

Eucalyptus and Citrus Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Project Addendum to the 2017 Comprehensive Sewer Master Plan Supplemental Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2007091072)

February 2022

Prepared For:

City of Vista/Buena Sanitation District
200 Civic Center Drive
Vista, CA 92084



N|V|5

15092 Avenue of Science, Suite 200 |
San Diego, CA 92128
858.385.2195
Project713121-2021001.29



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	4
1.1	PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM AND BASIS FOR DECISION TO PREPARE ADDENDUM	5
1.2	PROJECT LOCATION	5
1.3	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	5
1.4	POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL effectS.....	10
1.5	DETERMINATION	11
1.6	EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	12
2.0	ENVIRONMENTAL SPEIR ADDENDUM	13
2.1	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST:	13
2.1.1	AESTHETICS	13
2.1.2	AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.....	15
2.1.3	AIR QUALITY.....	17
2.1.4	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	20
2.1.5	CULTURAL RESOURCES	33
2.1.6	ENERGY	42
2.1.7	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	44
2.1.8	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	48
2.1.9	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	50
2.1.10	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	56
2.1.11	LAND USE AND PLANNING	60
2.1.12	MINERAL RESOURCES	62
2.1.13	NOISE	63
2.1.14	POPULATION & HOUSING	69
2.1.15	PUBLIC SERVICES	70
2.1.16	RECREATION	71
2.1.17	TRANSPORTATION	73
2.1.18	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	77
2.1.19	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	80
2.1.20	WILDFIRE.....	82
2.1.21	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	84
3.0	REFERENCES	87
4.0	LIST OF PREPARERS	89
4.1	LEAD AGENCY – CITY OF VISTA	89
4.2	PROJECT CONSULTANTS NV5.....	89

LIST OF APPENDICES

- A Biological Resources Report
- B Cultural Resources Report
- C Hazardous Materials Summary



1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

The City of Vista, California (City) is proposing to construct the Eucalyptus and Citrus Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Project a complex set of collection infrastructure improvements that is subject to environmental review as an addendum to the City’s 2017 City Comprehensive Sewer Master Plan Update (CSMP) Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (SPEIR) (State Clearinghouse [SCH] #2007091072) for the City/Buena Sanitation District (District) CSMP addressing the currently proposed Eucalyptus and Citrus Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Project (Project).

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Report compliant with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was written in 2008 and supplemented in 2017 (SPEIR) that covered several of the elements of the current project. The Proposed Project includes an approximately 90-foot segment not included in the SPEIR (8-inch connection) which would divert flows to Vista Village Drive. This Addendum covers those new components, as well as proposed changes to existing components.

The 2017 CSMP SPEIR updates and tiers from the 2008 Sewer Master Plan Update Program Environmental Impact Report (2008 PEIR). The current document has been prepared in conformance with the provisions of CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Environmental Quality) and the State Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines; Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3). In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15164, this document tiers from the more recently certified 2017 CSMP SPEIR which updates the 2008 PEIR and is therefore considered an Addendum to the Final 2017 CSMP SPEIR (hereinafter referred to simply as the SPEIR Addendum). The City is the Lead Agency (as defined by CEQA) for this Addendum as prepared.

The previous 2008 PEIR and 2017 CSMP SPEIR comply with CEQA Guidelines §15168(a), which requires that a programmatic environmental document be prepared for a series of actions that can be characterized as one large program, with each action related as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions. Typically, such a program can involve individual activities/projects carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways (§15168(a)(4)).

PEIRs generally analyze broad environmental effects of the program acknowledging that site-specific environmental reviews may be required for subsequent implementing activities/projects. When a subsequent project within the program is proposed for implementation, it must undergo additional CEQA review (§15168(c)) to confirm whether it would result in any new significant environmental effects or increase the severity of any previously identified environmental effects. CEQA Guidelines §§15162-15164 provide the circumstances under which a subsequent project that has been evaluated in a previously certified PEIR may warrant a subsequent EIR or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), a supplement to an EIR or MND, or an Addendum to an EIR or MND, based on the significance or severity of new or increased environmental effects that could result from project changes, new information, changing circumstances, or changes to Mitigation Measures or alternatives. If determined that a subsequent project would not have any new or greater significant environmental effects than what was concluded for that project in a PEIR, then a subsequent or supplemental EIR or MND is not required, and the Lead Agency may rely on a CEQA Addendum to approve the subsequent project (§15164(a) and (b)).

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM AND BASIS FOR DECISION TO PREPARE ADDENDUM

The City completed its CSMP in 2017. CSMP builds on and refines the 2007 Sewer Master Plan Update (SMPU) plan by providing a set of recommended projects for inclusion in the City’s CIP and operations and maintenance (O&M) program. The CIP component of the 2017 CSMP includes a combination of conveyance capacity improvements to address undersized pipelines and replacement/rehabilitation improvements to address pipelines in poor condition and experiencing inflow/infiltration. The SPEIR requires project-level evaluation and provides an Environmental Checklist to be completed for projects included in the SPEIR analysis. Subsequent projects within the program require additional CEQA review (§15168[c]) and demonstrate whether they result in new significant environmental effects. CEQA Guidelines §15162-15164 define how a new project needs to be compared to a previously certified PEIR.

The analysis developed in this document informs the decision to examine each of the environmental effects for conformity to the SPEIR and to include the new projects in the SPEIR Addendum. Because of that double use, most of the effects in the original SPEIR, plus several new effects, not examined by the SPEIR but now part of the CEQA Environmental Checklist, are re-examined. Therefore, the Proposed Project in the basis of this Addendum may be approved by the City as a subsequent activity covered within the scope of the 2017 CSMP SPEIR.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The Proposed Project is located in the City of Vista, within San Diego County and consists of five design components along five segments (Figure 1.1). The first component is parallel to Eucalyptus Avenue between Civic Center Drive and Citrus Avenue. The second component is parallel to Citrus Avenue north of Eucalyptus Avenue and south of East Broadway. The third component is located on the Vista Magnet Middle School (VMMS) campus, near the track and field area, approximately 530 feet west of Civic Center Drive. The fourth component is located south of the Cinépolis Cinemas parking lot, immediately east of Wave Drive and terminates on Eddie Drive, approximately 250 feet west of the railroad tracks. The fifth component is located north of the second component parallel to Citrus Avenue, approximately 350 feet south of Vista Village Drive.

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The programmatic analysis in the SPEIR differentiated between the following categories:

- Category 1: CIP Capacity and Condition Projects (Hardscape Environs)
- Category 2: CIP Capacity and Condition Projects (Cross-Country Environs)
- Category 3: O&M Program Operations and Pump Station Rehabilitations
- Category 4: Out-of-Service Area Projects

There are five design components (also referred to as Alignments) analyzed in this addendum: Components 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The Proposed Project involves replacing and upsizing approximately 1,380 linear feet of 10-inch diameter vitrified clay pipe (VCP) to 12-inch/15-inch diameter polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe along Eucalyptus and Citrus Avenues, between Civic Center Drive and Broadway within the City. The existing 10-inch sewer main along Eucalyptus Avenue and Citrus Avenue was identified in the 2017 Sewer Master Plan Update as capacity deficient, requiring upsizing to a 12-

inch sewer main. A second area of pipeline replacement was identified as capacity deficient, which is located within the grounds of the VMMS. This portion would replace approximately 558 linear feet of 6-inch VCP with 8-inch PVC pipe. In addition, sewer improvements from Eddie Drive to Wave Drive through a private parking lot south of the Cinépolis Theatre are also included in this Proposed Project.

Best management practices (BMPs) would be employed during construction of the Project to maintain soil stabilization, erosion control practices, and sediment control practices. Performance and effectiveness of these BMPs would be determined either by visual means where applicable (i.e., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where verification of contaminant reduction or elimination (e.g., inadvertent petroleum release) is required to determine adequacy of the measure.

In addition, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be implemented to address other project-specific water quality threats, as required for individual improvements including but not limited to temporary dewatering, hydrostatic testing, and other resources permits as required under the Federal Clean Water Act, County Grading Ordinance, and State Fish and Game Code, as applicable. Construction and post-construction BMPs would be designed to avoid the creation of standing water and potential mosquito breeding habitat.

Construction of the Proposed Project would take approximately 8 months and is anticipated to begin in Spring 2022 and end in Fall 2022.

Included in the SPEIR for the 2008 Sewer Master Plan Update (Figure 1.1):

1. Eucalyptus Avenue/Category 1 The existing 10-inch diameter (VCP) on Eucalyptus Avenue from Civic Center Drive to South Citrus Avenue is operating over capacity and beyond the City’s design criteria. Approaching 975 linear feet in length, this sewer main would be abandoned-in-place and replaced with a 12-inch diameter PVC sewer main, including seven (7) new sanitary sewer manholes (48-inch diameter) and one (1) rehabilitated sanitary sewer manhole. The proposed 12-inch diameter PVC sewer main would be installed approximately 6 feet south of the existing 10-inch diameter VCP sewer main and would remain within the asphalt concrete pavement of the roadway, entirely within the public right-of-way. The depth of excavations for the sewer improvements would vary between 8 and 14 feet. The proposed 12-inch diameter PVC sewer main and sanitary sewer manholes would be constructed with traditional open-trench, cut and cover.

2. Citrus Avenue/Category 1 The existing 10-inch diameter VCP sewer main on South Citrus Avenue from Eucalyptus Avenue to Broadway is operating over capacity and beyond the City’s design criteria. This sewer main reach would total more than 400 linear feet and consist of 12-inch and 15-inch diameter PVC sewer mains, including two (2) new sanitary sewer manholes (48-inch diameter), one (1) new sanitary sewer “inside-drop” manhole (60-inch diameter), one (1) rehabilitated sanitary sewer manhole at Broadway, and lastly, one (1) new sanitary sewer manhole (48-inch diameter) to facilitate the connection of wastewater flows conveyed from VMMS via an existing 10-inch diameter VCP sewer main. The proposed 12-inch and 15-inch diameter PVC sewer mains would be installed approximately 21 feet southwest of the existing 10-inch diameter VCP sewer main and would remain within the asphalt concrete pavement of the roadway, entirely within the public right-of-way. A portion of the proposed 15-inch diameter PVC sewer main would cross above an existing concrete box culvert owned by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and utilized for stormwater and drainage flows. The depth of excavations for the sewer

improvements would vary between 4 and 18 feet. The proposed 12-inch and 15-inch diameter PVC sewer mains and sanitary sewer manholes would be constructed with traditional open-trench, cut and cover.

Not included in the 2008 Sewer Master Plan Update SPEIR (Figure 1.1):

3. VMMS/Category 1 The existing 6-inch diameter VCP sewer mains on VMMS campus (within the existing track and field area) are operating over capacity and beyond the City’s design criteria. Three (3) sewer segments that total approximately 540 linear feet would be replaced in-place. The proposed sewer main would be an 8-inch diameter PVC sewer main, including four (4) new sanitary sewer manholes (48-inch diameter). The proposed 8-inch diameter PVC sewer main would remain within the current Alignment (replace-in-place), which is in an open grass/turf or dirt track on the VMMS campus in an existing public utility easement. The depth of excavations for the sewer improvements would vary between 8 and 10 feet. The proposed 8-inch diameter PVC sewer main and sanitary sewer manholes would be constructed with traditional open-trench, cut and cover. Construction of this Alignment would be completed during Summer 2022.

4. Eddie Drive and Wave Drive/Category 1 The existing 6-inch diameter VCP and cast-iron (CI) sewer main from Eddie Drive to the existing parking lot behind the Cinépolis Theatre is experiencing a loss of structural integrity and has an elevated consequence of failure due to its installation. Currently, the existing 6-inch diameter sewer main traverses a concrete-lined, open drainage channel above-grade and is fully exposed. The below-grade portions of the existing 6-inch diameter sewer main are VCP and straddle the concrete-lined, open drainage channel. The reach suspended above the concrete-lined, open drainage channel is less than 50 linear feet and is made of CI material. This collective sewer main reach is less than 130 linear feet but would be completely re-aligned to avoid the concrete-lined, open drainage channel.

The proposed Alignment would commence at Eddie Drive, traverse a private parking lot south of the Cinépolis Theatre, and terminate at Wave Drive totaling nearly 485 linear feet in length. The sewer main improvements would consist of an 8-inch diameter PVC sewer main, including four (4) new sanitary sewer manholes (48-inch diameter) and one (1) rehabilitated sanitary sewer manhole at Wave Drive that would result in an “inside-drop” manhole. The proposed 8-inch diameter PVC sewer main would remain within the asphalt concrete pavements of the roadway and private parking lot but would require a permanent easement for operation and maintenance by the City. The depth of excavations for the sewer improvements would vary between 8 and 14 feet. The proposed 8-inch diameter PVC sewer main and sanitary sewer manholes would be constructed with traditional open-trench, cut and cover means, with a small section tunneled beneath an existing concrete masonry unit (CMU) block retaining wall between Eddie Drive and the private parking lot.

The collector pipe suspended above Buena Vista Creek would be removed. The contract for the Proposed Project removal would be stipulated by the City as requiring that the creek be protected by the contractor from any accidental addition of material during removal. This stipulation would attempt to obviate the need for any Clean Water Act, 404/401 or state §1602 permitting.

The pipe would be supported with equipment on each side (Eddie Dr. and Cinépolis parking lot) of the channel. The contractor would extend either plastic or large tarps across the channel to protect it during removal. Cuts would be made at each end close to where the pipe goes underground. The contractor would wrap the pipe with plastic/tarp and pull the pipe to one side for removal. Aboveground pipe stubs would be plugged with concrete.

5. South Citrus Avenue and Broadway Avenue/Category 1 In addition, and due to its proximity, there is a sewer improvement at the intersection of South Citrus Avenue and Broadway that consists of approximately 100 linear feet of 18-inch diameter PVC sewer main, including two (2) new sanitary sewer manholes (60-inch diameter). The depth of excavations for the 18-inch diameter PVC sewer main would vary between 14 and 20 feet, would be constructed with traditional open-trench, cut and cover means, and entirely within the public right-of-way.



<p>Legend</p> <p>— Components described in the SPEIR</p> <p>— Components not in the SPEIR</p>	<p>NOTES: Project Area: 0.47 miles City of Vista, CA San Marcos USGS 7.5' Quadrangle San Diego County, California</p>	<p>FIG 1-1 PROJECT AREA MAP</p>								
<p>0 0.25 0.5 Kilometers</p> <p>0 0.25 0.5 Miles</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1:10,000</p>		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Service Layer Credits: Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, Increment</td> <td>PROJECT NO.: 227519-0000616.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>REVISED: 10/7/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>DRAWN BY: MB</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>FILE NAME: fig1_1.MXC</td> </tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">N V 5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Eucalyptus-Citrus Sewer Improvements San Diego County, CA</p>	Service Layer Credits: Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, Increment	PROJECT NO.: 227519-0000616.01		REVISED: 10/7/2021		DRAWN BY: MB		FILE NAME: fig1_1.MXC
Service Layer Credits: Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, Increment	PROJECT NO.: 227519-0000616.01									
	REVISED: 10/7/2021									
	DRAWN BY: MB									
	FILE NAME: fig1_1.MXC									

1.4 POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The Proposed Project could potentially result in one or more of the following significant environmental impacts; however, proposed Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts to less-than-significant. As discussed in the Introduction, despite the clearance of several of these Checklist items in the SPEIR, documentation of their continued application to the SPEIR is also examined in Chapter 2.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture/Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hazardous and Hazardous Materials
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology and Water Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wildfire	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance

1.5 DETERMINATION

Based on this evaluation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that the Proposed Project WOULD NOT have any significant effects on the environment that either have not already been analyzed in the prior SPEIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c), CEQA does not apply to such effects. A Notice of Determination (Section 15094) would be filed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the Proposed Project would have effects that either have not been analyzed in the prior SPEIR or are more significant than described in the prior SPEIR. With respect to those effects that are subject to CEQA, I find that such effects WOULD NOT be significant, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION would be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the Proposed Project would have effects that either have not been analyzed in the prior SPEIR or are more significant than described in the prior SPEIR. I find that although those effects could be significant, there would not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION would be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the Proposed Project would have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior SPEIR or are more significant than described in the prior SPEIR. I find that those effects WOULD be significant, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required to analyze those effects that are subject to CEQA.

