SUMMARY

S.1 Project Synopsis

Location

The existing Las Colinas Detention Facility (LCDF) is located at the northern terminus of Cottonwood Avenue, north of Mission Gorge Road on County-owned land that lies within the boundaries of the City of Santee. The site is located on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute El Cajon quadrangle map, Township 15 South, Range 1 West. The facility is operated on a 15.98-acre site immediately west of the 42.3-acre Edgemoor Skilled Nursing Facility. The location for the proposed replacement facility includes the existing LCDF site, undeveloped property to the north and east, and a portion of the Edgemoor Skilled Nursing Facility site to the east encompassing a total of 45 acres.

Setting

In a regional context, the project site is located in the southwestern portion of a large tract of County-owned land within the southern portion of the City of Santee. The site is approximately 14 miles northeast of downtown San Diego, 16 miles east of the Pacific Ocean, just north of the City of El Cajon and east of the City of Santee's municipal boundary with the City of San Diego near the Tierrasanta community. The project site is located within the San Diego River watershed, which is a long triangular-shaped area of about 440 square miles draining to the San Diego River. Habitat types in this area of San Diego County generally consist of coastal sage scrub, southern willow scrub, non-native grassland, disturbed lands and developed areas.

Land uses surrounding the project site include: residential subdivisions to the southeast (and east of Magnolia Avenue); the Edgemoor Skilled Nursing Facility to the immediate east; single family residences to the immediate south; the currently developing office/commercial uses associated with the City's Town Center Specific Plan to the south, and west; the City's Fire Station No. 4 to the immediate south; and undeveloped land and the San Diego River to the north. The Santee Transit Center is roughly 2,500 feet to the southwest of the project site and provides a trolley line and bus service to the area.

The project site is a combination of existing LCDF buildings, disturbed lands, and scattered vegetation and is surrounded by existing and planned office/commercial uses, existing residential development, and the San Diego River. Developed land uses on the site consist of the existing LCDF and the Edgemoor Skilled Nursing Facility. The County, as part of a separate project, is in the process of replacing Edgemoor Skilled Nursing Facility with a new facility that is being constructed north of the San Diego River and south of Mast Boulevard. Once construction of the new 150,000-square foot hospital is complete, Edgemoor patients will vacate the old buildings

and the existing Edgemoor facility will be demolished. The demolition of three Edgemoor buildings would be required as part of the LCDF project and therefore impacts associated with demolition of the three buildings are addressed in this EIR. However, the EIR for the demolition of Edgemoor will analyze the impacts of demolishing all of the Edgemoor buildings, including the three buildings also analyzed in this LCDF EIR.

The project site is relatively level, with an elevation of approximately 340 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). No earthquake faults are known to traverse the project site. The nearest known active fault is the Rose Canyon Fault located approximately 13 miles to the west. As described in *Section 1.2.1.6*, the proposed project site is located within a FEMA 100-year flood zone, and within a "special flood hazards inundated by 100-year flood" designated by the City of Santee.

Description

The proposed project consists of the replacement of the existing LCDF with a new 1,216-bed women's detention facility. In addition to an increase in the size of the facility to accommodate the projected increase in the female inmate population, the proposed LCDF would include additional facilities and services to facilitate implementation of the San Diego County Sheriff's Department's (SDSD's) behavioral management philosophy. The new facility would also be designed to ensure the safety of staff, inmates, and the public while providing increased operational efficiency. The proposed LCDF project site consists of 45 acres of County-owned property located within the City of Santee, consisting of the existing approximately 16-acre existing LCDF site and a portion (approximately 29 acres) of the Edgemoor Skilled Nursing Facility site.

The project site can be easily accessed from the nearby Interstate Highway (I)-8 and State Routes (SR)-67 and SR-125, as well as major arterial roadways and public transportation services. The nearest Trolley Station (Santee Town Center) is located approximately 2,500 feet west of LCDF, and the nearest bus stop is approximately 1,130 feet away.

Water, electricity, sewer and other necessary utility needs will be provided by the applicable utilities, including Padre Dam Municipal Water District (PDMWD) and San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E).

