

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **S.1 Project Synopsis**

The purpose of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) is to review potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the Lindo Lake Restoration Project (proposed project), as required by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project proposes excavation and grading of approximately 226,000 cubic yards of silt and sediment to recontour the lakebed, deepen the east and west lake basins, and provide retention basins.

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for improvements to Lindo Lake Park was certified by the County of San Diego (County) Board of Supervisors on May 27, 1976. Subsequently, an SEIR was prepared for improvements at Lindo Lake Park in conformance with a Park Master Plan dated January 1983 that was certified by the County Board of Supervisors on February 28, 1984. Since that time, a change of circumstances not previously considered in the 1984 SEIR has occurred, including various additional environmental regulations that have been enacted at the local, state, and federal level since 1984. Pursuant to CEQA Section 15163, this new SEIR has been prepared to address changes in circumstances and to provide minor changes and additions to the previously certified EIRs in order to make the previous EIRs adequately apply to the proposed project.

#### **S.1.1 Project Location and Existing Conditions**

The Lindo Lake Restoration Project (project) is located within the Lindo Lake County Park at 12660 Lindo Lane (Assessor's Parcel Number 394-180-03-00), and covers approximately 57.46 acres. The project site is bounded by Vine and Chestnut streets to the west, Lakeshore Drive to the north, Petite Lane to the east, and Lindo Lane to the south. Lindo Lake is surrounded by a park area including walking trails, picnic areas, softball fields, horseshoe pits, tennis courts, play areas, skate park, gazebo (historic former boathouse), community center, and a public library. The Lindo Lake Park area is surrounded by neighborhood retail commercial (grocery), multi-family residential (apartments), single-family residential uses, and Lindo Park Elementary School to the north; single-family residential to the east and south; and a mix of commercial, light industrial, residential, and public facilities (Lakeside Public Library, Lakeside Community Center) to the west.

The project is located in the town center of the unincorporated community of Lakeside, in southwestern San Diego County, approximately one-quarter mile south of State Route 67. The project site is located within the Metro-Lakeside-Jamul segment of the Multiple Species Conservation Program County of San Diego Subarea Plan. The majority of the project site is within a Biological Resource Core Area, because it was mapped as a Pre-Approved Mitigation Area on the wildlife agencies' preapproved mitigation map (Attachment F of Document No. 0769999 on file with the Clerk of the Board).

#### **S.1.2 Project Components**

The project proposes excavation and grading of approximately 226,000 cubic yards of silt and sediment to recontour the lakebed, deepen the east and west lake basins, and provide retention basins. Approximately 27,000 cubic yards of the excavated lake material would be used to stabilize the banks of the lake basins and to create graded mounds surrounding the basins, and for landscaping and habitat creation. The balance of the material (approximately 199,411 cubic

yards) would be exported off-site. Following grading, the basins would be lined with bentonite clay up to the water surface level in the majority of the west basin and two feet below the water surface level in the east basin. The bentonite clay liner would assist in reduction of groundwater percolation while improving wetland habitat. The lake deepening would be conducted in two initial phases, with Phase 1 focused on the east basin and Phase 2 focused on the west basin. Raw water from the Helix Water District pipeline would be used for the initial fill of the deepened lake. Post-construction water levels would be maintained by using groundwater from on-site wells. The project would also introduce drainage improvements, park landscaping improvements, as well as access and circulation improvements. Further details regarding project components are presented in Section 1.2 Project Description.

## **S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects**

Table S-1 provides a summary of each potential environmental effect found to be significant with the implementation of the proposed project, the mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect, and the conclusion as to whether the effect is reduced to below a level of significance by applying mitigation measures.

## **S.3 Areas of Controversy**

Section 15123(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR shall identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. The County issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed project on March 10, 2017; held a public scoping meeting in the community; and received three written communications from surrounding residents during the NOP comment period. Appendix A contains the published NOP and comment letters received, which primarily address aesthetics, biological resources, and project design.

## **S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-making Body**

The County Board of Supervisors would be required to determine whether significant impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, and hazards and hazardous materials could be reduced to less than significant with implementation of proposed mitigation measures, or whether or not to adopt a project alternative that would reduce the impact to less than significant.

## **S.5 Project Alternatives**

Alternatives are required to be identified and evaluated to determine if they would lessen or avoid significant impacts identified in Chapter 2.0. Two build alternatives and the No Project alternative were evaluated for environmental advantages compared to the proposed project. An analysis of potential significant impacts associated with each alternative in comparison to the proposed project is presented in Chapter 4.0. Project alternatives are summarized below.