John Conley
Signature

3/9/2022
Date

John Conley
Printed Name

City of Vista
For

1.6 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. For the purposes of this checklist, “prior SPEIR” means the environmental impact report certified for the 2017 CSMP.
4. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur because of an improvement contemplated under the CSMP, then the checklist must indicate whether that effect has already been analyzed in the prior SPEIR or whether the new significant impact is due to unusual circumstances or substantial added information, as indicated in the column headings. If the effect of the project is not more significant than what has already been analyzed that effect of the project is not subject to CEQA. The brief explanation accompanying this determination should include page and section references to the portions of the prior SPEIR containing the analysis of that effect. The brief explanation shall also indicate whether the prior SPEIR included any Mitigation Measures to lessen that effect and whether those measures have been incorporated into the project.
5. If all impacts of an improvement contemplated under CSMP were analyzed in the prior SPEIR, CEQA does not apply to the project, and the lead agency shall file a Notice of Determination.
6. Impacts of an improvement contemplated under CSMP that has not been analyzed in a prior EIR are subject to CEQA. With respect to those impacts of individual improvements contemplated under CSMP that are subject to CEQA, the checklist shall indicate whether impacts have been previously analyzed in the SPEIR, new significant impacts due to unusual circumstances or substantial new information, less-than-significant impact with SPEIR Mitigation Measures applied, less-than-significant impact, or no impact. If there are one or more “Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required. The EIR should be limited to analysis of those impacts determined to be significant (Section 15128).
7. “SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable” applies where the incorporation of Mitigation Measures from the SPEIR would reduce an effect of a project that is subject to CEQA from “Significant Impact” to a “Less-than-significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the SPEIR Mitigation Measures, and briefly explain how those measures reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.
8. The explanation of each issue should identify:

- a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
- b. the Mitigation Measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SPEIR ADDENDUM

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST:

2.1.1 AESTHETICS

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the Project:					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a State scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. In non-urbanized areas, degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the Proposed Project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The 2017 SPEIR did not evaluate aesthetic resources. They were examined by the 2008 Sewer Update PEIR, and no significant impacts were identified.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The area was surveyed during the Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) and no scenic areas, as defined by the 2030 General Plan,

were decentered. The Proposed Project is in a heavily urban area near roads and is primarily commercial and residential. Therefore, there are no scenic vistas within the Proposed Project area that would be adversely affected by the Proposed Project. Additionally, the pipelines are underground.

- b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a State scenic highway?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The area was surveyed during the PER and no scenic areas, as defined by the 2030 General Plan were disinterred. The local roads in the Project Area are not designated as a State scenic highway. The closest state-designated or eligible scenic highways are Interstate 5 (6.2 miles from Eddie Drive and Wave Avenue) and State Route 76 (3.8 miles from Eddie Drive and Wave Avenue), both eligible (Caltrans 2021), and the Proposed Project is not directly visible from either.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Project Area is in a heavily urban area near roads and is primarily commercial and residential. Therefore, the Project Area does not have exceptional visual character or quality. Construction activities would result in temporary visual impacts due to the presence of equipment and staged materials in the Project Area and vegetation removal and ground disturbance activities, which would be visible from some residences and commercial areas and for travelers along nearby roads. These activities would take place in a developed area and are like other construction activities that periodically occur. No long-term visual changes would take place because the pipeline would be underground and the surface would be restored to its current, or improved, condition.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The pipelines are underground. After construction, there would be no permanent aboveground features that would result in lighting or glare impacts. No nighttime construction would be required; therefore, a City Lighting Plan is not needed for the Proposed Project.

Although not examined in the 2017 SPEIR, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to aesthetics have been identified.

2.1.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measures(s) Required
<p>AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Proposed Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the Project:</p>					
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, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resource Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use, or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
conversion of forest land to non-forest use?					

The 2017 SPEIR did not evaluate agriculture and forestry resources.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** Based on the City Community Development Department Vista website GIS tool (Vista CDD 2021) and the California Department of Conservation maps, no land considered Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be impacted by the Proposed Project, as none occurs within the Project Area.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** Based upon the data of the City Community Development Department website no land subject to agricultural zoning is in the Project Area.

- c) *Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resource Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** Based upon the data of the City Community Development Department website no forest land, timberland, or timberland-zoned Timberland Production is in the Project Area. The Proposed Project would have no conflict with existing zoning or require rezoning for forest and timberland resources.

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

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** No forest land occurs within the Project Area.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. Conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use would not occur, or other changes to the existing environment due to the construction and operation of the Proposed Project.

Although not examined in the 2017 SPEIR, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to agriculture and forestry resources have been identified.

2.1.3 AIR QUALITY

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measures(s) Required
AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project:					
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

As analyzed in the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, construction emissions from CSMP projects are not expected to exceed the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) thresholds or obstruct implementation of the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) for the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB).

All Alignment Work:

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The Project Site is within the SDAB, which is regulated by SDAPCD. The SDAPCD monitors air pollution, implementation of the County of San Diego’s (County) portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP), and application of the

SDPACD Rules and Regulations. The SIP contains strategies and tactics to be applied as part of RAQS in order to maintain acceptable air quality in the County. The RAQS is the applicable air quality plan for the Proposed Project.

Consistency with the RAQS is determined by whether a project would: (1) exceed assumptions contained in the RAQS, and (2) increase the frequency or severity of violations of existing air quality standards, contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or interim reductions as contained in the RAQS.

The Proposed Project would not result in changes to the City's 2030 General Plan land use designations and would not generate growth. It would therefore be consistent with the 2030 General Plan. In addition, as analyzed in the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, construction emissions from CSMP projects are not expected to exceed the SDAPCD thresholds or obstruct implementation of the RAQS for the SDAB.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would provide infrastructure to accommodate existing residential developments; as such, it would not generate additional population growth or serve unplanned growth.

b) *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct Effects – Construction: Less-than-Significant Impact. The SDAB is designated as nonattainment for the federal standard for ozone and the state standards for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. As such, significant cumulative air quality impacts in the SDAB could occur in association with emissions of the ozone precursors volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and NOX, as well as PM10 and PM2.5. Cumulatively considerable net increases during the construction phase would typically occur if two or more projects near each other undergo construction simultaneously, or if a project's VOC, NOX, PM10, or PM2.5 emissions exceed SDAPCD thresholds. Construction-Related Water Use. Water would be required to support project-related construction for dust control. The 2017 CSMP SPEIR analyzed air pollutant emissions associated with continuous pipeline construction in tandem with either a pump station rehabilitation project or an access road project representing worst-case cumulative impact, and concluded that emissions from construction would be well below SDAPCD thresholds. Due to the developed residential nature of the Project Area and the Project's short-term construction period in a relatively small area, it is anticipated that the air emissions from the Project's construction would be much less than what was analyzed in the 2017 CSMP SPEIR.

Direct Effects – Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. Minimal number of emissions would occur from ongoing maintenance activities. The proposed sewer would be passive and would not include new sources of operational air pollution. Maintenance of the sewer would involve worker vehicle trips to inspect the sewer facilities. The 2017 CSMP SPEIR analyzed air pollutant emissions associated with 15 maintenance workers, or 30 daily trips, and concluded that emissions from ongoing maintenance would be well below SDAPCD thresholds. Based on its relatively small size, it is likely that maintenance of the Proposed Project would require less than 15 workers and would therefore generate less emissions than what was analyzed in the 2017 CSMP SPEIR.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in indirect criteria pollutant emissions. The Proposed Project would provide infrastructure to accommodate existing residential developments; as such, it would not generate additional population growth that could generate air pollutant emissions that would contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

c) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors (i.e., children, senior citizens, and acutely or chronically ill people), are more susceptible to the impacts of air pollution than the general population. Land uses considered as sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, convalescent homes, and retirement homes. The closest sensitive receptors to the Proposed Project’s construction and operational maintenance activities is one Alignment (Component 3) at the athletic field located within the VMMS. The area surrounding the construction performed within the school grounds (athletic field) would be blocked off from student access and/or scheduled during non-school days. This would reduce potential exposure to the students. In addition, several single-family residences are located on the south side of Eucalyptus.

During the short-term construction periods associated with each alignment, diesel exhaust particulate matter would be generated by construction equipment and vehicles. Diesel exhaust particulate matter is known by the State of California to include carcinogenic compounds, and long-term exposure to diesel exhaust emissions has the potential to result in adverse health impacts. The risks associated with exposure to carcinogenic substances are typically based on a lifetime of chronic exposure, which defined in the California Air Pollution Control Officers’ Associated Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program Risk Assessment Guidelines as 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, 365 days per year, for 70 years. In addition, as discussed in section 2.1.3.b, the air emissions that could occur from both construction and operation of the projects identified in the 2017 CSMP would be well below significance thresholds. Accordingly, given the short-term nature of the Proposed Project’s construction period, potential impacts related to exposure of existing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (including diesel exhaust) would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects– Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not indirectly generate pollutants and would therefore not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct Effects – Construction: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (CARB 2005) includes a list of the most common sources of odor complaints received by local air districts. Typical sources of odor complaints include facilities such as sewage treatment plants, landfills, recycling facilities, petroleum refineries, and livestock operations. Construction activities are not a typical source of odor complaints. Potential construction-related sources of odors include asphalt during repaving of the roadway and diesel emissions from

construction equipment. Due to the relatively small size of the Proposed Project and short-term nature of construction, the Project would not expose a substantial number of people to odors for an extended period, and impacts would be less-than-significant.

Direct Effects – Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. Based on the CARB’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (CARB 2005) list of common odor complaints, sewer facilities have the potential to cause objectionable odors. Although odors periodically emanate from sewer manholes and this work includes the installation of additional manholes, the Proposed Project is not expected to increase the frequency and severity of such odors because it would result in more stable sewer flows. In addition, all new manholes would be sealed and opened only for maintenance. Since the proposed manholes would still be in proximity to the school and residences, there is potential for nuisance odors at the nearby residences, and the Proposed Project would comply with SDAPCD Rule 51. SDAPCD Rule 51 prohibits emissions, including odor emissions, from any source whatsoever in such quantities of air contaminants or other material, which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to public health or damage to property.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would not result in indirect impacts related to odors. The Project does not include off-site components or facilitate additional projects that would generate new sources of odor.

No significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to air quality have been identified that would deny conformity to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or Substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community as identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or Substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A general biological survey was conducted on June 7, 2021, by NV5 biologist, Robin Kinmont, to document biological resources within the Project Area and to document if any significant changes occurred within the area since the previous analysis conducted in 2017. The Project Area includes approximately 0.48 mile (2,526 feet) of proposed sewer line, which are represented by five Project Alignments. Photographs were taken of each alignment. A query of plant and animal species databases were researched to determine the potential for special-status species to occur within the Proposed Project area California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) (CDFW 2021). No biological resources or special-status species or their habitats were identified during the general biological survey. There is no critical habitat within the Project Area (USFWS 2021a). The Project Area does not provide any wildlife corridors. For more detailed information see Appendix A (Figures) for the Draft Biological Resources Report for the Eucalyptus and Citrus Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Project which was completed in October 2021 and analysis of potential impacts to biological resources from implementation of the Proposed Project includes all five Project Alignments. This impacts analysis is discussed below.

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?*

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Proposed Project construction would occur within developed commercial and urban residential areas in existing

roadways and adjacent to commercial and residential properties. Although trenching would occur within roadway right-of-way, ornamental vegetation and non-native trees are immediately adjacent along both sides of Eucalyptus Avenue. These vegetated areas are predominately ornamental and/or not of high-quality habitat for wildlife in general, however, it may provide nesting habitat for bird species covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). These species would potentially be impacted by construction if these activities occur during the nesting bird breeding season (January 15 through September 15). If it is determined that nest abandonment has occurred specifically due to the proximity of construction activities, it would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is proposed, consistent with the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, to minimize potential impacts to MBTA protected species.

Operations and maintenance activities would occur in developed and disturbed areas within roadway right-of-way and shoulder areas and would not require vegetation removal. Operations and maintenance activities impacts to special-status species and their habitats are unlikely.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, indirect impacts from night lighting or noise would not be anticipated as no construction activities are proposed at night and implementation of BIO-1 would minimize potential impacts to nesting birds. After construction is completed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to special-status species or their habitats.

Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. Proposed Project construction would occur within developed commercial and urban residential areas in existing roadways and adjacent to commercial and residential properties. Although trenching would occur within roadway right-of-way, ornamental vegetation and native/non-native trees are immediately adjacent along both sides of North Citrus Avenue. These vegetated areas are predominately ornamental and/or not of high-quality habitat for wildlife in general; however, it may provide nesting habitat for bird species covered under the MBTA. These species would potentially be impacted by construction if these activities occur during the nesting bird breeding season (January 15 through September 15). If it is determined that nest abandonment has occurred specifically due to the proximity of construction activities, it could be considered a significant impact. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is proposed, consistent with the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, to minimize potential impacts to MBTA protected species. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is proposed, consistent with the 2017 CSMP SPEIR (Vista 2017), to minimize potential impacts to MBTA protected species.

Operations and maintenance activities would occur in developed and disturbed areas within roadway right-of-way and shoulder areas and would not require vegetation removal; however, tree branch trimming may be needed. Operations and maintenance activities impacts to special-status species and their habitats are unlikely. This impact is considered less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, indirect impacts from night lighting or noise would not be anticipated as no construction activities are proposed at night and implementation of BIO-1 would minimize potential impacts to nesting birds. After construction is completed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to special-status species or their habitats.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work):

Direct Effects – Construction: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Proposed Project construction would occur within developed school district property. The athletic field is landscaped habitat comprised of a maintained ornamental grass field. Although trenching would occur within the athletic field, mature native trees (western sycamore [*Platanus racemosa*]) are immediately adjacent to the north bordering Vista Village Drive and the school property fence. These trees are located within landscape setting and may provide nesting habitat to bird species covered under the MBTA. These species would potentially be impacted by construction if these activities occur during the nesting bird breeding season. If it is determined that nest abandonment has occurred specifically due to the proximity of construction activities, it could be considered a significant impact. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is proposed, consistent with the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, to minimize potential impacts to MBTA protected species; therefore, the impact is less-than-significant.

Direct Effects – Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Operations and maintenance activities would occur in the school district property athletic field and would not require vegetation removal. Operations and maintenance activities impacts to special-status species and their habitats are unlikely. The school athletic field does not provide habitat for special-status species (including birds and raptors protected under the MBTA). This impact is considered less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects– Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, indirect impacts from night lighting or noise would not be anticipated as no construction activities are proposed at night and implementation of BIO-1 would minimize potential impacts to nesting birds. After construction is completed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to special-status species or their habitats.

Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Proposed Project construction would occur within developed commercial and urban residential areas in existing roadways and adjacent to commercial and residential properties. Project trenching would occur within roadway right-of-way, a paved parking lot, and a small section of ornamental vegetation between two western sycamore trees. Tree branch trimming of the two western sycamore trees may be needed prior to construction activities. Additional native and non-native trees are immediately adjacent along both sides of the parking lot. These trees are located within landscape setting and are not of high-quality habitat; however, the trees may provide nesting habitat to special-status bird species covered under the MBTA. A few small non-native invasive Brazilian pepper trees (*Schinus terebinthifolia*) occur along the fence near where the existing sewer pipe daylights, which may need to be trimmed prior to pipe removal activities. These species would potentially be impacted by construction if these activities occur during the nesting bird breeding season. If it is determined that nest abandonment has occurred specifically due to the proximity of construction activities, it could be considered a significant impact. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is proposed, consistent with the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, to minimize potential impacts to MBTA protected species; therefore, this impact is less-than-significant.

Operations and maintenance activities would occur in developed and disturbed areas within roadway right-of-way and shoulder areas, and paved parking lots, and would not require vegetation removal. Operations and maintenance activities impacts to special-status species and their habitats are unlikely. This impact is considered less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, indirect impacts from night lighting or noise would not be anticipated as no construction activities are proposed at night and implementation of BIO-1 would minimize potential impacts to nesting birds. After construction is completed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to special-status species or their habitats.

Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Proposed Project construction would occur within developed commercial areas in existing roadways and adjacent to commercial and school district properties. Although trenching would occur within roadway right-of-way, ornamental vegetation and non-native trees are immediately adjacent along both sides of North Citrus Avenue. These vegetated areas are predominately ornamental and/or not of high-quality habitat, however, may provide nesting habitat to special-status bird species covered under the MBTA. These species would potentially be impacted by construction if these activities occur during the nesting bird breeding season. If it is determined that nest abandonment has occurred specifically due to the proximity of construction activities, it could be considered a significant impact. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is proposed, consistent with the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, to minimize potential impacts to MBTA protected species. Operations and maintenance activities would occur in developed and disturbed areas within roadway right-of-way area and would not require vegetation removal. Operations and maintenance activities impacts to special-status species and their habitats are unlikely.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, indirect impacts from night lighting or noise would not be anticipated as no construction activities are proposed at night and implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would minimize potential impacts to nesting birds. After construction is completed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to special-status species or their habitats.