The proposed construction is anticipated to take 36 months and would be conducted in two phases: Phase I and Phase II. Phase I of the proposed project would include infrastructure improvements (utilities) and construction of an essentially 'stand-alone' facility, including a security administration complex, medical unit, food services facilities, program building(s), a facility administration building, an energy plant sized to support the campus at buildout, and an estimated 832 inmate beds, depending on the demand for beds during the transition phase. Phase

II would consist of two main components: (1) demolition and remediation of the existing LCDF site; and (2) construction of the Phase II components of the proposed LCDF.

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

Table S-1 provides a summary of the impacts, mitigation, and the level of significance after mitigation for each significant effect for the proposed project addressed in *Chapter 2*.0 of the EIR.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS			
2.1 Cultural Resources			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.1.2.1 Historical Resources			
CR-1 and CR-3	Direct and cumulative potential impacts to three historical buildings	M-CR-1 Proposed mitigation for impacts to the Santa Maria Building, Dietary Building, and Rehabilitation Building includes: • Preparation of Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level III documentation in accordance with the National Park Service's *Historic American Building Survey Guidelines for Preparing Written and Historical Descriptive Data*; • Written documentation and photographs of the history of the site and/or buildings, including documentation of oral interviews; and • Salvage of items such as call buttons and chapel windows that can be archived and/or incorporated into a future County facility.	CR-1: Significant and Unmitigable CR-3: Significant and Unmitigable
2.2 Transportation / Traffic			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.2.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis			
TR-1 and TR-4	Cumulatively significant impacts to the Cuyamaca Street and Mission Gorge Road intersection	M-TR-1 For the intersection of Cuyamaca Street and Mission Gorge Road, the Traffic Improvement Master Plan recommends upgrading traffic signal equipment to provide better trolley and vehicle traffic flow through the Cuyamaca Street corridor as a mid-range and long-term improvement for the intersection. The Master Plan identifies an additional northbound right turn lane as long-term capacity enhancement to improve the LOS as this intersection. According to	Significant and Unmitigable

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

		the Master Plan, the estimated cost for the improvements to this intersection is $382,000. Mitigation measures must be roughly proportional to the impacts caused by the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines, section 15126.4(a)(4)(B). The project would contribute 3.6% of the cumulative traffic at this intersection. (Note: this percentage would be 2.9% under the 4-lane Riverview Parkway scenario). Given the small percentage of traffic that the project would contribute, a mitigation measure requiring the County to construct these intersection improvements would not be roughly proportional to the project's impact. Therefore, this mitigation measure is infeasible.	
TR-2 and TR-6	Cumulatively significant impacts to the Prospect Avenue/Magnolia Avenue intersection	M-TR-2 For the intersection of Prospect Avenue/Magnolia Avenue, the Transportation Improvement Master Plan recommends that the existing controller be changed to a Caltrans-compliant controller for better communications with Caltrans signal and for a smoother traffic flow at the intersection. According to the Master Plan, the estimated cost for the improvements to this intersection is $338,000. Mitigation measures must be roughly proportional to the impacts caused by the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines, section 15126.4(a)(4)(B). The project would contribute 2.4% of the cumulative traffic at this intersection. Given the small percentage of traffic that the project would contribute, a mitigation measure requiring the County to construct these intersection improvements would not be roughly proportional to the project's impact. Therefore, this mitigation measure is infeasible.	Significant and Unmitigable

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

TR-3	Cumulatively significant impacts to the Magnolia Avenue roadway segment between Mission Gorge Road and Riverview Parkway	M-TR-3 For the segment of Magnolia Avenue between Mission Gorge Road and Riverview Parkway, the Transportation Improvement Master Plan does not recommend a specific improvement project as Riverview Parkway is currently a proposed roadway. The widening of Magnolia Avenue between Mission Gorge Road and Chubb Lane would mitigate the cumulative impact. According to the Master Plan, the estimated cost for the improvements to this segment is $3,395,300. Mitigation measures must be roughly proportional to the impacts caused by the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines, section 15126.4(a)(4)(B). The project would contribute 2.1% of the cumulative traffic. (Note: this percentage would be 1.37% under the 4-lane Riverview Parkway scenario). Given the small percentage of traffic that the project would contribute, a mitigation measure requiring the County to construct these improvements would not be roughly proportional to the project's impact. Therefore, this mitigation measure is infeasible.	Significant and Unmitigable
TR-5	Cumulatively significant impacts to the Magnolia Avenue/Mission Gorge Road intersection	M-TR-4 For the intersection of Magnolia Avenue/Mission Gorge Road, the Transportation Improvement Master Plan states that there is no additional capacity at the intersection in any direction. The Master Plan recommends improving signal coordination by relocating westbound advanced loop detectors to the Caltrans suggested minimum setback distance of 285 feet as a minor modification. According to the Master Plan, the estimated cost for the improvements to this intersection is $3,309,200. Mitigation measures must be roughly proportional to the impacts caused by the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines, section 15126.4(a)(4)(B). The project would contribute 2% of the cumulative traffic at this intersection. (Note: this percentage would	Significant and Unmitigable

