, and speak loudly and slowly.

MR. LYLE COCKING: Hello. My name is Lyle, L-y-l-e, Cocking, C-o-c-k-i-n-g. I live at 4890 Renovo Way, which is at the junction of Seda and Renovo Way.

I just want to verify, and your staff has told me verbally, they will not be using the Renovo Way as an access point, so we're happy with that.

We had a contentious thing the first time around, and we struck an agreement, and I would like to compliment the Water Authority because they have honored it perfectly. Anytime somebody's gone through there that we've spoken to them, it never happened again.

And also I'd like to point out that the Water Authority has probably used it less times than we've had, because it (inaudible) indeed, which we contend in the first place.

So if the EIR will just verify that is not going to be an access point, which we'd
appreciate.

Thank you.

MS. PATRICIA TENNYSON: Lyle's the only person that's given me a speaker slip that wanted to say something out loud tonight. Anybody else? Because I don't want to cut anybody off.

If anybody else wants to say something tonight? If not, that will end the formal part of the meeting. We will be adjourned.

I think there's still cookies to be eaten. I think there's still coffee and other drinks out there. And all of those displays are still up. So if you want to ask some questions, the Water Authority staff will be up there for a little while. And if you need any written information, Carl is holding -- he's got the NOP, the Notice of Preparation, and that has some description in there, project description.

And then please do make sure that -- I believe you all signed in so the Water Authority can send you information at subsequent meetings on this project. And call that number whenever you have a question. We'd love to hear from you.

Thanks very much for coming tonight.

(Proceedings concluded at 7:30 p.m.)
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Environmental Impact Report for the Mission Trails Project
Scoping Comment Form

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
CEQA State Clearinghouse SCH# 2005041025

Scoping is helpful in identifying the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures and significant effects to be analyzed in depth in an Environmental Impact Report and in eliminating from detailed study issues found not to be important. If you have any comments about the scope or content of analysis to be included in the EIR for the proposed Mission Trails Regional Park Projects provide them in the space below (for additional space, the reverse side may be used). To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIR, comments should be received at the address below no later than May 5, 2005.

We understand that no access for construction of the FRS will be via Seda Drive or Renovo way. An existing agreement between Villa Dominique Viewdomes and the SDCWA severely limits access across our property except for clearly defined situations of an emergency situation. This access is never allowed for construction. Please verify this is still the plan.

Your Name

Address

City / State / Zip Code

Please mail, e-mail or fax to:
San Diego County Water Authority
Attention: Mark Tegio, Sr.
4677 Overland Ave.
San Diego, CA 92123
mtegio@sdcea.org
Fax: (858) 268-7881
Scoping is helpful in identifying the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures and significant effects to be analyzed in depth in an Environmental Impact Report and in eliminating from detailed study issues found not to be important. If you have any comments about the scope or content of analysis to be included in the EIR for the proposed Mission Trails Regional Park Projects provide them in the space below (for additional space, the reverse side may be used). To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIR, comments should be received at the address below no later than May 5, 2005.

Your present charts show an access point into the project at Idaho Drive. This is an emergency entrance only and the red dot should be removed from your chart.

Your Name: Linda Cocking
Address: 4890 Renovo Way
City / State / Zip Code: San Diego, CA 92124

Please mail, e-mail or fax to:
San Diego County Water Authority
Attention: Mark Tegio, Sr.
4677 Overland Ave.
San Diego, CA 92123
mtgiao@sdewa.org
Fax: (858) 268-7881