Mitigation

BIO-1: MBTA Nest Avoidance (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

If construction activities occur between January 15 and September 15, a preconstruction survey (within seven days prior to construction activities) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests are present within or adjacent to the area proposed for development in order to avoid the nesting activities of breeding birds/raptors. The results of the survey shall be submitted to the City (and made available to the Wildlife Agencies, upon request) prior to initiation of any construction activities.

If nesting activities within 200 feet of the proposed work area are not detected, construction activities may proceed. If nesting activities are confirmed, construction activities shall be delayed within an appropriate buffer (e.g., 300 feet) from the active nest until the young birds have fledged and/or until the nest is no longer active as determined by a qualified biologist. The results of all biological monitoring shall be submitted to the City (and made available to the Wildlife Agencies, upon request).

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

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within a commercial and urban areas and would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian or other sensitive natural community. There is no critical habitat within the Project Area (USFWS 2021a).

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, indirect impacts from night lighting or noise would not be anticipated as no construction activities are proposed at night. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial and urban areas and would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian or other sensitive natural community. There is no critical habitat within the Project Area (USFWS 2021a).

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, indirect impacts from night lighting or noise would not be anticipated as no construction activities are proposed at night. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in developed school district property within an athletic field and would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian or other sensitive natural community.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, indirect impacts from night lighting or noise would not be anticipated as no construction activities are proposed at night. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways and parking lot within commercial and urban areas. The removal of the existing sewer pipe would be conducted from the area either side of the Buena Vista Creek concrete channel. Prior to removal, the existing sewer pipe would be cleaned. The pipe would either be unbolted or cut, and then removed. The pipe ends would be capped. Then the section of pipe crossing over the concrete channel would be disconnected from above the jurisdictional channel. A few small non-native invasive Brazilian pepper trees (*Schinus terebinthifolia*) occur along the fence near where the existing sewer pipe daylights, which may require trimming prior to pipe removal. No riparian habitat is present. The proposed improvements would not result in the disturbance of any riparian habitat. Therefore, construction and operations would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian or other sensitive natural community.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, indirect impacts from night lighting or noise would not be anticipated as no construction activities are proposed at night. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial areas and would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian or other sensitive natural community.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, indirect impacts from night lighting or noise would not be anticipated as no construction activities are proposed at night. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

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

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial and urban areas and would not have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands (USFWS 2021b).

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to wetlands.

Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial and urban areas. The trench would occur above the existing concrete box culvert, protecting the culvert in place, and the new pipe would be installed above the box culvert and under the existing road within the area above ordinary high-water mark. No hydrological interruption of the box culvert would occur. Soil and/or water entering the drainage during construction activities would be considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 is proposed, consistent with the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, to minimize potential impacts to wetlands through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

Operations and maintenance activities would occur in developed and disturbed areas within roadway right-of-way above the concrete box culvert. Operations and maintenance activities impacts to the box culvert or wetlands is unlikely. This impact is considered less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to wetlands.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in developed school district property within an athletic field and would not have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands (USFWS 2021b).

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to wetlands.

Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project trenching would occur in existing roadways and parking lot within commercial and urban areas. Improvements within Eddie Drive would occur within the roadway right-of-way and surface disturbance would be limited. The proposed improvements would not result in the disturbance of any wetland habitat. The removal of the existing sewer pipe would be conducted from the areas on either side of the Buena Vista Creek concrete channel outside of California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or USACE jurisdiction. Prior to removal, the existing sewer pipe would be cleaned. The pipe would be either unbolted or cut and then removed. The pipe ends would be capped, and the abandoned line filled with concrete. During this work, plastic sheeting would be stretched across the span of the channel and secured to prevent any materials from entering the channel. No hydrological interruption of the concrete channel would occur. Soil and/or water entering the drainage during construction activities would be considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 is proposed, consistent with the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, to minimize potential impacts to wetlands. Therefore, construction and operations would not adversely affect any federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

The removal of the pipe would reduce the long-term risk of environmental harm to Buena Vista Creek. Operations and maintenance activities would occur in developed and disturbed areas within roadway right-of-way. Operations and maintenance activities impacts to wetlands is unlikely. This impact is considered less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground, and the old, exposed sewer pipe removed would not result in indirect impacts to wetlands.

Mitigation

HWQ-1: Assess Project Risk, Receiving Water Vulnerability, and Implement a Water Quality Protection Strategy (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

The construction contractor would assess the receiving water vulnerability and develop a SWPPP that complies with the requirements of the NPDES General Construction Permit (Order 2009-0009-DWQ as amended by 2010 0014-DWQ and 2012-006-DWQ) based on the project-specific risk level subject to the City Engineer’s approval. The SWPPP shall identify specific actions and BMPs relating to the prevention of stormwater pollution from project-related construction sources by identifying a practical sequence for site restoration, BMPs implementation, contingency measures, responsible parties, and agency contacts. The SWPPP shall reflect localized surface hydrological conditions, local

jurisdictional requirements, and shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to commencement of work.

The SWPPP shall be prepared by a qualified SWPPP developer with BMPs selected to achieve maximum pollutant removal and that represent the best available technology that is economically achievable. BMPs for soil stabilization and erosion control practices and sediment control practices would also be required. Performance and effectiveness of these BMPs shall be determined either by visual means where applicable (i.e., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where verification of contaminant reduction or elimination (e.g., inadvertent petroleum release), is required to determine adequacy of the measure.

The SWPPP shall also address other project-specific water quality threats, as required for individual improvements, including but not limited to temporary dewatering, hydrostatic testing, and other resources permits as required under the Federal Clean Water Act, County Grading Ordinance, and State Fish and Game Code, as applicable. Construction and post-construction BMPs would be designed to avoid the creation of standing water and potential mosquito breeding habitat.

Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial areas and would not have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts to wetlands.

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?

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial and urban areas. There are no wildlife corridors or nursery sites within the Project Area.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial and urban areas. The trench would occur above the existing concrete box culvert, protecting the culvert in place. No impacts to the box culvert would occur. There are no wildlife corridors or nursery sites within the Project Area.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would occur in developed school district property within an athletic field. There are no wildlife corridors or nursery sites within the Project Area.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways and a parking lot within commercial and urban areas. The removal of the existing sewer pipe would be conducted from the areas on either side of the Buena Vista Creek concrete channel outside of CDFW, RWQCB, or USACE jurisdiction. There are no wildlife corridors or nursery sites within the Project Area.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial areas. There are no wildlife corridors or nursery sites within the Project Area.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

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

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial and urban areas that do not contain sensitive or protected biological resources. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial and urban areas that do not contain sensitive or protected biological resources. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would occur in developed school district property within an athletic field that does not contain sensitive or protected biological resources. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances pertaining to protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy of ordinance.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways and a parking lot within commercial and urban areas that do not contain sensitive or protected biological resources. Limited removal of ornamental landscape trees and/or shrubs that are not protected under local policies or ordinances may occur to allow access; however, the removal of any sensitive or protected plant species is not required or proposed. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or tree ordinances pertaining to biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy of ordinance.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial areas that do not contain sensitive or protected biological resources. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances pertaining to protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy of ordinance.

Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would occur in existing roadways within commercial areas that do not contain sensitive or protected biological

resources. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources.

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?*

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The North County Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) Subregional Plan was adopted and certified by the SANDAG Board of Directors on March 28, 2003 (SANDAG 2003). The MHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional planning program designed to develop an ecosystem preserve in the northwestern part of the County of San Diego. Each of the seven jurisdictions within the MHCP planning area (including Vista) is required to implement their respective portion of the MHCP via Citywide subarea plans. The City participates in the MHCP, a regional conservation plan under the states NCCP Program that would also act as an HCP under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). While the City’s Subarea Plan has not been adopted, the City enforces the MHCP through its General Plan (Vista 2012a). Due to the developed nature of the Project Site and surrounding areas and lack of sensitive biological resources at the site, the Proposed Project would not conflict with provisions of the MHCP.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with the MHCP.

Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The North County MHCP Subregional Plan was adopted and certified by the SANDAG Board of Directors on March 28, 2003 (SANDAG 2003). The MHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional planning program designed to develop an ecosystem preserve in the northwestern part of the County of San Diego. Each of the seven jurisdictions within the MHCP planning area (including Vista) is required to implement their respective portion of the MHCP via Citywide subarea plans. The City participates in the MHCP, a regional conservation plan under the states NCCP Program that would also act as an HCP under the ESA. While the City’s Subarea Plan has not been adopted, the City enforces the MHCP through its General Plan (Vista 2012a). Due to the developed nature of the Project Site and surrounding areas and lack of sensitive biological resources at the site, the Proposed Project would not conflict with provisions of the MHCP.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with the MHCP.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The North County MHCP Subregional Plan was adopted and certified by the SANDAG Board of Directors on March 28, 2003 (SANDAG 2003). The MHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional planning program designed to develop an ecosystem preserve in the northwestern part of the County of San Diego. Each of the seven jurisdictions within the MHCP planning area (including Vista) is required to implement their respective portion of the MHCP via Citywide subarea plans. The City participates in the MHCP, a regional conservation plan under the states NCCP Program that would also act as an HCP under the ESA. While the City’s Subarea Plan has not been adopted, the City enforces the MHCP through its General Plan (Vista 2012a). Due to the developed nature of the Project Site and surrounding areas and lack of sensitive biological resources at the site, the Proposed Project would not conflict with provisions of the MHCP.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with the MHCP.

Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The North County MHCP Subregional Plan was adopted and certified by the SANDAG Board of Directors on March 28, 2003 (SANDAG 2003). The MHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional planning program designed to develop an ecosystem preserve in the northwestern part of the County of San Diego. Each of the seven jurisdictions within the MHCP planning area (including Vista) is required to implement their respective portion of the MHCP via Citywide subarea plans. The City participates in the MHCP, a regional conservation plan under the states NCCP Program that would also act as an HCP under the ESA. While the City’s Subarea Plan has not been adopted, the City enforces the MHCP through its General Plan (Vista 2012a). Due to the developed nature of the Project Site and surrounding areas and lack of sensitive biological resources at the site, the Proposed Project would not conflict with provisions of the MHCP.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with the MHCP.

Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The North County MHCP Subregional Plan was adopted and certified by the SANDAG Board of Directors on March 28, 2003 (SANDAG 2003). The MHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional planning program designed to develop an ecosystem preserve in the northwestern part of the County of San Diego. Each of the seven jurisdictions within the MHCP planning area (including Vista) is required to implement their respective portion of the MHCP via Citywide subarea plans. The City participates in the MHCP, a regional conservation plan under the states NCCP Program that would also act as an HCP under the ESA. While the City’s Subarea Plan has not been adopted, the City enforces the MHCP through its General Plan (Vista 2012a). Due to the developed nature of the Project Site and surrounding areas and lack of sensitive biological resources at the site, the Proposed Project would not conflict with provisions of the MHCP.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. During construction, no indirect impacts are expected. Once constructed, these improvements would be located underground and would not result in indirect impacts related to conflict with the MHCP.

Mitigation Measures adopted in the 2017 SPEIR as outlined would be implemented; therefore, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to biological resources would occur. As such, the Project would conform to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A Phase I cultural resources survey was conducted July 26 and 28, 2021, by NV5 archaeologist, Karry Blake, to document cultural resources within the Project Area and to document if any significant changes occurred within the area since the previous analyses were conducted in 2017. For more detailed information see Appendix B for the Cultural Resources Report for the Eucalyptus and Citrus Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Project which was completed in September 2021 and includes all five alignments discussed.

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

The SPEIR identified that direct impacts during construction were less-than-significant and that no impacts would occur during operations. Indirect impacts were identified as temporary for vibration-related impacts. To reduce impacts, Mitigation Measure CULT-1 was required for the preparation of a project-specific archaeological survey to minimize construction-related impacts to historic structures. With implementation of this Mitigation Measure, impacts were reduced to less-than-significant.

The project-specific Archaeological Survey Report prepared for the Proposed Project included a records search at the South Coast Information Center (SCIC), a review of historic maps and aerials, and a pedestrian survey to determine the potential presence of historic resources. A total of fourteen

cultural resources were identified within the ¼-mile search radius. Of these resources two are historic sites, one is a multicomponent site, one precontact site, eight are historic buildings, one historic park, and one historic road. No historic resources were identified within or adjacent to the Project areas.

NV5 submitted a request to Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on August 25, 2021, requesting a search of their Sacred Lands Files. The NAHC indicated that a search for the Project Area was negative. Letters (n = 22) were sent to all contacts provided by the NAHC with an email address including the Pala Band of Mission Indians, San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, and San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians on October 11, 2021. A response was received from the Rincon Band of the Luiseño Indians (Luiseño) on November 1, 2021. This response indicates that the Project Area is within the Territory of the Luiseño people and within the tribe’s area of historic interest. It is noted in the response that a gathering area is adjacent to the Project Area addressed in this study. To date, no response has been received from the Pala Band of Mission Indians and San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians. When a response is received Tribal outreach with Tribes identified by the NAHC would be completed.

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work) and Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The entire Project Area was found to be highly disturbed by modern residential development and non-native landscaping. Accessible portions of the Project Area, primarily along the road shoulders, were intensively surveyed. No archaeological resources were observed.

Historic aerial imagery indicates that Eucalyptus Avenue and Citrus Avenue were established as early as 1938. They are not depicted on the Government Land Office survey plats from the 1800s nor the United States Geological Survey 15-minute Escondido quadrangle topographic maps from 1893 and 1901. Eucalyptus Avenue and Citrus Avenue are typical early town roads which are ubiquitous in the early 1900s. Both roadways have been maintained and updated to meet use demands since construction. As visible on historic aerial photographs, throughout the subsequent years, the road appears to continuously be maintained, paved, and striped, with sidewalks and bikeways being constructed along both roads by 1980. These roads do not retain or possess any of the defining elements that might contribute to their significance or demonstrate the roads as historic resources. The Proposed Project does not warrant the realignment of either roadway. No additional historic resources were identified during the pedestrian survey of the Project areas, and the Project impact would be temporary.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. Construction activities can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the types of equipment used and methods of construction employed. Construction activities known to generate high levels of ground-borne vibration that would have the potential to adversely affect fragile historic structures include pile driving and the use of a vibratory roller for soil compaction. Pile driving would not be required for the Project and a vibratory roller would not be used due to trench size constraints. Other construction equipment to be used would not generate substantial ground-borne vibration.

Based on the results of the project-specific Archaeological Survey Report (NV5 2021) and a review of historic aerials, structures within a ¼ mile of the proposed new sewer lines that were constructed prior to 1970 include three residences (built in 1949), a church, a commercial building, and VMMS.

As such, the structures would meet the 50-year threshold for consideration for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. The residential structures, church, and commercial building are post-World War II structures and are likely not fragile historic structures and would not be impacted by the Proposed Project activities. Of the VMMS complex, the nearest structure is 50 feet north of the eastern end of the Eucalyptus Avenue alignment. This school complex has been in place since 1933, continually used, updated, and maintained. This is not a fragile historic structure and is unlikely to be impacted by the Proposed Project activities. None of the structures are within 25 feet of the Project Alignment and were not recorded or evaluated as part of the project-specific Archaeological Survey Report (NV5 2021). Therefore, no impacts would occur during construction or operational maintenance activities.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work), Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work), and Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Historic aerial imagery indicates that the Citrus Avenue/Broadway intersection and VMMS were established as early as 1938. They are not depicted on the Government Land Office survey plats from the 1800s nor the United States Geological Survey 15-minute Escondido quadrangle topographic maps from 1893 and 1901. Citrus Avenue is typical of early town roads which are ubiquitous in the early 1900s. This roadway has been maintained and updated to meet use demands since construction. Visible on historic aerial photographs the road appears to continuously be maintained, paved, and striped, with sidewalks constructed by 1980. VMMS football field and track were present by 1946. Based upon historic aerial photographs, Eddie Drive was constructed between 1953 and 1964 with the location, prior to construction, part of an agricultural field boundary and terraced slope. The Proposed Project does not warrant the realignment of either roadway. The alignment within the VMMS sports field passes under the sports field and does not impact the historical significance or characteristics of the VMMS. These roads (Eddie Drive, Wave Drive, and Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue) do not retain or possess any of the defining elements that might contribute to their significance or demonstrate the roads as historic resources. No additional historic resources were identified during the pedestrian survey of the Project areas. Project impacts would be temporary.