### **S.5.1 No Project Alternative**

The No Project Alternative would leave the project area in its present condition, without project development or new construction. The No Project Alternative is what would reasonably be expected to occur in the future if the project is not approved. None of the environmental effects associated with the proposed project would occur under the No Project Alternative.

This alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. The east basin would continue to fill with silt and sediment, resulting in more frequent dry periods, and there would be no improvement to the existing west basin water quality, which is too shallow and warm to maintain high water quality and wildlife habitat. If the No Project Alternative were chosen, the shallow water would warm up and become murky. As a result, the lake as a public amenity would decrease, the aquatic functions would decrease, and the habitat for aquatic and avian species would diminish.

### **S.5.2 West Basin Only Alternative**

This alternative would improve only the west basin. No excavation, recontouring, lining, or filling of the east basin would occur. All other park landscaping improvements, drainage improvements, and access and circulation improvements included with the proposed alternative would be included with this alternative.

The east basin would continue to fill with silt and sediment under the West Basin Only Alternative, resulting in more frequent dry periods. Additionally, the West Basin Only Alternative would create less native riparian habitats, and fewer native riparian habitats would be able to establish naturally around the rim of the east basin due to the increased sedimentation and dry periods. The West Basin Only Alternative would also allow poor water quality to continue at the east basin, which would also contribute to the continuation of poor habitat for aquatic and avian species as currently exists on-site. Consequently, the West Basin Only Alternative would only partially achieve the project objectives to restore and enhance the natural aquatic functions of Lindo Lake or improve habitat for aquatic and avian species.

### **S.5.3 No Liner Alternative**

This alternative would excavate, recontour, and refill both basins, but the bentonite clay liner would not be added to the basins after recontouring. All other park landscaping improvements, drainage improvements, and access and circulation improvements included with the proposed alternative would be included with this alternative.

The absence of the bentonite clay liner under this alternative would allow for increased percolation into the soils. This increased percolation would not sustain enough water within the basins to sustain the fringing riparian habitats and other post-restoration biological resources. Although more groundwater would be pumped in an attempt to maintain water levels under this alternative, the increased percolation could result in a lack of water necessary to sustain the fringing riparian habitats and other post-restoration biological resources, which could result in the continuation of poor habitat for aquatic and avian species as currently exists on-site. This could necessitate additional restoration activities to improve habitat quality at the project site. This increased groundwater pumping may result in use of a greater amount of groundwater that could exceed the County significance threshold of a 50 percent reduction in total groundwater in storage within the Santee-El Monte Groundwater Basin. If projections of groundwater pumping necessary to maintain post-restoration water levels under the No Liner Alternative were to exceed the County threshold, the County would have to develop mitigation measures or maintain Lindo Lake with lower water levels. Consequently, the No Liner Alternative would not achieve the project objectives to restore and enhance the natural aquatic functions of Lindo Lake or improve habitat for aquatic and avian species.

<b>Table S-1 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures</b>		
Impact Number and Description of Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>BI-1a-e:</b> The proposed project has potential to cause significant direct impacts to Cooper’s hawk (<i>Accipiter cooperii</i>), tricolored blackbird (<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>), great blue heron (<i>Ardea herodias</i>), western least bittern (<i>Ixobrychus exilis hesperis</i>), and other California Fish and Game Code-protected species if vegetation clearing occurs during these species’ respective breeding seasons. This would be considered a <i>significant direct impact</i>.</p>	<p><b>M-BI-1a</b> Removal of habitat and vegetation that may support active nests shall occur outside of the breeding season for all potentially impacted species (February 1 to July 15 for Cooper’s hawk; January 15 to August 31 for all other species).</p> <p><b>M-BI-1b</b> If vegetation clearing must begin during the breeding season, the following measures must be implemented:</p> <p><b>Before Construction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A qualified biologist shall attend the pre-construction meeting to discuss biological resource issues of the project and identify measures to avoid impacts to sensitive species during construction.</li> <li>• A qualified biologist shall conduct surveys to determine if active nests are present in the impact area or within 300 feet (or within 500 feet for Cooper’s hawk and other raptors). If active nests are found, a no-activity buffer zone shall be established at the discretion of the biologist in consultation with the County, until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. If no nests are found, no mitigation will be needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>During Construction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the first day of construction, the qualified biologist shall attend the tailgate meeting and conduct training for contractors and construction personnel, including explaining the purpose for protecting biological resources and any avoidance measures that should be implemented during project construction.</li> <li>• The qualified biologist shall monitor construction activities full time during vegetation clearing and grubbing, and weekly thereafter to direct crews on avoidance measures. The biological monitor shall verify the following:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Any installed construction fencing or silt fencing shall remain intact, and movement of construction personnel, vehicles, and equipment shall be confined to existing roads and areas within the defined project footprint.</li> <li>○ Equipment maintenance, staging, and fuel dispensing areas shall be situated such that runoff from these areas remains outside of the lake basins or any other areas of sensitive habitat.</li> <li>○ All trash (including, but not limited to, food scraps, wrappers, and beverage containers) shall be removed from work sites or completely secured in a wildlife-proof container at the end of each workday.</li> <li>○ Pets of project personnel shall not be allowed in the work area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>After Construction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The biological monitor shall provide a letter to the County describing monitoring activities and any biological issues identified.</li> </ul>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures**

