

CITY OF ESCONDIDO
Planning Division
201 North Broadway
Escondido, CA 92025-2798
(760) 839-4671
www.ci.escondido.ca.us

## **Environmental Checklist Form**

1.	Project Title and Case File Number: <u>Benton Burn Site Remediation Project, Case No. ENV 10-0005</u>
2.	Lead agency name and address: City of Escondido
	Planning Division
	201 N. Broadway
	Escondido, CA 92025
3.	Lead Agency contact person name, phone number and email: Rozanne Cherry, Principal Planner
	760-839-4536, rcherry@ci.escondido.ca.us
4.	Project location: Ravine east of Still Water Glen and David Glen
5.	Project applicant's name, address, phone number and email: Edward Domingue, Engineering Services
	City of Escondido, 201 N. Broadway, Escondido, CA 92025
	760-839-4813
	edomingue@ci.escondido.ca.us
6.	General Plan designation: City-Estate 1, County-Rural Residential Zoning: City-PD-R1.0, County-RR1
8.	Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
	Implementation of the Remedial Action Plan (RAP) prepared for the California Integrated Waste Management
	Board, October 5, 2009, by URS Corporation. The RAP entails the consolidation of waste by excavating
	burn ash-containing waste present near or at the ground surface on the steep side slopes of the ravine
	and spreading it thinly across the floor of the ravine where it will be capped by 2-feet of clean soil.
	Vegetation in the areas of excavation and capping will be removed. The excavated areas of the sides
	of the ravine will be backfilled with clean soil at no more than 2:1 slope, compacted & seeded. The drainage area
	will be backfilled with 2-feet of rock and gravel for erosion control. The affected area is less than 1 acre. As
	0.05 acre of Coastal Sage Scrub habitat will be removed, mitigation will be implemented.
9.	Surrounding land uses and setting (briefly describe the project's surroundings):
	To the west & south is a single-family residential development & to the northwest is an associated undeveloped
	open space lot owned by the Country Club Woods Homeowner Association, within the City of Escondido.
	To the east and northeast are single-family homes located in the County.
10.	Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

	County of San Diego and possibly the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the California Department					
	of Fish and Game, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board.					
EN'	VIRONMENTAL FACTORS POT	ENTIALLY	AFFECTED:			
The a "F	e environmental factors checked bottomically Significant Impact" as in	pelow poter andicated by	ntially would be affected the checklist on the fo	by this project llowing pages.	involving at least one impact that is	
	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		] Air Quality	
$\boxtimes$	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Greenhouse Gas Emissions	
	Geology/Soils		Hazards & Hazardous M	laterials	Hydrology/Water Quality	
	Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources		] Noise	
	Population/Housing		Public Services		Recreation	
	Transportation/Traffic		Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance	
DE	TERMINATION: (To be complete	ed by the Le	ead Agency)			
On	the basis of this initial evaluation:					
	I find that the proposed project DECLARATION shall be prepare		NOT have a significa	nt effect on th	e environment, and a NEGATIVE	
$\boxtimes$	I find that, although the propose significant effect in this case beca A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECL	ause revision	ons in the project have	it effect on the been made by,	environment, there would not be a or agreed to, the project proponent	
	the city's General Plan Quality o	of Life stand Regulations	dards, and the extent o pursuant to Zoning	f the deficiency	and/or deficiencies exist relative to exceeds the levels identified in the 47, Section 33-924 (b), and ar	
	I find that the proposed project might have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT shall be required, but it shall analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.					
	significant effects: (a) have bee applicable standards, and (b)	n analyzed have bee	l adequately in an earl n avoided or mitigat	ier EIR or NEG ed pursuant to	environment, because all potentially ATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE upon the proposed project, nothing	
	France Che	neg		8-15-	//	
3	ignature			Date		
	Rozanne Cherry, Principal Planner	ſ				
	rinted Name and Litle					

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1. This section evaluates the potential environmental effects of the proposed project, generally using the environmental checklist from the State CEQA Guidelines as amended and the City of Escondido Environmental Quality Regulations (Zoning Code Article 47). A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including off-site, on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact might occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. The definitions of the response column headings include the following:
  - A. "Potentially Significant Impact" applies if there is substantial evidence that an effect might be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries once the determination is made, an EIR shall be required.
  - B. "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 2 below, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
  - C. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project creates no significant impacts, only less than significant impacts.
  - D. "No Impact" applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. "No Impact" answers do not require an explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency which show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2. Earlier Analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - A. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where it is available for review.
  - B. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of an adequately analyzed earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - C. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 3. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 4. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 5. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - A. The significance of criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - B. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

ISSUES:

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
l.	<u>LA</u> 21	ND USE PLANNING AND AESTHETICS (1, 2, 3, 6, 10, 13, 17,				
	Wo	ould the project:				
	a.	Physically divide an established community?				$\boxtimes$
	b.	Conflict with any applicable land-use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
	C.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				
	d.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	20			$\boxtimes$
	e.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
	f.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				$\boxtimes$
	g.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				$\boxtimes$
II.	AG	RICULTURE RESOURCES (1, 2, 3, 10, 17, 21)				
	Ag pre mo	determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant vironmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California ricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) spared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional del to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would be project:				
	a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency or (for annexations only) as defined by the adopted policies of the Local Agency Formation Commission, to non-agricultural use?				
34	b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	. 🗆		14	$\boxtimes$