Indirect Effects– Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** Construction activities can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the types of equipment used and methods of construction employed. Construction activities known to generate high levels of ground-borne vibration that would have the potential to adversely affect fragile historic structures include pile driving and the use of a vibratory roller for soil compaction. Pile driving would not be required for the Proposed Project and a vibratory roller would not be used due to trench size constraints. Other construction equipment to be used would not generate substantial ground-borne vibration.

Based on the results of the project-specific Archaeological Survey Report (Appendix B) and a review of historic aerials, no structures are within 25 feet of the proposed new sewer lines. Within 250 feet of the proposed sewer lines are one commercial building (Citrus/Broadway), VMMS, and four residences (Eddie Drive). None of the structures within 250 feet of the Project Alignment were recorded or evaluated as part of the project-specific Archaeological Survey Report (Appendix B) because they are outside and beyond the initial 25 feet of the Project footprint or are on file at the SCIC as a historic address. Therefore, no indirect impacts would occur.

Mitigation

CULT-1: Construction-Related Vibration (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Prior to the issuance of project-specific construction documents for CIP Capacity and Condition Projects (Hardscape Environs), the City Engineer shall determine whether construction activities would occur within 25 feet of a NRHP or CRHR eligible or listed historic structure. For structures that have not been previously evaluated, the City Engineer shall consult with a qualified Architectural Historian approved by the City to conduct an evaluation of the structure. If the structure is determined eligible or already eligible or listed in the NRHP or CRHR, a structural evaluation shall be conducted by a Professional Structural Engineer to identify maximum allowable levels of vibration during construction. If a historic determination is required, the engineer shall provide recommendations on approaches to stabilization in conjunction with vibration monitoring. Permanent stabilization measures shall follow the Secretary of the Interior’s guidelines for the treatment of historic properties. If the buildings are temporarily stabilized for the duration of construction activities, when removed, the buildings shall be restored to their pre-construction condition when the stabilization measures are removed.

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

The SPEIR identified that direct impacts during construction were significant, and that less-than-significant impacts would occur during operations. No indirect impacts were identified in the SPEIR. To minimize impacts, Mitigation Measures CULT-2 and CULT-3 were required. Mitigation Measure CULT-2 requires the preparation of a project-specific archaeological survey be conducted to identify whether cultural resources (including Native American resources) would be impacted. This measure also requires outreach to the NAHC, and tribal outreach with the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians to request any information they may have regarding known resources. If the potential for resources is identified, then Mitigation Measure CULT-3 (Archaeological Monitoring) would be required. With implementation of these Mitigation Measures, impacts were reduced to less-than-significant.

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work) and Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The project-specific Archaeological Survey Report was completed to fulfill 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measures CULT-2. Per the requirements of the Mitigation Measures, the report included a records search at the SCIC, a Sacred Lands File Search, review of historic maps and aerials, a pedestrian survey to determine the potential presence of archaeological resources at the Project Site, and an assessment for potential monitoring.

The NAHC indicated that a search for the Project Area was negative. Letters (n = 17) were sent to all contacts provided by the NAHC with an email address including the Pala Band of Mission Indians, San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, and the Luiseño on October 11, 2021. A response was received from the Luiseño on November 1, 2021. This response indicates that the Project Area is within the Territory of the Luiseño people and within the tribe’s area of historic interest. It is noted in the response that a gathering area is adjacent to the Project Area addressed in this study. The letter also requested the presence of a tribal monitor during cultural resource survey, but the survey was

conducted in July before NAHC search was submitted and letters sent to stakeholders. The Luiseño also requested direct consultation with the CEQA lead agency as well as tribal monitoring during construction.

The SCIC identified one precontact artifact scatter, one multicomponent site, two historic sites with features, a historic road, a City Park, and eight buildings within the ¼-mile search radius used for the desktop review. All resources are unevaluated for the state and local registers, and none are located within the Project Alignments. No cultural resources were encountered during the cultural resources survey.

Proposed Project construction is to be conducted within existing roadways. These roadways have been in place since the early 20th century. These roads are perpendicular to and flank Buena Vista Creek a riparian corridor that would have been an important resource to precontact peoples of the region. The existing asphalt paved surface impeded the ability of the survey to determine if archaeological resources are present within the Project Alignments. Earliest aerial images of the City date to 1938 with Eucalyptus and Citrus Avenues in their current alignments. This continuity of use of these roadways and the development of the City suggests that any buried resources may have been impacted by improvements and previous placement of buried sewer lines. There is the potential for previously unidentified buried resources. Mitigation of this potential impact would be mitigated by implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3 – Archaeological Monitoring that was established by the SPEIR (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure). With implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3, impacts would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not induce new growth that could intrude on areas with the potential for archaeological resources. No indirect impacts are identified.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project-specific Archaeological Survey Report was completed to fulfill 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measures CULT-2. Per the requirements of the Mitigation Measures, the report included a records search at the SCIC, a Sacred Lands File Search, review of historic maps and aerials, a pedestrian survey to determine the potential presence of archaeological resources at the Project Site, and an assessment for potential monitoring.

The NAHC indicated that a search for the Project Area was negative. Letters were sent to all contacts provided by the NAHC with an email address including the Pala Band of Mission Indians and the Luiseño on October 11, 2021. A response was received from the Luiseño on November 1, 2021. This response indicates that the Project Area is within the Territory of the Luiseño people and within the tribe’s area of historic interest. It is noted in the response that a gathering area is adjacent to the Project Area addressed in this study. The letter also requested the presence of a tribal monitor during cultural resource survey, but the survey was conducted in July before NAHC search was submitted and letters sent to stakeholders. The Luiseño also requested direct consultation with the CEQA lead agency as well as tribal monitoring during construction.

The SCIC identified one precontact artifact scatter, one multicomponent site, two historic sites with features, a historic road, a City Park, and eight buildings within the ¼-mile search radius used for the desktop review. All resources are unevaluated for the state and local registers and none within the

Project Alignments. No cultural resources were encountered during the cultural resources survey. No archaeological resources were observed.

The replacement proposed at VMMS is planned as an upsize of the existing sewer line present through the VMMS field. The construction activities are planned within the existing trench footprint. This construction would not cause new ground disturbance; however, the Proposed Project would have temporary impacts. If replacement requires the expansion of the existing utility trench there is a high probability that this work would have a significant impact to undiscovered cultural resources. A qualified archaeologist and traditionally and culturally affiliated (TCA) Native American monitor should be included in the construction kickoff meeting regarding the integrity of soils along the alignment. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT-3 and CULT-5 are recommended during construction. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would not induce new growth that could intrude on areas with the potential for archaeological resources.

Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The project-specific Archaeological Survey Report was completed to fulfill 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measures CULT-2. Per the requirements of the Mitigation Measures, the report included a records search at the SCIC, a Sacred Lands File Search, review of historic maps and aerials, a pedestrian survey to determine the potential presence of archaeological resources at the Project Site, and an assessment for potential monitoring.

The NAHC indicated that a search for the Project Area was negative. Letters were sent to all contacts provided by the NAHC with an email address including the Pala Band of Mission Indians and Rincon Band of the Luiseño Indians (Luiseño) on October 11, 2021. A response was received from the Luiseño on November 1, 2021. This response indicates that the Project Area is within the Territory of the Luiseño people and within the tribe’s area of historic interest. It is noted in the response that a gathering area is adjacent to the Project Area addressed in this study. The letter also requested the presence of a tribal monitor during cultural resource survey, but the survey was conducted in July before NAHC search was submitted and letters sent to stakeholders. The Luiseño also requested direct consultation with the CEQA lead agency as well as tribal monitoring during construction.

The SCIC identified one precontact artifact scatter, one multicomponent site, two historic sites with features, a historic road, a City Park, and eight buildings within the ¼-mile search radius used for the desktop review. All resources are unevaluated for the state and local registers and none within the Project Alignments. No cultural resources were encountered during the cultural resources survey.

Based upon historic aerial photographs, Eddie Drive was constructed between 1953 and 1964 with the location, prior to construction, part of an agricultural field boundary and terraced slope. The Proposed Project does not warrant the realignment of either roadway (Eddie Drive or Wave Drive). No additional historic resources were identified during pedestrian survey of the Project Areas, and the impacts would be temporary. There is the potential for previously unidentified buried resources. Mitigation of this potential impact would be mitigated by implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3 – Archaeological Monitoring that was established by the SPEIR (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure). With implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3, impacts would be less-than-significant.

Proposed Project construction is to be conducted within existing roadways. These roadways have been in place since the early 20th century. These roads are perpendicular to and flank Buena Vista Creek, a riparian corridor that would have been an important resource to precontact peoples of the region. The existing asphalt paved surface impeded the ability of the survey to determine if archaeological resources are present within the Project Alignments. The history of roadway improvements and previous placement of buried utilities without encountering buried historic resources supports concluding that the area is of lower probability. There is the potential for unidentified buried resources. Mitigation of this potential impact would be mitigated by implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3 – Archaeological Monitoring that was established by the SPEIR (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure). With implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3, impacts would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would not induce new growth that could intrude on areas with the potential for archaeological resources.

Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The project-specific Archaeological Survey Report was completed to fulfill the 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measures CULT-2. Per the requirements of the Mitigation Measures, the report included a records search at the SCIC, a Sacred Lands File Search, review of historic maps and aerials, a pedestrian survey to determine the potential presence of archaeological resources at the Project Site, and an assessment for potential monitoring.

The SCIC identified one precontact artifact scatter, one multicomponent site, two historic sites with features, a historic road, a City park, and eight buildings within the ¼-mile search radius used for the desktop review. All resources are unevaluated for the state and local registers and none within the Project Alignments. No cultural resources were encountered during the cultural resources survey.

Citrus Avenue was established as early as 1938 but is not depicted on the Government Land Office survey plats from the 1800s nor the United States Geological Survey 15-minute Escondido quadrangle topographic maps from 1893 and 1901. Citrus and Broadway Avenue are typical early town roads which are ubiquitous in the early 1900s. Both roadways have been maintained and updated to meet use demands since construction. As visible on historic aerial photographs, throughout the subsequent years, the road appears to continuously be maintained, paved, and striped, with sidewalks and bikeway being constructed along both roads by 1980. The Proposed Project does not warrant the realignment of either roadway the impact would be temporary.

Proposed Project construction is to be conducted within existing roadways. These roadways have been in place since the early 20th century. These roads are perpendicular to and flank Buena Vista Creek a riparian corridor that would have been an important resource to precontact peoples of the region. The existing asphalt paved surface impeded the ability of survey to determine if archaeological resources are present within the Project Alignments. There is the potential for unidentified buried resources. Mitigation of this potential impact would be mitigated by the implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3 – Archaeological Monitoring that was established by the SPEIR (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure). With implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3, impacts would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would not induce new growth that could intrude on areas with the potential for archaeological resources.

Mitigation

CULT-2: Project-Specific Archaeological Survey (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Prior to the issuance of project-specific construction documents for CIP Capacity and Condition Projects (Hardscape and Cross-County Environs), Pump Station Rehabilitations, and Out-of-Service Area Projects, a Qualified Archaeologist approved by the City shall contact the NAHC regarding a Sacred Lands File Search for the Project Area. In addition, the City shall request a written response from the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians (SLR Band) (a tribe traditionally and culturally affiliated with the site) regarding whether the site of the 2017 CSMP improvement project may potentially affect Native American resources. If the NAHC and/or the SLR Band confirms potential known resources, a pedestrian survey (i.e., physical walk over) shall first be conducted by the Qualified Archaeologist and a TCA (traditionally and culturally affiliated) Native American Monitor. Should the pedestrian survey identify Native American cultural resources, the Qualified Archeologist shall, in consultation with the TCA Native American monitor and the SLR Band, make an immediate written evaluation of the significance and appropriate treatment of the resource, including any avoidance measures, additional testing and evaluations, or data recovery plans, and Pre-Excavation Agreements with the Tribe. If the SLR Band confirms, in consultation with the Qualified Archaeologist, that there is a potential for unknown resources to be uncovered during construction activities, then Mitigation Measure CULT-3, Archaeological Monitoring, shall be implemented.

CULT-3: Archaeological Monitoring (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Cultural resource mitigation monitoring shall be conducted to provide for the identification, evaluation, treatment, and protection of any cultural resources that are affected by or may be disinterred during the construction of the Proposed Project. The monitoring shall consist of the full-time presence of a Qualified Archaeologist and a TCA (traditionally and culturally affiliated) Native American Monitor, and the monitoring activities shall be identified and defined in a Pre-Excavation Agreement between the City's Engineering Department and the San Luis Rey Band. The purpose of this agreement shall be to formalize protocols and procedures for the protection, treatment, and disposition of, but not limited to, such items as Native American human remains, funerary objects, cultural and religious landscapes, ceremonial items, traditional gathering areas and cultural items, located and/or discovered through the cultural resource mitigation monitoring program in conjunction with the construction of the Proposed Project, including additional archaeological surveys and/or studies, excavations, geotechnical investigations, soil surveys, grading, or any other ground disturbing activities. Other tasks of the monitoring program shall include the following:

- The requirement for cultural resource mitigation monitoring shall be noted on all applicable construction documents, including demolition plans, grading plans, etc.
- The Qualified Archaeologist and TCA Native American Monitor shall attend all applicable pre-construction meetings with the Contractor and/or associated Subcontractors.
- The Qualified Archaeologist shall maintain ongoing collaborative consultation with the TCA Native American Monitor during all ground disturbing or altering activities, as identified above.

- The Qualified Archaeologist and/or TCA Native American Monitor may halt ground-disturbing activities if archaeological artifact deposits or cultural features are disinterred. In general, ground-disturbing activities shall be directed away from these deposits for a short time to allow a determination of potential significance, the subject of which shall be determined by the Qualified Archaeologist and the TCA Native American Monitor, in consultation with the San Luis Rey Band. Ground disturbing activities shall not resume until the Qualified Archaeologist, in consultation with the TCA Native American Monitor, deems the cultural resource or feature has been appropriately documented and/or protected. At the Qualified Archaeologist's discretion, the location of ground disturbing activities may be relocated elsewhere on the Project Site to avoid further disturbance of cultural resources.
- The Qualified Archaeologist and/or TCA Native American Monitor may also halt ground disturbing activities around known archaeological artifact deposits or cultural features if, in their respective opinions, there is the possibility that they could be damaged or destroyed.
- The avoidance and protection of disinterred unknown and significant cultural resources and/or unique archaeological resources is the preferable mitigation for the Proposed Project. If avoidance is not feasible, a Data Reciter Plan may be authorized by the City as the Lead Agency under CEQA. If data reciter is required, then the San Luis Rey Band shall be notified and consulted in drafting and finalizing any such reciter plan.
- Prior to the release of any Bonds associated with the construction of improvements noted in the 2017 CSMP, a Monitoring Report and/or Evaluation Report, which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of the cultural resource mitigation monitoring efforts (such as, but not limited to, a Data Reciter Program) shall be submitted by the Qualified Archaeologist, along with the TCA Native American Monitor's notes and comments, to the City's Director of Community Development for approval.

CULT-5: Disturbance to Human Remains (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

As specified by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are found on the Project Site during construction or during archaeological work, the person responsible for the excavation, or his or her authorized representative, shall immediately notify the San Diego County Coroner's office by telephone. No further excavation or disturbance of the disinter or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains (as determined by the Qualified Archaeologist and/or the TCA [traditionally and culturally affiliated] Native American Monitor) shall occur until the coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code 5097.98. If such a disinter occurs, a temporary construction exclusion zone shall be established surrounding the area of the disinter so that the area would be protected (as determined by the Qualified Archaeologist and/or the TCA Native American Monitor), and consultation and treatment could occur as prescribed by law. As further defined by State law, the coroner would determine within two working days of being notified if the remains are subject to his or her authority. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be Native American, he or she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. The NAHC would decide as to the Most Likely Descendent. If Native American remains are disinterred, the remains shall be kept "in situ" ("in place"), or in a secure location near where they were found, and the analysis of the remains shall only occur on-site in the presence of the TCA Native American Monitor.