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

		be 0.24% under the 4-lane Riverview Parkway scenario.) Given the small percentage of traffic that the project would contribute, a mitigation measure requiring the County to construct these intersection improvements would not be roughly proportional to the project's impact. Therefore, this mitigation measure is infeasible.	
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT			
2.1 Cultural Resources			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.1.1.2 Archaeological Resources			
CR-2	Potential to result in impacts to unknown buried cultural resources during project grading activities	M-CR-2a Mitigation measures employed with regard to cultural resources will comply with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources, dated December 5, 2007. Mitigation includes monitoring by the Project Archaeologist and a Native American during the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, determined necessary by the Project Archaeologist. Monitoring of the cutting of previously disturbed deposits would be determined by the Project Archaeologist. If potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the Project Archaeologist would have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the County Staff Archaeologist, would determine the significance of the discovered resources. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts would be prepared by the Project Archaeologist and approved by the Staff Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods.	CR-2: Less than Significant CR-3: Significant and Unmitigable (as identified above)

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

		M-CR-2b All cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated at a San Diego facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. The mitigation would be considered complete when the County Staff Archaeologist received evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid. A report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use prior to grading. The report shall include Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms. If any human bones are discovered, the Project Archaeologist would contract the County Coroner. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, Shall be Contacted by the Project Archaeologist in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains. M-CR-3 Refer to M-CR-1.	

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

2.3 Biological Resources			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.3.2.1 Special Status Species			
B-1	Direct impacts to nesting birds/raptors	M-BI-1 To avoid any direct impacts to white-tailed kite, Cooper's hawk, California horned lark, raptor species, burrowing owl, or other nesting birds, removal of habitat that may support active nests shall occur outside of the combined breeding season of January 15 to September 15. If removal of habitat must occur during the breeding season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds within the construction area. The pre-construction survey must be conducted within 10 calendar days of the start of construction and the results submitted to the County for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. Nests that are detected within the proposed impact areas shall be flagged and avoided until nesting is completed. The nest shall be monitored to ensure that no nest is removed or disturbed until all young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. Construction activities shall be avoided for a distance of 300 feet around active nests identified within the project impact area.	Less than Significant
B-2	Indirect noise impacts to offsite nesting birds	M-BI-2a To avoid indirect impacts from demolition and construction noise to breeding or nesting least Bell's vireo, white-tailed kite, yellow-breasted chat, Cooper's hawk, yellow warbler, and raptors within the noise contour greater than 60 dB(A) Leq, which is a distance of up to 500 feet from the project site, grading and other mechanized construction activities that produce noise in excess of 60 dB(A) Leq shall be conducted outside of the combined breeding season of January 15 to September 15 for these species. If construction activities must occur during the breeding season, a qualified	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

		biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting raptors and special status bird species listed above within areas exposed to noise levels greater than 60 dB(A) Leq. The pre-construction survey must be conducted within 10 calendar days of the start of construction and the results submitted to the County for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. M-BI-2b If nesting birds are detected during the pre-construction/pre-demolition survey, noise attenuating measures, such as noise walls or berms shall be used to reduce the level of noise within the habitat to less than 60 dB(A) Leq. A qualified acoustician shall monitor noise weekly during site clearing and monthly during active construction or as applicable based on construction schedule when excessive noise may be produced in order to document that the noise levels are kept below 60 dB(A) Leq.	
2.3.2.2 Riparian or Sensitive Natural Communities			
B-3	Permanent removal of 0.6 acre of disturbed coastal sage scrub and 4.8 acres of non-native grassland	M-BI-3a Prior to project construction, preserve 1.2 acres (2:1 ratio) of Diegan coastal sage scrub and 2.4 acres (0.5:1 ratio) of non-native grassland off-site (*Table 2.3-1*), in accordance with mitigation ratios generally accepted by the County for impacts to these types of habitat. Proposed mitigation consists of purchasing credits at the Rancho San Diego Mitigation Bank. M-BI-3b Impacts to coastal sage scrub habitat may be allowed by obtaining a Habitat Loss Permit in accordance with Section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act. The Section 4(d) Special Rule allows a loss of five percent of coastal sage scrub habitat in any individual	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