Impact Number and Description of Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>BI-2:</b> The proposed project would cause direct impacts to 25.41 acres of sensitive vegetation communities (Tiers I, III, and unvegetated aquatic habitats). This would be considered a <i>significant direct impact</i>.</p>	<p><b>M-BI-2a</b> Impacts to unvegetated aquatic habitat, including permanent impacts 1.57 acres and temporary impacts to 16.78 acres of open water and non-vegetated channel would be mitigated through on-site revegetation at an estimated 1:1 ratio. This equates to a mitigation total of 18.35 acres of unvegetated aquatic habitat. However, the project will mitigate for 17.82 acres of unvegetated aquatic habitat; the remaining permanent impact of 0.53 acre to unvegetated aquatic habitats would be mitigated with the excess of 0.61 acre of on-site revegetation of marsh habitats, which would be within the upper 2 feet of the inundated basins. Marsh habitat permanent impacts would be mitigated in accordance with mitigation measure M-BI-2b.</p> <p><b>M-BI-2b</b> Permanent impacts to 1.61 acres of marsh habitat (freshwater marsh and cismontane alkali marsh) would be mitigated through on-site revegetation at an estimated 2:1 ratio. This equates to a mitigation total of 3.22 acres of freshwater marsh habitat.</p> <p><b>M-BI-2c</b> Temporary impacts to 3.42 acres of marsh habitat (freshwater marsh and cismontane alkali marsh) would be mitigated through on-site revegetation at an estimated 1:1 ratio. This equates to a mitigation total of 3.42 acres of freshwater marsh habitat.</p> <p><b>M-BI-2d</b> Permanent impacts to 0.96 acres of riparian habitat (southern willow scrub and southern riparian woodland) would be mitigated at an estimated 2:1 ratio. This equates to a mitigation total of 1.92 acres. On-site revegetation would occur within 1.14 acres and the remainder would occur off site with preservation of 0.78 acre of riparian habitat.</p> <p><b>M-BI-2e</b> Permanent impacts to 0.08 acre of native grassland (seagrass grassland) would be mitigated through off-site revegetation at a 2:1 ratio. This equates to a mitigation total of 0.16 acre of native grassland in compliance with the County's Biological Mitigation Ordinance.</p> <p><b>M-BI-2f</b> Permanent impacts to 0.99 acre of non-native grassland would be mitigated through off-site revegetation at a 1:1 ratio. This equates to a mitigation total of 0.99 acre of non-native grassland in compliance with the County's Biological Mitigation Ordinance.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p><b>BI-3:</b> The proposed project would cause direct impacts to wetlands (6.05 acres) and non-wetland waters/lake/streambeds (18.35 acres) as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). This would be considered a <i>significant direct impact</i>.</p>	<p><b>M-BI-3</b> The project would cause direct impacts to 24.40 acres of likely jurisdictional areas, including 6.05 acres of ACOE wetlands, CDFW riparian habitat, and RWQCB wetland Waters of the State (1.23 acres of permanent impact and 4.76 acre of temporary impact), as well as 18.35 acres expected to be considered ACOE non-wetland waters of the U.S., CDFW lake/streambed, and RWQCB lake/streambed (0.53 acre of permanent impact and 17.82 acres of temporary impact; see Table 2.1-4 and Figure 2.1-5). Impacts to wetlands and waters as defined by ACOE, CDFW, and RWQCB would be offset by the proposed inundation and revegetation of the lake basins, as shown in the project planting plan.</p> <p>On-site revegetation would provide 9.80 acres of ACOE and RWQCB jurisdictional wetlands (for an increase of 2.28 acres), and 10.13 acres of CDFW riparian habitat (for an increase of 2.61 acres; see Table 2.1-5 and Figure 2.1-6). Additionally, recontouring and inundation of the lake basins is expected to re-establish a total of 17.83 acres of ACOE</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