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

The SPEIR identified that direct impacts during construction were significant, and that less-than-significant impacts would occur during operations. No indirect impacts were identified in the SPEIR. The SPEIR requires the implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-5 (Disturbance to Human Remains) should human remains be identified. This condition requires consultation with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) if human remains are identified during construction. This condition provides the MLD the opportunity to consult on the disposition of the human remains. With implementation of this Mitigation Measure, impacts were reduced to less-than-significant.

All Alignment Work:

Direct Effects – Construction: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Human remains were not identified during the cultural survey. However, the potential to encounter unknown human remains during ground-disturbing activities exists. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant. The Proposed Project would implement SPEIR Mitigation Measure CULT-5, to reduce potential impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

Direct Effects – Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Once constructed, the Proposed Project would be installed below ground. Operational maintenance activities would not involve substantial ground-disturbance and are not anticipated to disturb human remains.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** No indirect impacts to human remains would occur.

Mitigation

CULT-5: Disturbance to Human Remains (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.5, question “b” for Mitigation Measure CULT-5 compliance requirements.

Mitigation Measures adopted in the 2017 SPEIR as outlined would be implemented; therefore, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to cultural resources would occur. As such, the Project would conform to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.6 ENERGY

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measures(s) Required
Energy. Would the Project:					
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or Substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The 2017 SPEIR did not evaluate energy resources.

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

All Alignment Work:

The primary forms of energy consumed in the City are electricity and natural gas, as well as automotive fuels for transportation (gasoline and diesel). In the City, electricity and natural gas are supplied by the San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E).

In 2008, the City, along with San Diego County, issued a General Plan to guide growth and development for the next 20 years, known as the 2030 General Plan. Chapter 4 of the 2030 General Plan lists goals for Resource Conservation and Sustainability. Goal 2 is to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from community activities and municipal facilities and operations to support the state’s efforts under Assembly Bill 32, Senate Bill 375, and to mitigate the community’s contributions to global climate change. Goal 14 is to promote efficient and sustainable use of energy resources through conservation, demand reduction activities, and alternative energy sources. In support of the 2030 General Plan, the City issued a Climate Action Plan (CAP) in 2012 which was updated and revised in 2019. The CAP (adopted in 2021) is geared to reduction of greenhouse gases by limiting energy consumption.

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Implementation of the Proposed Project would involve excavation of sewer lines, removal of soil, and backfill of excavations. Grading of the final excavation would be required. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline, diesel fuel, other fuels, and electricity in order to be completed. Energy usage during construction typically involves the use of motor vehicles both for transportation of workers and equipment but also for direct construction actions such as the use of cranes, excavators, and trucks. This one-time energy expenditure required to construct the Proposed Project would be non-Recordable. However, energy needs for Project construction would be temporary and would not require additional capacity or increase peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. Additional energy usage would occur as power for tools and equipment used on-site, including but not limited to gas generators, air compressors, air handlers and filters, and other typical direct construction energy uses. Electricity to the Project Site is available through SDG&E, and this service is readily available.

Direct and Indirect Effects – Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project is similar in nature to other construction activity within the City and surrounding area, in that it would use compressors and other conventional construction equipment. The power and energy system is

considered adequate to handle the demand during construction. Because of the high cost of fuel, construction activities are not anticipated to result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary use of energy as construction contractors would purchase fuel from local suppliers and would conserve the use of their supplies to minimize the cost of constructing the Proposed Project. In addition, construction equipment used on City projects is already required to have at least 30% be electric or alternate fuel sources. For these reasons, this impact is considered less-than-significant.

Proposed Project operation would require electricity to power various components of the sewer system, including water pumps and security lighting. However, there would be no change in these components and no increase in energy consumption. The new facilities would replace existing aging facilities, and thus, would likely be more energy efficient. Additionally, any increase in vehicle trips during operation would be minimal. Thus, the Project would not significantly increase the amount of gasoline and diesel consumption associated with employee trips or maintenance activities during operation.

The Proposed Project would be beneficial for the City because these sewer system modifications would improve the City’s aging sewer system. For these reasons, the Project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during construction or operation.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects– Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed above, the City’s 2030 General Plan and the CAP are the local plans that provide a roadmap for expanding energy efficiency, water efficiency, and renewable energy efforts already underway in the City. The Proposed Project would be consistent with all applicable 2030 General Plan and CAP goals and strategies, particularly Resource Conservation & Sustainability (RCS) Goal 2 on climate change and RCS Goal 14 on efficient and sustainable use of energy resources, and CAP initiatives on energy efficiency in City and community activities, because the Project would increase energy efficiency in existing municipal structures (i.e., sewer system facilities). Thus, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Although not examined in the 2017 SPEIR, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to energy have been identified.

2.1.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measures(s) Required
GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the Project:					
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse impacts, including the risk of loss, injury, or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measures(s) Required
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?					
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Or					
iv. Landslides?					
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The 2017 SPEIR did not evaluate geological or soils impacts. The 2008 Sewer Plan PEIR concluded that there are no significant geology and soils impacts. Paleontological resources were examined with Cultural Resources in the 2017 SPEIR and recommended that Pipeline improvements extending to a depth of 10 feet or greater, located in areas characterized with a moderate to high sensitivity for

paleontological resources have the potential to directly destroy paleontological resources during excavation activities. Mitigation Measure CULT-4: Paleontological Monitoring was recommended in those cases.

- a) *Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse impacts, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations:

- 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?*

No Impact. The Project Area is not underlain by active, potentially active, or inactive faults, nor are they within a State of California Earthquake Alquist-Priolo (A-P) Earthquake Fault Zones. The closest A-P fault zone is the Elsinore Fault Zone, located 16 miles northeast of the Project near the Pauma and Yuima Reservation (CGS 2021).

- ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. Although the Project Area is not underlain by or near active, potentially active, or inactive faults ground shaking could have the potential to affect the integrity of the proposed sewer pipelines. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with soil stabilization/compaction requirements and standard engineering practices per seismic standards in the CBC and City’s development code.

- iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with soil stabilization/compaction requirements and standard engineering practices per seismic standards in the CBC and City’s development code.

- iv) *Landslides?*

No Impact. The Project Area is flat and not adjacent to any slopes capable of failure.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Construction activities would result in temporary soil disturbance throughout the Project Area. Most of the soil disturbance would occur in previously disturbed areas and ground disturbance would be limited. Along the pipeline alignment, excavated soil would be used to backfill the trenches and to restore disturbed areas to pre-disturbance conditions (contours and vegetation). Disturbed soils would be

exposed to erosion during construction as soils loosen and become susceptible to the impacts of wind and precipitation events, also addressed by a SWPPP. As stated in the 2008 Sewer Plan (Vista 2008) update:

“the majority of the project components are within roadways and existing rights of way and would not result in substantial amounts of erosion. Regardless, standard design features and construction measures incorporated in the project (see Table 2–3) include compliance with the NPDES Construction General Permit which requires the development and implementation of a SWPPP as well as implementation of BMPs for project components impacting more than 1 acre during grading operations. Where projects result in disturbance to less than one acre of land, the City of Vista would comply with the local grading ordinance in addition to implementation of BMPs. General BMPs include erosion controls, sediment controls, tracking controls, wind erosion control, water management, and materials and water management. Implementation of these BMPs and SWPPP would ensure that erosion impacts would remain below a level of significance.”

Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 would be implemented and a SWPPP and BMPs required, therefore soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation

HWQ-1: Assess Project Risk, Receiving Water Vulnerability, and Implement a Water Quality Protection Strategy (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.4, question “c” for Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 compliance requirements.

- c) *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Proposed Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with soil stabilization/compaction requirements and standard engineering practices per seismic standards in the CBC and City’s development code.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The potential for expansive soil conditions along the Project Alignments is low due to the underlying soil types are not susceptible to such hazards (i.e., they possess a “very low” to “medium” expansion potential). Soils in the Project Area include Fallbrook sandy loam, Greenfield sandy loam, and Salinas clay loam. Shrink-swell potential is low to moderate for these soils. Potential exposure of people or buried infrastructure to substantial adverse impacts, including the risk of loss, injury, or death from expansive soils would be less-than-significant.

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?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project does not involve the construction of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The alluvial sediments in the Project Area have been extensively disturbed during past construction-related activities. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been previously documented within or near the Project Site and the underlying Quaternary, 2.5 million years ago to present, alluvium has not yielded significant paleontological remains.

The 2017 SPEIR identifies a Mitigation Measure, CULT-4: Paleontological Monitoring that would require compliance during the Project for any excavation greater than 10 feet deep. Monitoring by a professional paleontologist would be required.

Mitigation

CULT-4: Paleontological Monitoring (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Monitoring during construction grading or trenching shall be required for all CIP conveyance projects (Hardscape and Cross-Country Environs) that would excavate to a depth of ten feet or more. Prior to the issuance of project-specific construction documents, the City Engineer shall retain a Professional Paleontologist to observe all earth-disturbing activities. All fossil materials recovered during mitigation monitoring shall be cleaned, identified, cataloged, and analyzed in accordance with standard professional practices. The results of the field work and laboratory analysis shall be submitted in a technical report and the entire collection transferred to an approved facility.

Mitigation Measures adopted in the 2017 SPEIR as outlined would be implemented for paleontological resources. Although geology or soils were not examined in the 2017 SPEIR, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to geology or soils would occur. As such, the Project would conform to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the Project:					
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or Substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?					
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

The 2017 CSMP SPEIR analyzed GHG emissions from operation of the improvements described in the CSMP SPEIR 2017 which would result in the direct emission of GHGs from additional vehicle maintenance trips.

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. In 2016, the City developed interim guidance for evaluating GHG emissions from individual development projects. The purpose of the Interim Policy on Greenhouse Gas Emissions Significance Thresholds for CEQA (Vista 2012b) is to provide guidance for a consistent and objective evaluation of significant climate change impacts in compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 32 until the CAP can be updated to include such evaluation criteria. The interim guidance identifies a numerical “Bright Line” threshold based on a review of projects within the City. It was determined that a level of 1,185 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) would capture 90 percent of the City’s GHG emissions that are attributable to development projects. To determine if a project is making substantial progress towards meeting 2020 GHG emissions targets set forth in the CAP and AB 32, the total project GHG emissions in its first fully operational year must be less than the “Bright Line” threshold. If the project emissions are below the threshold, the project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

The Proposed Project would abandon and replace existing sewer lines and laterals. Therefore, operation of the passive sewer pipeline and laterals would not lead to an increase in sewage requiring treatment and would therefore not increase GHG emissions. Construction of the Project would generate emissions through the operation of construction equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commute vehicles; however, construction emissions would be temporary and minimal due to the relatively small size of the Proposed Project.

The 2017 CSMP SPEIR analyzed GHG emissions from operation of the improvements described in the CSMP SPEIR 2017 which would result in the direct emission of GHGs from additional vehicle maintenance trips. The analysis assumed a total of 30 daily maintenance trips to serve all facilities. The trip length used was 15 miles. Maintenance trips was determined to generate approximately 46 MTCO₂e and would not exceed the City’s “Bright Line” threshold. For this Proposed

Project, the same number of existing maintenance trips would be expected. Therefore, the impact from operations would be less-than-significant.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. At the time the 2017 CSMP SPEIR was approved, the 2016 GHG Interim guidelines were in place and set a threshold for GHG emissions. In October 2021, the City released a new CAP that includes measures to reach their GHG emissions reduction goals. The Proposed Project would generate minimal GHG emissions and would be consistent with the City’s interim GHG guidelines in place for the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, AB32, SB32, the City’s Plan, and the City’s CAP (October 2021). In addition, the Proposed Project and is not considered a development project, and is identified as a Category 1 Project as discussed in Chapter 1 of this SPEIR addendum. Therefore, impacts relative to this issue would be less-than-significant.

No significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to greenhouse gas have been identified that would deny conformity to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the Project:					
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or Substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
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 a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

The 2017 SPEIR concluded that CSMP projects would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Further, adopting the 2017 CSMP would not result in the emission of hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school or locate on a site which is on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The list was updated in October 2021 specifically for the purposes of this addendum for all five alignments in Appendix C.

Despite this, the 2017 SPEIR concluded that construction of new conveyance facilities would involve excavation and grading activities, which could encounter documented and unreported contaminated soils and groundwater during excavation activities. The 2017 SPEIR proposed Mitigation Measures HAZ-1: Halt Construction Work if Potentially Hazardous Materials are Encountered and HWQ-1: Assess Project Risk, Receiving Water Vulnerability, and Implement a Water Quality Protection Strategy to reduce the impact of these potential unexpected occurrences to less-than-significant.

In addition, access for emergency vehicles could be impaired as result of reduced roadway widths (or capacity) and increased volumes of construction related traffic and/or re-distributed traffic. The document proposed Mitigation Measure TR-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan to reduce this effect to less-than-significant.

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Proposed Project construction would involve use of toxic or hazardous substances typical for construction related activities (e.g., oil, vehicle fuels, construction equipment, hydraulic fluids, and solvents) which could result in exposure to the public or the environment in the event of a spill or leak. The contractor is required to employ standard cleanup and safety procedures in compliance with Federal, State, and local regulations (for example, the Resource Conservation and Reciters Act, federal and California Occupational Safety and Health Act, Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations and San Diego County Code, Section 68.505. Hazardous and Medical Wastes) pertaining to the handling, storage, and disposal of toxic and/or hazardous substances.

To mitigate the unlikely possibility of hazardous materials releases, Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, TR-1, and HWQ-1 have been adopted from the 2017 SPEIR. No buildings would be demolished; therefore HAZ-2 Hazardous Materials Surveys is not applicable. With implementation of these requirements, potential exposures of people or the environment through the routine use or disposal of these hazardous materials would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation

HAZ-1: Halt Construction Work if Potentially Hazardous Materials are Encountered (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

All construction contractors shall immediately stop all surface or subsurface activities if potentially hazardous materials are encountered, an odor is identified, or considerably stained soil is visible. Contractors shall follow all applicable local, state, and federal regulations regarding disinter, response, disposal, and remediation for hazardous materials encountered during the construction process. These requirements shall be included in the contractor specifications.

If any hazardous materials, waste sites, or vapor intrusion risks are identified prior to or during construction, a qualified professional, in consultation with appropriate regulatory agencies, would develop and implement a plan to remediate the contamination and properly dispose of the contaminated material.

If material imports are proposed, the contractor shall furnish the City would appropriate documentation certifying that the imported materials are free of contamination

TR-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

The construction contractor shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan for roadways and intersections affected by the Proposed Project for approval by the City Engineer. The Traffic Control Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements based on local site and roadway conditions:

- Provide street layout showing location of construction activity and surrounding streets to be used as detour routes, including “special signage.” Post a minimum 72-hour advance warning of construction activities within affected roadways to allow motorists to select alternative routes.

- Restrict delivery of construction materials to non-peak travel periods (9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.) as appropriate. Weekend and night work shifts would be allowed in non-residential areas only.
- Maintain the maximum travel-lane capacity during non-construction periods and provide flagger-control at construction sites to manage traffic control and flows.
- Limit the construction work zone in each block to a width that, at a minimum, maintains alternate one-way traffic flow past the construction zone.
- Maintain access for driveways and private roads, except for brief periods of construction, in which case property owners would be notified.
- Require temporary steel-plate trench crossings, as needed, to maintain reasonable access to homes, businesses, and streets. When required by the applicable encroachment permit, maintain the existing lane configuration during nonworking hours by covering the trench with steel plates or by using temporary backfill.
- Require appropriate warning signage and safety lighting for construction zones.
- Access for emergency vehicles shall be always maintained. Police, fire, and emergency services shall be notified of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities that could hinder and/or delay emergency access through the construction period.
- Identify detours, where available, for bicyclists and pedestrians in areas potentially affected by construction.
- Provide adequate off-street parking locations for workers' vehicles and construction equipment in those areas where on-street parking availability is insufficient.
- Repair and restore the roadway ROW to its original conditions or better upon completion of work.

HWQ-1: Assess Project Risk, Receiving Water Vulnerability, and Implement a Water Quality Protection Strategy (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.4, question “c” for Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 compliance requirements.