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
	C.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				
III.	<u>TR</u>	ANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC (1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 17, 21)			721	
53	Wo	ould the project:				
	a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but no limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and				
		mass transit?				
	b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
	C.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	E 1			
	d.	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
	e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?		2%		$\boxtimes$
	f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			П 7	
IV.		R QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 17, 21)				
	Wh	nere applicable, the significance criteria established by the applicable quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon make the following determinations. Would the project:				r
	a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	, 🗆 ,			$\boxtimes$
	b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				$\boxtimes$

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	C.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		, s		
	d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				$\boxtimes$
	e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				$\boxtimes$
	f.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly of indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				$\boxtimes$
	g.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?				
<b>/</b> .	BIG	DLOGICAL RESOURCES (1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 17, 20, 21, 22)			8	
	Wo	ould the project:				
	a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
100	b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
ti.	C.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vemal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
	d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
	е.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				$\boxtimes$

		er ::	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				
VI.	CU	LTURAL RESOURCES (1, 2, 5, 10, 17, 19, 21)				
	Wo	uld the project:				
	a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				
	b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				
	C.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				$\boxtimes$
	d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			1	$\boxtimes$
VII.	GE	OLOGY AND SOILS (1, 2, 6, 14, 17, 21)				
	Wo	uld the project:				
	a.	Expose people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
		i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
		ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				$\boxtimes$
		iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				$\boxtimes$
		iv. Landslides?				$\boxtimes$
	b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				$\boxtimes$
	C.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				

		Sec.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2.5%	d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
	e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				
VIII.	<u>HA</u>	ZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (1, 2, 15, 17, 21)				
	Wo	ould the project:				
	a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				В
	b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
	C.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
	d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
	e.	For a project located within an airport land-use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	s:			
	f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	e			
	g.	Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
	h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				

Less Than Significant with Less Than **Potentially** Significant Mitigation Significant Incorporated Impact Impact No Impact IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (1, 2, 6, 11, 12, 14, 17, 20, Would the project: X Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including but not limited to increasing pollutant discharges to receiving waters (Consider temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants)? b. Have potentially significant adverse impacts on ground water quality, X including but not limited to, substantially depleting groundwater supplies or substantially interfering with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, M including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner which would result in substantial/increased erosion or siltation on- or off-site? Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, 冈 including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site and/or significant adverse environmental impacts? Cause significant alteration of receiving water quality during or X following construction? Cause an increase of impervious surfaces and associated run-off? Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? M h. Cause potentially significant adverse impact on ground water quality? Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or ground water receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses? j. Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, can it result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired? Create or exacerbate already existing environmentally sensitive X areas?

			Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	I.	Create potentially significant environmental impact on surface water quality, to either marine, fresh, or wetland waters?				$\boxtimes$
	m.	Impact aquatic, wetland or riparian habitat?			$\boxtimes$	
	n.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				$\boxtimes$
	0.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
	p.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				$\boxtimes$
	q.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
	r.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				$\boxtimes$
X.	MII	NERAL RESOURCES (1, 2, 6, 10, 17, 21)				
	Wo	uld the project:				
	a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
	<b>b</b> .	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land-use plan?				
XI.	NO	ISE (1, 2, 6, 17, 21)				
	Wo	ould the project result in:				
	a.	Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
	b.	Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
	C.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
	d.	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				

		* I	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	e.	For a project located within an airport land-use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
	f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
XII.	PO	PULATION AND HOUSING (1, 2, 10, 17, 21)				
	Wo	ould the project:				
	a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
	b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
	C.	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
XIII.	PU	BLIC SERVICES (1, 2, 8, 9, 17, 21)				
	Wo	ould the project:				
	a.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	.5	Fire protection?				$\boxtimes$
		Police protection?				$\boxtimes$
		Schools?				$\boxtimes$
		Parks?				
		Libraries?				
		Gas/Electricity?				$\boxtimes$

			Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			EI .	
	C.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
XIV.	<u>UT</u>	ILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS (1, 2, 17, 21)				
	Wo	ould the project:				
	a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				$\boxtimes$
	b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
	C.	Require, or result in, the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
	d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<u> </u>			
	e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves, or may serve, the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
	f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
	g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				
XV.	<u>M.</u>	ANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
×	a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number, or restrict the range, of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	,			

		Potentially Significant impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				
C.	Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				

## Source of Information/Material Used in Preparation of this Analysis

- 1. Escondido General Plan and Environmental Impact Report, 1990
- 2. Escondido General Plan Update and Environmental Impact Report, 2000
- 3. Escondido Zoning Code and Land Use Maps
- 4. SANDAG Summary of Trip Generation Rates
- 5. Escondido Historic Sites Survey
- 6. City of Escondido Engineering Services Public Works Department
- 7. City of Escondido Traffic Division
- 8. City of Escondido Fire Department
- 9. City of Escondido Police Department
- 10. City of Escondido Planning Division
- 11. Escondido Drainage Master Plan, 1995
- 12. Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM)
- 13. Draft Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) maps
- 14. United States Geological Survey Topographic Map for San Diego (Escondido) area
- 15. County of San Diego Health Department, Hazardous Material Management Division (HMMD) Hazardous Sites List
- 16. Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP) on How to Analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents (Comment Draft, March 5, 2007)
- 17. Project Description and Preliminary Information
- 18. Biological Resources Technical Memorandum, prepared by URS Corporation, dated October 2010
- 19. Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum, prepared by URS Corporation, dated October 2010
- 20. Hydrology and Hydraulic Report, prepared by URS Corporation, dated March 2009
- 21. Remedial Action Plan, prepared by URS Corporation, dated October 2009
- 22. 45-Day Report for California Gnatcatcher Surveys, prepared by URS Corporation, dated May 2011