<b>Table S-1 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures</b>		
Impact Number and Description of Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>non-wetland waters of the U.S., CDFW lake/streambed, and RWQCB lake/streambed. This reflects a reduction of 0.53 acre in surface area of unvegetated open water. However, a substantial portion of the inundated portions of the lake basins contain wetland freshwater marsh vegetation. Taking this into account, the project would result in an overall increase in total area of inundation (from the current 19.11 acres to 22.47 acres after construction). Furthermore, the project would increase overall water capacity from the current 9.9 million gallons to the post-construction capacity of 48.3 million gallons. These increases in wetland and non-wetland waters are expected to improve aquatic and wetland functions and services within the park.</p> <p>To comply with the state and federal regulations for impacts to Waters of the U.S./State, the following agency permits may be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clean Water Act Section 401 and 404 permits issued by the California RWQCB and the ACOE for all project-related disturbances of Waters of the U.S. and/or associated wetlands would be required for this project. Nationwide Permit (NWP) 27 under Section 404 should apply for this project. NWP 27 is designed for projects that serve to rehabilitate and improve the function of wetlands and riparian habitats and open waters. Under this NWP, compensatory mitigation is not required since these activities result in net increases in aquatic resource functions and services.</li> <li>• A Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement issued by the CDFW for all project-related disturbances of the lake/streambed would be required for this project.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>BI-4:</b> The proposed project would conflict with the provisions of California Fish and Game Code 3503 and 3503.3, as proposed project has potential to cause significant direct impacts to Cooper's hawk, tricolored blackbird, great blue heron, western least bittern, and other California Fish and Game Code-protected species if vegetation clearing occurs during these species' respective breeding seasons. This would be considered a <i>significant direct impact</i>.</p>	<p>Implementation of mitigation measures M-BI-1 through M-BI-3 would ensure consistency with local policies, ordinances, and adopted plans. No additional mitigation measures are recommended in order to address Impact BI-4.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p><b>CUL-1:</b> Project construction would have the potential to unearth unknown or previously undisturbed archaeological resources. This would be considered a significant direct impact.</p>	<p><b>M-CUL-1</b> Prior to beginning any construction work that requires monitoring, a preconstruction meeting will be held and will include a qualified Archaeological Monitor. The qualified Archaeological Monitor will make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Archaeological Monitoring Program with the Project Manager, Construction Manager or Construction Contractor.</p> <p>Prior to the start of any construction work that requires monitoring, the Archaeological Monitor will submit an archaeological monitoring exhibit based on the appropriate</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

<b>Table S-1 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures</b>		
Impact Number and Description of Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>construction documents to the County identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of excavation limits.</p> <p>The Archaeological Monitor will be present during excavation activities that could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the exhibit. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the monitors of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored.</p> <p>The Archaeological Monitor will document field activity via a site monitoring log. These logs will be transmitted to the County on the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly, and in the case of any discoveries.</p> <p>In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor will direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources, and immediately notify the County. The Archaeological Monitor and traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American tribe, where Native American resources are discovered, will evaluate the significance of the resource.</p>	
	<p><b>M-HZ-1</b> In order to supplement the 2004 soil samples, prior to any excavation of lakebed material for the proposed project, the County would conduct sampling and analytical testing of lakebed soils in order to determine the presence of any potentially hazardous soils due to the presence of contaminants that may have accumulated within the lakebed sediment of both the east and west basins. The County would collect and analyze up to 35 soil samples in each basin. Soils testing would be completed prior to re-use and/or off-site export of any material excavated from the lakebed basins. Soils disposed of at the Sycamore Landfill would be required to have been tested for hazardous materials, and confirmed to not contain substantial quantities of significant contaminants, no more than six months prior to receiving the materials.</p> <p><b>M-HZ-2</b> If hazardous soils are encountered, a third party specializing in the handling of hazardous materials will be hired to properly handle and dispose hazardous soils in accordance with state and federal requirements.</p>	Less Than Significant

This page intentionally left blank