- 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?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects– Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. Proposed Project construction would involve use of toxic or hazardous substances typical for construction related activities (e.g., oil, vehicle fuels, construction equipment, hydraulic fluids, and solvents) which could result in exposure to the public or the environment in the event of a spill or leak. As such, there is the possibility of accidental releases (e.g., spilling of hydraulic fluid or diesel fuel from construction maintenance activities) during pipeline installation. These incidents are expected to involve small

volumes and low concentrations, and the contractor is required to employ standard cleanup and safety procedures in compliance with Federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to the handling, storage, and disposal of toxic and/or hazardous substances. Project operation would not result in any additional exposure risks. With implementation of these requirements, potential exposures of people or the environment through the routine use or disposal of these hazardous materials would be less-than-significant.

To mitigate the unlikely possibility of hazardous materials releases, Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, TR-1, and HWQ-1 have been adopted from the 2017 SPEIR. No buildings would be demolished; therefore HAZ-2 Hazardous Materials Surveys is not applicable. With implementation of these requirements, potential exposures of people or the environment through the routine use or disposal of these hazardous materials would be less-than-significant.

To mitigate the unlikely possibility of hazardous materials, discovery during excavation, Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HWQ-1 have been adopted from the 2017 SPEIR. With implementation of these Mitigation Measures, potential exposures of people or the environment would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation

HAZ-1: Halt Construction Work if Potentially Hazardous Materials are Encountered (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.9, question “a” for Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 compliance requirements.

TR-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.9, question “a” for Mitigation Measure TR-1 compliance requirements.

HWQ-1: Assess Project Risk, Receiving Water Vulnerability, and Implement a Water Quality Protection Strategy (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.4, question “c” for Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 compliance requirements.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The VMMS is within one-quarter mile of the Project Alignments, with one Alignment (Component 3, Figure 1-1) located on the VMMS track field. Project construction would involve use of toxic or hazardous substances typical for construction related activities (e.g., oil, vehicle fuels, construction equipment, hydraulic fluids, and solvents) which could result in exposure to the public or the environment in the event of a spill or leak. The contractor is required to employ standard cleanup and safety procedures in compliance with Federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to the handling, storage, and disposal of toxic and/or hazardous substances. Project operation would not result in any additional exposure risks.

To mitigate the unlikely possibility of hazardous materials releases, Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HWQ-1 have been adopted from the 2017 SPEIR. No buildings would be demolished; therefore HAZ-

2 Hazardous Materials Surveys is not applicable. With implementation of these Mitigation Measures, potential exposures of people or the environment would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation

HAZ-1: Halt Construction Work if Potentially Hazardous Materials are Encountered (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.9, question “a” for Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 compliance requirements.

HWQ-1: Assess Project Risk, Receiving Water Vulnerability, and Implement a Water Quality Protection Strategy (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.4, question “c” for Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 compliance requirements.

- 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?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The 2017 CSMP SPEIR determined that no CSMP projects were located on a list of hazardous materials sites. Therefore, consistent with *CSMP Impact 4.5-2* in the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, there is a potential that underlying conditions along some of the Project Alignments could be affected by potential contamination from prior uses and owners (e.g., waste disposal, leaking underground storage tanks, groundwater contamination). In order to confirm that no new hazardous materials have been found since 2017, a new site screen was ordered (Radius 2021). An updated hazardous materials sites list was assessed in October 2021 with no identification of new hazardous sites (Appendix C).

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

The 2017 SPEIR also concluded that the CSMP would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project Area, if 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.

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project is not 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. The nearest airport, McClellan-Palomar Airport, is 5.4 miles from the Proposed Project; therefore, no impact is expected.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Proposed Project construction activities along heavily used roads would result in temporary reductions in roadway widths (or capacity) and increased volumes of construction-related traffic and/or re-distributed traffic which could affect circulation for emergency vehicles and potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with adopted City emergency response and evacuation plans. However, such potential impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant with incorporation of Mitigation Measure TR-1 (consistent with the 2017 CSMP SPEIR findings), which requires implementation of a Traffic Control Plan to ensure emergency response and evacuation plans are effectively facilitated through the construction sites, as needed.

Mitigation

TR-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.9, question “a” for Mitigation Measure TR-1 compliance requirements.

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

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project is in a highly urbanized area with no potential for wildfire risk. Detailed analysis of Wildland Fire impacts is discussed in Section 2.1.20, therefore 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 and Haz-4 are not applicable. No direct or indirect impact would occur relative to this issue.

Mitigation Measures adopted in the 2017 SPEIR as outlined would be implemented; therefore, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to hazards and hazardous materials would occur. As such, the Project would conform to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the Project:					
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

management of the basin?					
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

The 2017 SPEIR concluded that the CSMP would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

Despite this, the 2017 SPEIR identified several potential impacts from the CSMP. Precipitation during construction could increase the amount of sedimentation due surface runoff transport. Vegetation removal would result in the exposure of bare ground to precipitation and wind movement, changing the erosive capacity and frequency of surface runoff. For this reason, Mitigation Measure HWQ-1: Assess Project Risk, Receiving Water Vulnerability, and Implement a Water Quality Protection Strategy was recommended to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant.

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work) and Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** Construction and operation of this Alignment would be unlikely to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. During construction, BMPs would be required by the City as part of the Construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Work adjacent to any Waters of the U.S. would follow USACE and CDFW requirements to assure no impact to those resources. It is unlikely that dewatering would be necessary for the Proposed Project. A water supply well at 600 Eucalyptus Avenue reported a static water level of 48 feet below ground surface. The depth of excavation is expected to be less than 20 feet below ground surface. No impact would occur relative to this issue.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work), Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work), and Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: The Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Construction and operation of this Alignment is unlikely to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. During construction, BMPs would be required by the City as part of the Construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Work adjacent to any Waters of the U.S. would follow USACE and CDFW requirements to assure no impact to those resources.

During removal of the existing sewer pipe crossing Buena Vista Creek, Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 would be implemented. The removal of the existing sewer pipe would be conducted from the area either side of the creek outside of the creek banks. Prior to removal, the existing sewer pipe would be vacuumed, cut, and capped, and then the section of pipe crossing over the creek would be removed protecting the existing concrete channel in place. No hydrological interruption of the creek is planned. Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 is proposed, consistent with the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, to minimize potential impacts to the creek through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Therefore, this impact is less-than-significant.

Mitigation

HWQ-1: Assess Project Risk, Receiving Water Vulnerability, and Implement a Water Quality Protection Strategy Mitigation Measure (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.4, question “c” for Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 compliance requirements.

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

All Other Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The Project would obtain its water from the same sources as the existing systems and not additionally deplete groundwater supplies. No impact would occur relative to this issue.

- c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a*

manner which would:

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site. No disturbance to existing streams or rivers is planned and surface topography would be restored to existing grade and drainage. The Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff and would not impede or redirect flood flows. The pipelines would be located underground. No impact would occur relative to this issue.

- i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site.*

No Impact. The Proposed Project would be underground and not generate erosion or deposition of sediment or surface water of any kind.

- ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?*

No Impact. The Proposed Project would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff and would contribute to flooding on or off site.

- iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction*

No Impact. The Proposed Project would be underground and not generate surface water of any kind.

- iv. impede or redirect flood flows?*

No Impact. The Proposed Project would be underground and not generate surface water of any kind.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** A flood map search for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) panel ID number 06073C0778G shows the Project Alignments occur either within Area of Undetermined Flood Hazard or 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard. No water features are present to create seiche conditions. The closest upslope body of water is Turner Lake at 9.3 miles. No tsunami hazard areas have been

designated. The closest tsunami hazard area is at Buena Vista Lagoon, 5.75 miles west of the Project (California Tsunami Maps and Data, CGS 2021). In any case, the Proposed Project would cause no additional impact relative to this issue.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. No impact would occur relative to this issue.

Mitigation Measures adopted in the 2017 SPEIR as outlined would be implemented; therefore, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to hydrology and water quality would occur. As such, the Project would conform to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Project:					
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *Physically divide an established community?*

The 2017 CSMP concluded that improvements would not physically divide an established community.

All Alignment Work:

Direct Effects – Construction: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** A project could result in impacts to the physical division of an established community if new or widened roads would traverse an established community; if new development would block existing connections within an established community; if redevelopment would disrupt the physical arrangement of an existing community by shifting existing development from one land use to another; if the project would impact existing street and sidewalk patterns; or if the project would preclude development of surrounding parcels.

Construction of the Proposed Project sewer pipeline would require pipeline trenching within VMMS track field, Eddie Drive, Eucalyptus Avenue, and Citrus Avenue, adjacent to existing commercial

buildings and residences within an established community. Associated construction activities would not physically divide an established community, but it would result in temporary disturbances to existing residents; however, access to and from the affected residences would be maintained through implementation of a Traffic Control Plan, as required under 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure TR-1. In addition, impacts would be limited to the temporary construction period.

Direct Effects – Operations: **No Impact.** Upon completion of construction activity, the proposed sewer pipeline sections would be below ground and would not physically divide an established community. No direct operational impacts would occur relative to this issue.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not induce growth or result in subsequent development or impacts that could result in the division of an established community. No impact would result.

Mitigation

TR-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.9, question “a” for Mitigation Measure TR-1 compliance requirements.

- 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?*

The 2017 CSMP determined improvements would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

All Alignment Work:

Direct Effects – Construction: **No Impact.** Land uses adjacent to the Proposed Project include commercial, educational, and single-family residential uses. Construction would occur primarily within the roadways adjacent to commercial, educational, and single-family residences and could temporarily disrupt local circulation and neighborhood access. Potential impacts to adjacent land uses from the project’s construction-related activities could include traffic delays and/or safety hazards, risks associated with the release of hazardous materials, and increased noise. Such impacts are discussed in various sections of this addendum.

The Proposed Project would be consistent with the 2030 General Plan in that the plan does not preclude construction of new or updated sewer facilities. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would serve the existing commercial, educational, and single-family residential land uses and would reduce the potential environmental harm that could be caused by failure of the existing facilities. For these reasons, construction would not conflict with plans or policies of an agency with jurisdiction of the Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating for adverse environmental impacts, and impacts would be less-than-significant.

The City is a participating entity in the North County MHCP. The MHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional planning program designed to develop an ecosystem preserve in the northwestern part of the County. Due to the developed nature of the Project Site and surrounding areas and lack of

sensitive biological resources at the site, the Proposed Project would not conflict with provisions of the MHCP. No impacts would occur relative to this issue.

Direct Effects – Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would serve an existing population and would therefore be consistent with the adopted land uses defined in the City’s General Plan (Vista 2012a). The Project would also not conflict the goals and policies of the Public Safety, Facilities, and Services Element of the 2030 General Plan as the Project would be consistent with the stated goal (Goal Public Safety, Facilities, and Service Element-PSFS 9) of providing sanitary sewer facilities to accommodate the safe, efficient, and cost-effective disposal of waste and commensurate with existing and proposed development.

The City is a participating entity in the North County MHCP. The MHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional planning program designed to develop an ecosystem preserve in the northwestern part of the County. Due to the developed nature of the Project Site and surrounding areas and lack of sensitive biological resources at the site, the Project would not conflict with provisions of the MHCP. No impacts would occur relative to this issue.

Upon installation of the sewer pipeline sections, the Project Site would be restored to existing conditions and would not represent or cause a change in land use. Impacts relative to this issue would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would not facilitate or encourage new, unplanned development or a change in existing or planned land uses, including the MHCP. Therefore, no indirect impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures adopted in the 2017 SPEIR as outlined are implemented, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to land use and planning would occur. As such, the Project identified that would conform to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:					
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The 2017 SPEIR did not evaluate mineral resources. They were examined by the 2008 Sewer Update PEIR, and no significant impacts were identified.

- 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?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project area is located in an urban area of the City and is primarily surrounded by commercial and residential uses. According to the San Diego County Land Use Plan website accessed in October 2021, the Project Area does not contain any known mineral resources or locally important mineral resource recovery sites. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not 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. No impact would occur relative to this issue.

- 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?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project area is located in an urban area of the City and is primarily surrounded by commercial and residential uses. The project area is not designated for mineral extraction and is currently not available for mineral extraction. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource site delineated in the City’s 2030 General Plan. The Proposed Project would require the use of certain mineral resources for backfilling trenches and re-paving roads and parking areas, and these resources would come from locally viable sources and would not result in the loss of availability of a valuable mineral resource. No impact would occur relative to this issue.

Although not examined in the 2017 SPEIR, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to mineral resources have been identified.

2.1.13 NOISE

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measures(s) Required
NOISE. Would the Project result in:					
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

standards of other agencies?					
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people be residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

The 2017 CSMP determined improvements would potentially to exceed the thresholds established in the City of Vista Noise Control Ordinance and the County of San Diego Noise Control Ordinance of 75 dBA for more than eight hours during any 24-hour period. Mitigation Measure NV-1 (Construction Noise Reduction Measures) was implemented to bring the impact to less-than-significant.

City of Vista Municipal Code

The City of Vista established noise control ordinances under Municipal Code Chapter 8.32. Exterior property line noise level limits for various land uses are as follows:

Receiving Land Use	Noise Level Limit (1-hour Leq in dBA)	
	Day (7 a.m. - 10 p.m.)	Night (10 p.m. - 7 a.m.)
Residential	50	45
Commercial	60	55

County of San Diego

The County of San Diego Land Use and Environment Group prepared the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Noise (Guidelines) presenting a range of quantitative, qualitative, and performance levels for environmental effects. Per Section 4.2(B) of the Guidelines or San Diego County Code Section 36.409, it shall be unlawful for any person to operate construction equipment or cause construction equipment to be operated, that exceeds an average sound level of 75 decibels for an eight-hour period, between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., when measured at the boundary line of the property where the noise source is located or on any occupied property where the noise is being received.

Section 4.2(C) of the Guidelines outline regulations associated with impulsive noise generated by a Proposed Project which is covered under San Diego County Code Section 36.410. Per Section 36.410(c) the minimum measurement period for any measurements conducted under this section shall be one hour. During the measurement period a measurement shall be conducted every minute from a fixed location on an occupied property. The measurements shall measure the maximum sound level during each minute of the measurement period. If the sound level caused by construction equipment or the producer of the impulsive noise exceeds the maximum sound level for

any portion of any minute, it would be deemed that the maximum sound level was exceeded during that minute.

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Noise levels generated by a point source decrease at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source. Therefore, if a particular point source generates average noise levels of 89 dBA at 50 feet, the equivalent sound level (Leq) would be 83 dBA at 100 feet, 77 dBA at 200 feet, 71 dBA at 400 feet, and so on. This calculated reduction in noise level is based on the loss of energy resulting from the geometric spreading of the sound wave as it leaves the source and travels outward. For example, to characterize noise levels associated with construction activities, it is important to understand the highest level of noise generated by the construction equipment. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model 2006 produced estimates of the Lmax of typical construction equipment and provides the noise levels for typical construction equipment at distances of 50 and 200 feet:

Equipment Type	Lmax at 50 feet (dBA)	Lmax at 200 feet (dBA)
Tractors	86	70
Graders	87	71
Trucks	76	60
Water Truck	76	60
Haul Truck	78	62
Concrete Trucks	81	65
Flatbed Trucks	76	60
Generator	83	67
Air Compressor	80	64
Paving Machine	79	63
Roller	82	66

Noise impacts associated with construction of the Project would -be temporary in nature. Noise generated due to increased vehicle trips during construction would be minimal due to the limited number of trips. Construction of the Proposed Project would involve trenching, pipe installation, backfilling, and repaving activities.

Sound levels of individual pieces of typical construction equipment range from 70 dBA to 90 dBA at 50 feet from the source, as referenced by FHWA. When multiple pieces of equipment are operating simultaneously, the combined noise levels are higher. For example, the noise from one tractor at a distance of 50 feet (86 dB) added to another tractor would equal approximately 89dB. These noise levels would attenuate with increasing distance from the source. Therefore, construction-related noise associated with the Proposed Project has the potential to exceed the thresholds established in the City Noise Control Ordinance and the County of San Diego Noise Control Ordinance of 75 dBA for more than 8 hours during any 24-hour period; measured at the property line where the noise source is located or on any occupied property where the noise is being received.

Construction and rehabilitation efforts for project components would result in noise impacts to various types of sensitive receptors near the Project Site including residences, businesses, schools, and libraries. The associated construction activities would increase the ambient noise levels above existing conditions, which could be perceived as annoying to sensitive receptors in the area. Therefore, short-term noise impacts associated with construction of the Proposed Project could potentially be significant. The 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure NV-1 Construction Noise Reduction Measures would be implemented to minimize construction noise, where construction activities occur within 200 feet of noise sensitive land uses. Academic buildings on VMMS property would not be impacted by construction activities as construction would not occur during school session.

Direct and Indirect Effects – Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would not generate significant permanent noise impacts due to operation. Operational noise generated by the Proposed Project would be associated with occasional maintenance. Noise generated by on-site maintenance and associated vehicle trips would not differ from existing maintenance and repair activities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have no impact on permanent ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project.

Mitigation

NV-1: Construction Noise Reduction Measures (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

The Construction Contractor shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer that the following noise control techniques are implemented during the clearing, demolition, grading, and construction phases of projects identified in the 2017 CSMP within 200 feet of noise-sensitive land uses:

- Heavy equipment repair and contractor staging shall be conducted at sites as far as practical from nearby residences. Construction equipment, including vehicles, generators, and compressors, shall be maintained in proper operating condition and shall be equipped with
- manufacturers' standard noise control devices or better (e.g., mufflers, acoustical lagging, and/or engine enclosures).
- Temporary sound barriers (or curtains), stockpiles of excavated materials, or other effective shielding or enclosure techniques shall be used where construction noise would exceed 90 dBA within less than 50 feet from a noise sensitive receptor.
- Construction work, including on-site equipment maintenance and repair, shall be limited to the hours specified in the noise ordinance of the affected jurisdiction(s).
- Electrical power shall be supplied from commercial power supply, wherever feasible, in order to avoid or minimize the use of engine-driven generators.
- Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible.
- Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines (i.e., in excess of 5 minutes) shall be prohibited.

- Operating equipment shall be designed to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal noise regulations.
- Construction site and access road speed limits shall be established and enforced during the construction period.
- If lighted traffic control devices are to be located within 500 feet of residences, the devices shall be powered by batteries, solar power, or similar sources, and not by an internal combustion engine.
- The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only.
- No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent sensitive receptor.
- The construction contractors shall provide advance notice, between 2 and 4 weeks prior to construction, by mail to all residents or property owners within 200 feet of the alignment. The announcement shall state specifically where and when construction would occur in the area. If construction delays of more than 7 days occur, an additional notice shall be made, either in person or by mail. The City shall publish a notice of impending construction on the City website, stating when and where construction would occur.
- The construction contractors shall identify and provide a public liaison person before and during construction to respond to concerns of neighboring residents about noise and other construction disturbance. The construction contractors shall also establish a program for receiving questions or complaints during construction and develop procedures for responding to callers. Procedures for reaching the public liaison officer via telephone or in person shall be included in notices distributed to the public in accordance with the information above.

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

The 2017 CSMP conclude that improvements would not generate excessive ground-borne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Typical background vibration levels are between 50 and 60 VdB, whereas the levels for minor cosmetic damage to fragile buildings or blasting are generally 100 VdB., as shown in the 2030 General Plan Common Groundborne Vibration Levels:

Velocity Level ¹	Human/Structural Response	Typical Sources _ (50 feet from source)
100	Threshold, minor cosmetic damage to fragile buildings	Blasting from construction projects

Between 90 and 100	Difficulty with tasks such as reading a video display terminal (VDT) screen	Bulldozers and other heavy-tracked construction equipment
Between 80 and 90	Residential annoyance, infrequent events _ (e.g., commuter rail)	Commuter rail, upper range_ Rapid transit, upper range
Between 70 and 80	Residential annoyance, frequent events _ (e.g., rapid transit)	Commuter rail, typical _ Bus or truck over bump_ Rapid transit, typical
Between 60 and 70	Limit for vibration-sensitive equipment_ Approximate threshold for human_ perception of vibration	Bus or truck, typical
Between 50 and 60	--	Typical background vibration

Construction activities that generate excessive ground-borne vibration include pile driving and the use of a vibratory roller for soil compaction. Vibration levels equal to or greater than 0.2 PPV, or 94 VdB, are considered significant because that is the level at which building damage may occur to fragile non-engineered timber and masonry structures (FTA 2006). Typical equipment causing vibration used for the Proposed Project would be jumping jack (tamping), vibratory plate, and maybe a vibratory roller for asphalt. A vibratory roller can generate ground-borne vibration levels of 0.210 in/sec PPV at a distance of 25 feet, however, the vibration level would dissipate below the threshold by adding only one additional foot of separation from the source. Therefore, impacts are less-than-significant.

Direct and Indirect Effects – Operations: No Impact. Operation of the Proposed Project would not generate ground borne vibration, and therefore no impact is anticipated to occur.

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

The 2017 CSMP concluded that improvements would not result in the exposure of people residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels from public or private aircraft.

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The nearest airport, McClellan-Palomar Airport, is located approximately 5.85 miles southwest of the Proposed Project. Other airports in the region include Oceanside Municipal Airport, located approximately 7 miles west and Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, located approximately 10 miles northwest. There are no airports or private airstrips within 2-miles of the Proposed Project, therefore improvements would have no impact in exposing people to airport-related noise levels.

Mitigation Measures adopted in the 2017 SPEIR as outlined would be implemented; therefore, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to noise would occur. As such, the Project would conform to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.14 POPULATION & HOUSING

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
POPULATION & HOUSING. Would the Project:					
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The 2017 SPEIR did not evaluate population and housing resources.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Project Area is in a built-up urban area and is surrounded by residential and commercial uses. The Project involves replacement of sewer pipelines. The Proposed Project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth because it does not involve construction of new residential buildings and businesses, expand roads, or other infrastructure into areas that are not designated for development in the 2030 General Plan. No impact would occur relative to this issue.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project involves replacement of sewer pipelines. No relocations of people or housing would result due to construction or operation of the Project. No impact would occur relative to this issue.

Although not examined in the 2017 SPEIR, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to population and housing have been identified.

2.1.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or Substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the Project:					
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the provision or need for new or physically altered public services, the construction of which could cause significant physical environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:					
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The 2017 SPEIR did not evaluate public services. They were examined by the 2008 Sewer Update PEIR, and no significant impacts were identified.

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the provision or need for new or physically altered public services, the construction of which could cause significant physical environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:*

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project does not involve development that would generate new population that would cause an increase in demand for public services and facilities, or the provision or need for new or physically altered public services, the construction of which could cause significant physical environmental impacts.

Fire protection?

Less-than-Significant Impact. First responders would receive notice before traffic was restricted to excavation of streets and sidewalks. The contractor would be required to develop and implement a traffic control plan.

Police protection?

Less-than-Significant Impact. First responders would receive notice before traffic was restricted to excavation of streets and sidewalks. The contractor would be required to develop and implement a traffic control plan.

Schools?

No Impact. Construction would occur during while school is not in session.

Parks?

Less-than-Significant Impact. City requirements would be included in all contracts for work potentially disruptive to normal use of adjacent public facilities. The contractor would be required to develop and implement a traffic control plan. Wildwood Park and Civic Center Park are located approximately 1100 feet east from the work boundary of Alignment 3 (VMMS), and further east of work occurring at Alignments 1, 2, and 5. Construction would occur while school is not in session. While the VMMS grounds are not considered a neighborhood or regional park, school grounds could potentially be accessed by the public during non-school hours. However, any perceived increase in use of Wildwood Park and Civic Center Park during the construction of the Proposed Project would not result in substantial physical deterioration of the facility or an accelerated deterioration rate. Traffic control measures through implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1 would take place west of VMMS for Alignments 1, 2, and 5.

Other public facilities?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Existing populations and services would be temporarily inconvenienced by construction activities. City requirements would be included in all contracts for work potentially disruptive to normal use of adjacent public facilities

Although not examined in the 2017 SPEIR, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to public services have been identified.

2.1.16 RECREATION

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measures(s) Required
RECREATION. Would the Project:					
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</p>					
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

The 2017 SPEIR did not evaluate recreation. They were examined by the 2008 Sewer Update PEIR, and no significant impacts were identified.

a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated?*

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work), Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work), and Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Wildwood Park and Civic Center Park are located approximately 1100 feet east from the work boundary of Alignment 3 (VMMS), and further east of work occurring at Alignments 1, 2, and 5. Construction would occur while school is not in session. While the VMMS grounds are not considered a neighborhood or regional park, school grounds could potentially be accessed by the public during non-school hours. However, any perceived increase in use of Wildwood Park and Civic Center Park during the construction of the Proposed Project would not result in substantial physical deterioration of the facility or an accelerated deterioration rate. Traffic control measures through implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1 would take place west of VMMS for Alignments 1, 2, and 5.

Direct and Indirect Effects – Operations: **No Impact.** No indirect impacts would occur following the completion of the Proposed Project construction.

Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work):

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Wave Waterpark and Vista Village Creek are located approximately 430 feet northwest of the work boundary of Alignment 4, respectively. Construction and operations of the Proposed Project at Alignment 4 would not disrupt visitors to either of these facilities.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The Proposed Project would have no impact related to recreation. The Proposed Project would have no impact related to recreation.

Although not examined in the 2017 SPEIR, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to recreation have been identified.

2.1.17 TRANSPORTATION

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or Substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measures(s) Required
TRANSPORTATION. Would the Project:					
a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

The 2017 CSMP SPEIR analyzed construction-related and traffic related activities to level of service capacity of public streets due to pipeline work in accordance with local and state analysis requirements. In 2020, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) was adopted as the appropriate measure for analyzing environmental impacts related to transportation. The City's December 2020 Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines established new transportation impact analysis guidelines which identified VMT as an appropriate measure of environmental impacts and determined level of service analysis to no longer be appropriate for CEQA purposes.

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work) and Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects – Construction: Less-than-Significant Impact. The North County Transit District (NCTD) BREEZE bus route 306 and bus route 318 are the closest public transit options to the Project Site with stops at various points along Vista Village Drive. The closest bus stop is located at the intersection of Vista Village Drive and South Citrus Avenue, approximately 0.2 miles north of the Project Site.

Construction of the Proposed Project is not anticipated to interfere with BREEZE bus services. There are no designated bicycle lanes along the roadways within which the construction would occur. Sidewalks located along the south side of Eucalyptus Avenue and on both sides of South Citrus Avenue would remain accessible during construction.

Direct Effect – Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. Following construction, the below ground pipeline and laterals would not affect the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, impacts relative to this issue would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would not result in indirect impacts to alternative modes of transportation.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work), Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work), and Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction: Less-than-significant Impact. The NCTD BREEZE bus route 302 and bus route 332 are the closest public transit option to the Project Site with stops at various points along Vista Village Drive. The closest bus stop is located on Vista Village Drive near Camino Corto, approximately 0.58 miles north of the Project Site.

Construction of the Proposed Project is not anticipated to interfere with BREEZE bus services. There are no designated bicycle lanes and no sidewalks along the roadways within which construction would occur. A portion of the construction activities would occur within the parking area north of Eddie Drive extending the parking lot located adjacent to Wave Drive. Impacts would be less-than-significant to the residences adjacent to the construction limits along Eddie Drive with implementation of the Mitigation Measure TR-1.

Direct Effects – Operations: No Impact. Following construction, the below ground pipeline and laterals would not affect the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, impacts relative to this issue would have no impact.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. The Proposed Project would result in no indirect impacts to alternative modes of transportation.

Mitigation

TR-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.9, question “a” for Mitigation Measure TR-1 compliance requirements.

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

CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 requires considerations be made for evaluating a project’s potential transportation impacts. Following July 1, 2020, VMT was determined to be the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts and refers to both the amount and distance vehicles travel when attributed to a project. As the Proposed Project would incur construction vehicle and potentially construction personnel arriving and departing the Project Site during the construction phase, any VMT accounted for the construction efforts is determined to be temporary and result in a less-than-significant impact.

The Proposed Project is also considered to be screened out of CEQA VMT analysis per the City’s December 2020 Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, as the project would be considered a safety improvement project, in addition to being screened out due to project’s location within a low-VMT generating area as identified by the SANDAG SB 743 VMT Screening map.

Further, the City determined in the 2020 Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines that screened out projects as “projects not needed to be analyzed for CEQA purposes that already support VMT reduction” and “projects are either locally servicing or are based on substantial evidence provided by the OPR Technical Advisory Committee supporting SB 743 implementation.”

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work) and Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The Proposed Project consists of sewer improvements along various existing sewer lines. The Project includes sewer improvements located specifically along Eucalyptus Ave and Citrus Avenue. The work proposed on Eucalyptus Avenue would include replacing the existing 10-inch diameter VCP sewer line with a 12-inch diameter PVC sewer line from Civic Center Drive to South Citrus Avenue, in addition to the installation of sanitary sewer manholes. The proposed work along South Citrus Avenue replaces the existing 10-inch VCP sewer line from Eucalyptus Avenue to Broadway with new sewer mains ranging from 12- to 15-inch PVC lines. Sanitary manholes would also be installed. The Proposed Project does not qualify as a land development project and is not VMT inducing in nature, based on the updated transportation impact analysis guidelines a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work), Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work), and Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The Proposed Project consists of sewer improvements along two existing sewer lines. An existing 6-inch VCP sewer main located at the VMMS would be replaced by an 8-inch PVC sewer main, in addition to installing four new sanitary sewer manholes. The replaced 8-inch PVC sewer line would remain within the same alignment (replace-in-place), which is located in an open grass/turf or dirt track on the VMMS campus in an existing public utility easement. The second sewer main to be replaced is an existing 6-inch VCP sewer line from Eddie Drive to the existing parking lot located behind Cinopolis Theatre. The proposed improvement would consist of an 8-inch PVC sewer main, including four new sanitary sewer manholes and one rehabilitated sanitary sewer manhole at Wave Drive. The proposed work would occur along Eddie Drive, traverse a private parking lot south of the theater, and terminate at Wave Drive. The Proposed Project does not qualify as a land development project and is not VMT inducing in nature, based on the updated transportation impact analysis guidelines a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.

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

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work) and Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects – Construction: Less-than-Significant Impact. Trenching and pipe installation activities, and associated lane closures, within the ROW of Eucalyptus Avenue, South Citrus Avenue, and Broadway could disrupt traffic flows and street operations and affect visibility from adjacent residential driveways. To minimize safety hazards, 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure TR-1 would be implemented to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Direct Effects – Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project would not include permanent design features or incompatible uses that would affect traffic safety. Following construction, the pipeline would be located below ground, and would not increase hazards to roadway users. Therefore, substantial hazards would not occur, and impacts would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects– Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project would not include the installation of roadway design features or incompatible uses that could result in permanent, indirect safety hazards; however, construction of the Project within public ROWs could increase the interaction of construction-related traffic, vehicles, and pedestrians, thus temporarily increasing the potential safety hazards and restricting or delaying access to adjacent land uses. 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure TR-1 would be implemented and would minimize potential indirect impacts associated with roadway hazards during the temporary construction period and impacts would be less-than-significant.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work), Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work), and Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** An increase of hazardous design features resulting from construction of the proposed sewer main replacement within the VMMS is not anticipated. Trenching and pipe installation activities, and associated lane closures, with the rights-of-way (ROW) of Eddie Drive and potentially at Wave Drive, which could disrupt traffic flows and street operations and affect visibility from adjacent residential driveways. To minimize safety hazards, Mitigation Measure TR-1 would be implemented to reduce this impact, and impacts would be less-than-significant.

Direct Effects – Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project would not include permanent design features or incompatible uses that would affect traffic safety. Following construction, the pipeline would be located below ground, and would not increase hazards to roadway users. Therefore, substantial hazards would not occur, and impacts would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not include the installation of roadway design features or incompatible uses that could result in permanent, indirect safety hazards; however, construction of the Project within public ROWs could increase the interaction of construction-related traffic, vehicles, and pedestrians, thus temporarily increasing the potential safety hazards and restricting or delaying access to adjacent land uses. The Project would have no indirect impacts.

Mitigation

TR-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.9, question “a” for Mitigation Measure TR-1 compliance requirements.

d) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

Alignment 1 (Eucalyptus Avenue Work) and Alignment 2 (Citrus Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue and Broadway Work):

Direct Effects Construction: Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction activities that would occur within Eucalyptus Avenue, South Citrus Avenue, and Broadway would result in temporary reductions in usable roadway widths. Such reductions could result in impaired emergency vehicle access; however, such potential impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with incorporation of 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure TR-1.

Direct Effects – Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. Following construction, the pipeline would be located below ground, and would not affect emergency access. Therefore, substantial hazards would not occur, and impacts would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: No Impact. Following construction, the pipeline would be located below ground, and would not affect emergency access. No indirect impacts would result.

Alignment 3 (VMMS Work), Alignment 4 (Eddie Drive and Wave Drive Work), and Alignment 5 (Citrus Avenue to Broadway Avenue Work):

Direct Effects – Construction: No Impact. Construction activities that would occur along Eddie Drive and Wave Drive would result in temporary reductions in usable roadway widths. Such reductions could result in impaired emergency vehicle access; however, such potential impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with incorporation of Mitigation Measure TR-1. Emergency access impacts due to the construction activities occurring within VMMS are not anticipated.

Direct Effects – Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. Following construction, the pipeline would be located below ground, and would not affect emergency access. Therefore, substantial hazards would not occur, and impacts would be less-than-significant.

Indirect Effects– Construction and Operations: No Impact. Following construction, the pipeline would be located below ground, and would not affect emergency access. No indirect impacts would result.

Mitigation

TR-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.9, question “a” for Mitigation Measure TR-1 compliance requirements.

Mitigation Measures adopted in the 2017 SPEIR as outlined would be implemented; therefore, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to transportation would occur. As such, the Project would conform to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code					

section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:					
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision © of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The SPEIR identified that direct impacts during construction were significant and that no impacts would occur during operations. Indirect impacts were identified as significant. To reduce impacts, Mitigation Measures CULT-2 and CULT-3 were required. Mitigation Measure CULT-2 requires the preparation of a project-specific archaeological survey be conducted to identify whether cultural resources (including Native American resources) would be impacted. This measure also requires outreach to the NAHC, and tribal outreach with the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians to request any information they may have regarding known resources. If the potential for resources is identified, then Mitigation Measure CULT-3 (Archaeological Monitoring) would be required. With implementation of these Mitigation Measures, impacts were reduced to less-than-significant.

A project-specific Archaeological Survey Report was prepared for the Proposed Project by NV5 archaeological staff (Appendix B) and fulfills the requirements of 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure CULT-2.

NV5 submitted a request to NAHC on August 25, 2021, requesting a search of their Sacred Lands Files. The NAHC indicated that a search for the Project Area was negative. Twenty-two letters to were sent to thirteen tribal contacts provided by the NAHC with an email address including the Pala Band of Mission Indians, San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians (SLR), and the Luiseño October 11, 2021. An additional attempt was made to reach the SLR with an email on January 6, 2022. A response was received from the Luiseño on November 1, 2021. This response indicates that the Project Area is within the Territory of the Luiseño people and within the tribe’s area of historic interest. It is noted in the response that a gathering area is adjacent to the Project Area addressed in this study. The letter also requested the presence of a tribal monitor during cultural resource survey, but the survey was conducted in July before NAHC search was submitted and letters sent to stakeholders. The Luiseño also requested direct consultation with the CEQA lead agency as well as tribal monitoring during construction.

No tribal cultural resources are known within the alignments analyzed here. Tribal outreach did not identify any resources of concern directly within the areas of impact though one was noted adjacent to the Project areas. No impacts to tribal cultural resources would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project because no tribal resources were identified during Assembly Bill 52 consultation for the 2017 CSMP SPEIR or during the tribal outreach efforts for the current Project.

- a) *Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?*

All Alignment Work:

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Refer to the discussion provided in Section 2.1.5, question “b” and “c”. Mitigation Measures CULT-3 and CULT-5 would be implemented during construction.

Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Refer to the discussion provided in Item 2.1.5, question “b” and “c”. Mitigation Measures CULT-3 and CULT-5 would be implemented during construction.

Mitigation

CULT-3: Archaeological Monitoring (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.5, question “b” for Mitigation Measure CULT-3 compliance requirements.

CULT-5: Disturbance to Human Remains (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.5, question “b” for Mitigation Measure CULT-5 compliance requirements.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Refer to the discussion provided in Section 2.1.5, question “b” and “c”. Mitigation Measures CULT-3 and CULT-5 would be implemented during construction.

Indirect Effects– Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Refer to the discussion provided in Section 2.1.5, question “b” and “c”. Mitigation Measures CULT-3 and CULT-5 would be implemented during construction.

Mitigation

CULT-3: Archaeological Monitoring (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.5, question “b” for Mitigation Measure CULT-3 compliance requirements.

CULT-5: Disturbance to Human Remains (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure)

Refer to Section 2.1.5, question “b” for Mitigation Measure CULT-5 compliance requirements.

Mitigation Measures adopted in the 2017 SPEIR as outlined would be implemented; therefore, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to tribal cultural resources would occur. As such, the Project would conform to the 2017 SPEIR.

2.1.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measures(s) Required
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the Project:					
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Utilities and service systems were not evaluated in the 2017 SPEIR. They were examined by the 2008 Sewer Update EIR, and no significant impacts were identified.

a) *Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater*

treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project is an element of the 2017 SPEIR planned to upgrade and repair existing system limitations in response to past growth. Some limited temporary disruption of utility service may occur because of construction; however, all services would be restored during completion of construction. No expansion of water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications is proposed.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project would not generate any new permanent demands on existing water supplies. The sewer infrastructure improvements would not result in any additional water usage. Minimal use of water would be required during construction, but it is within the normal daily usage variability of the water utility.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Wastewater collection and treatment for the City of Vista is provided by the Public Works Division at the Encina Water Pollution Control Facility, a 4.5-million-gallons-per-day (MGD) treatment plant and ocean outfall. As stated in the 2008 Sewer Master Plan, there is more than enough capacity in the system to support future growth; however, the Proposed Project would not add to wastewater demands and would improve the City sewer system operation. The sewer infrastructure improvements would not result in any additional generation of sewerage.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects– Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Solid waste collection in the City is hauled to several regional landfills by private contractors. The Proposed Project would not add permanently to solid waste demands or generate excessive solid waste. Minimal generation of solid waste would occur during construction; the waste generated would not exceed the capacity of the landfill.

- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations*

related to solid waste?

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: Less-than-Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would not result in a permanent generation of solid waste out of compliance with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations. The sewer infrastructure improvements would not result in waste that is governed by federal or state treatment, storage, or disposal regulation. No hazardous waste is expected to be generated during construction.

Although not examined in the 2017 SPEIR, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to utilities and service systems have been identified.

2.1.20 WILDFIRE

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
WILDFIRE If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as extremely high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:					
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The 2017 SPEIR did not evaluate Wildfire.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** All pipeline segments and construction zones are located within the urban areas. Parcels immediately surrounding the Project Site have the same designation. The closest Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) to the Project Site is located approximately one mile to the east, within the Sphere of Influence (SOI), which is within the Vista Fire Protection District (VFPD). The VFPD has adopted Emergency Evacuation Plans in its Community Wildfire Protection Plan to identify evacuation routes, emergency facilities, and available Vista Fire Department (VFD) personnel and equipment to effectively deal with emergency situations. As a result, no revisions to the adopted Emergency Evacuation Plans would be required due to the development of the Proposed Project.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** All pipeline segments and construction zones are located within urban zones surrounded by hardscape. The closest VHFHSZ to the Project Site is located approximately one mile to the east, within the SOI, which is within the VFPD. As a result, adherence to standard City and State policies and regulations regarding fire codes would not result in exacerbating wildfire risks and impacts from wildfire pollution would be less-than-significant.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** All pipeline segments and construction zones are located within urban zones surrounded by hardscape. The closest VHFHSZ to the Project Site is located approximately one mile to the east, within the SOI, which is within the VFPD. As a result, adherence to standard City and State policies and regulations regarding fire codes would not result in exacerbating wildfire risks and impacts from wildfire pollution would be less-than-significant.

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

All Alignment Work:

Direct and Indirect Effects – Construction and Operations: **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section 2.1.10, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” runoff occurs naturally within the Project Area and

is managed with existing flood control infrastructure. Additionally, the Project Site does not have steep slopes and is contained within locations beneath City streets and private properties. For these reasons, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Although not examined in the 2017 SPEIR, no significant direct or indirect effects from the Project to wildfire have been identified.

2.1.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Impact Analyzed in the SPEIR	New Significant Impact due to Unusual Circumstances or Substantial New Information	No Impact or Less-than-significant Impact	SPEIR Mitigation Measure(s) Applicable	New Mitigation Measure(s) Required
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.					
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental impacts of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the impacts of past projects, the impacts of other current projects, and the impacts of probable future projects,)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental impacts that would cause substantial adverse impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

All Alignment Work:

Less-than-Significant Impact. Proposed Project Construction of the improvements would be completed under all relevant Mitigation Measures required by the SPEIR. Strict adherence to all municipal, county, state, and federal laws, regulations, and ordinances would be required of the contractor. Environmental construction monitoring would be required of the contractors.

Due to the developed nature of the Project Site and surrounding area, and the subsequent lack of biological resources within and adjacent to the Project Site, the Project would have low 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 level, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The Proposed Project would implement 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure BIO-1 to avoid potential impacts that may occur to breeding birds protected under the MBTA and that may nest in nearby ornamental trees during construction activities. Similarly, based on the lack of historical and archaeological resources at the Project Site, the Project would not eliminate important examples of the major period of California history or prehistory. Through implementation of the Mitigation Measure CULT-1, impacts relative to this issue would be less-than-significant, in addition the implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-2 would require a Project specific Archaeological survey be performed to identify whether cultural resources (including Native American resources) would be impacted. This measure also requires outreach to the NAHC, and tribal outreach with the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians to request any information they may have regarding known resources. Therefore, impacts relative to this issue would be less-than-significant.

The implementation of 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure CULT-3 would require cultural resource monitoring to provide for the identification, evaluation, treatment, and protection of any cultural resources that are affected by or may be discovered during the construction of the Proposed Project. The 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure CULT-5 would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to human remains. In addition, the Proposed Project and projects included under the 2017 CSMP would implement Mitigation Measures from the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, as applicable, to minimize impacts. Therefore, impacts relative to this issue would be less-than-significant. In addition, through implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-4. Paleontological monitoring would be performed for excavation depths of 10 feet or greater. Therefore, impacts relative to this issue would be less-than-significant.

- b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental impacts of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the impacts of past projects, the impacts of other current projects, and the impacts of probable future projects.)*

All Alignment Work:

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is primarily a replacement of an underground sewer collection network; therefore, no incremental addition to or subtraction from the impacts of past or future projects is expected. No planned or envisioned improvements or changes of the City sewer system are anticipated that, when added to the Proposed Project, would have a cumulative effect on the Project Area.

Based on the existing extent of residential development in the vicinity of the Proposed Project, additional development projects are not anticipated to occur near the Proposed Project. Projects that would occur in the general vicinity include other projects proposed under the 2017 CSMP. Based on its relatively small size, short-term construction period, and lack of operational impacts, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to contribute impacts that are cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with these other projects.

c) *Does the project have environmental impacts that would cause substantial adverse impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

All Alignment Work:

Less-than-Significant Impact. Investigation of the Proposed Project has not found any environmental impacts that would cause substantial adverse direct or indirect impacts on human beings. In contrast, the planned improvements would improve the safety, cost effectiveness, and efficiency of the public sewer system.

Impacts associated with the release of hazardous materials, impairment of emergency access, and generation of noise during the temporary construction period would have the potential to cause substantial adverse impacts on human beings; however, through compliance with standard regulations and implementation of the Mitigation Measures identified in this document and in the 2017 CSMP SPEIR, impacts would be less-than-significant.

Specifically, in addition to standard construction controls and safety procedures during construction that would minimize risk associated with exposure to hazardous materials such as oils, fuels, hydraulic fluids, and solvents that would be used during construction, the Proposed Project would implement 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 to reduce potential impacts associated with undocumented contaminated soils and/or groundwater that may be encountered during the excavation activities. Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 would require the implementation of a Water Quality Protection Strategy (2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure). Implementation of 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure TR-1 would allow for sufficient emergency access when construction would occur within roadways. Implementation of 2017 CSMP SPEIR Mitigation Measure NV-1 would reduce noise levels at affected residences to within limits set by the City’s noise ordinance. Therefore, with the inclusion of these Mitigation Measures, the Project would not have environmental impacts which would cause substantial adverse impacts on human beings, and impacts would be less-than-significant.

3.0 REFERENCES

- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 1997. California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual. Accessed August 2021. Available online at: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/Pages/ql_lesa.aspx
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2021. California Tsunami Maps and Data. Accessed December 2021. Available online at: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps>
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2021. California Natural Diversity Database. Accessed August 2021. Available online at: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB>
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Scenic Highways. Accessed September 2021. Available online at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/design/lap/livability/scenic-highways/index.html>
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook. Accessed December 2021. Available online at: <https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm#:~:text=As%20part%20of%20the%20Air%20Resources%20Board%27s%0%28ARB%29,that%20go%20through%20the%20land%20use%20decision-making%20process.>
- GeoSearch. October 7, 2021. Radius Report. Available as Appendix C.
- FHWA, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2006. Roadway Construction Noise Model 2006, Accessed August 2021. Available online at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2021. FIRM Flood Maps. Accessed September 2021. Available online at: <https://www.fema.gov/flood-maps>
- San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). Accessed September 2021. Available online at: <https://www.sdapcd.org/>
- San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). 2003. North County Multiple Habitat Conservation Program. Accessed August 2021. Available online at: <https://www.sandag.org>
- San Diego County. 2021. Land Use and Environment Group. Accessed December 2021. Available online at: <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/lueg.html>
- San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E). 2021. Interactive Map and Integration Capacity Analysis. Accessed September 2021. Available online at: https://www.sdge.com/sites/default/files/documents/Navigation%20Tools_ICA_Rev5.pdf
- San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy. 2007. Accessed September 2021 Available online at: <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/genplan/pdf/peir/eir3p2airqualityfinal.pdf>

South Coast Information Center (SCIC). Accessed September 2021. Available online at: <https://scic.sdsu.edu/>

North County Transit District. 2021. BREEZE Bus System Routes and Schedule. Accessed September 2021. Available online at: <https://gonctd.com/services/breeze-bus/>

NV5. January 2022. Biological Resources Report for the Eucalyptus and Citrus Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Project. Available as Appendix A.

NV5. December 2021. Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Eucalyptus and Citrus Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Project. Available as Appendix B

U.S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2021a. Environmental Conservation Online System (ECOS). Accessed August 2021. Available online at: <https://www.fws.gov/>

U.S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2021b. National Wetlands Inventory. Accessed August 2021. Available online at: <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/>

Vista, City of Vista. 2012a. Vista General Plan 2030, Available online at: <https://www.Cityofvista.com/City-services/City-departments/community-development/building-planning-permits-applications/vista-general-plan-2030>

Vista, City of Vista. 2012b. Climate Action Plan (CAP). Available online at: <https://www.Cityofvista.com/City-services/City-departments/community-development/climate-action-plan>

Vista, City of Vista. 2020. Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines. Accessed September 2021. Available online at: <https://www.cityofvista.com/home/showpublisheddocument/23682/637477683814400000>

Vista, City of Vista. 2021. Emergency Evacuation Plan-Community Wildfire Protection Plan. Accessed in October 2021. Available online at: <https://www.cityofvista.com/home/showpublisheddocument/21336/637184691498130000>

Vista, City of Vista. Accessed in April 2021.

2017 Supplemental Program Environmental Impact Report for Comprehensive Sewer Master Plan Update.

2017 Comprehensive Sewer Master Plan Update.

2008 Program Environmental Impact Report for the City of Vista 2007 Sewer master plan Update.

4.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

4.1 LEAD AGENCY – CITY OF VISTA

Michael Hilker.....Capital Project Manager

4.2 PROJECT CONSULTANTS NV5

Tom Acuña.....Senior Reviewer, §2.1.20
 Mark Murphy.....Project Manager, §1, §2.1.2, §2.1.21,
 Rebecca Davey.....Environmental Scientist, §2.2.1, §2.1.7, §2.1.10, §2.1.12,
 §2.1.13, §2.1.14,
 David Newman.....Environmental Scientist, §2.1.9
 Steve Bump.....Environmental Scientist, §2.1.6, §2.1.19
 Robin Kinmont.....Biologist / Environmental Scientist, §2.1.4, Appendix X
 Mabelle Wongsanguan.....Environmental Scientist, §2.1.13, §2.1.16
 Kevin Cosgrove.....Senior Engineer, §2.1.3, §2.1.8
 Michelle Ray.....Environmental Planner, §2.1.17
 Karry Blake, MA, RPA.....Principal Archaeologist, §2.1.5