		subregion during the preparation of a regional NCCP. The wildlife agencies must concur with the Section 4(d) findings prior to allowing the impacts to coastal sage scrub habitat.	
2.3.2.4 Federal Wetlands			
B-4	Loss of 0.04 acre of ACOE/CDFG/ RWQCB-jurisdictional ephemeral waters	M-BI-4 Prior to impacts to 0.037 acre (0.04 acre when rounded) of ephemeral drainage under the jurisdiction of ACOE, CDFG and RWQCB, the County shall obtain the following permits: ACOE 404 permit, RWQCB 401 Water Quality Certification, and a CDFG Code 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement. Impacts shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio by creation or purchase of credits for the creation of jurisdictional habitat of similar functions and values. A suitable mitigation site shall be selected and approved by the resource agencies during the permitting process. The site shall be located within the vicinity of the drainage impact or within the watershed of the San Diego River. A conceptual wetland mitigation plan shall be prepared by the County and approved by the resource agencies as required by the applicable permits.	Less than Significant
2.3.2.5 Local Policies, Ordinances, and Adopted Plans			
B-5	Removal of one coast live oak tree on the existing LCDF site	M-BI-5 Impacts to one coast live oak tree will be mitigated by planting two replacement coast live oak trees. The replacement trees shall be at least 5-gallon size since trees that are of this size have been shown to be healthier and to grow more quickly than trees that are in larger containers. The trees shall be planted within the landscaped areas of the proposed project where it is suitable to include a relatively large tree and shall be monitored for a period of 5 years. If the trees die during the monitoring period, the trees shall be replaced.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

2.4 Geology and Soils			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.4.2.3 Seismic Induced Ground Failures Including Liquefaction			
GE-1	Indirect geology and soils impacts related to liquefaction effects	M-GE-1 Prior to grading, the County shall ensure that the proposed project's grading plans demonstrate compliance with remediation recommendations in the June 28, 2004 Geotechnical Investigation for the Town Center Specific Plan prepared by Geocon (2004), including but not limited to: a) Previously placed fill and alluvium within areas of planned new grading or improvements shall be removed and recompacted. b) To provide uniform bearing conditions for support of planned buildings and improvements, the upper 5 feet of Younger and Older Alluvium shall be removed and recompacted. c) Finish-grade elevations for building pads shall be designed so that at least 10 feet of properly compacted fill exists above the groundwater to provide a sufficient thickness of non-liquefiable soil. d) Prior to placing new fill, the base of overexcavations shall be scarified to a depth of at least 12 inches, heavily moisture conditioned, and compacted. This should result in densification of the upper 2 to 3 feet of existing soil at the base of the excavation. Fill soils may then be placed and compacted in layers to the design finish-grade elevations. The layers shall be no thicker than will allow for adequate bonding and compaction. All fill (including scarified ground surfaces and wall and utility trench backfill) shall be compacted to at least 90 percent of maximum dry density at near-optimum moisture content or slightly above as determined by ASTM D1557-02.	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

2.4.2.5 Soil Erosion/Unstable Soils			
GE-2	Unstable and expansive soils could result in damage to facilities	M-GE-2 Implementation of M-GE-1 described above would reduce impacts due to unstable soils to below a level of significance.	Less than Significant
2.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.5.2.1 Hazardous Materials			
HZ-1	Accidental spills of hazardous materials during construction activities could potentially cause soil or groundwater contamination	M-HZ-1a Prior to construction (including demolition), all contractor and subcontractor project personnel shall receive training regarding the appropriate work practices necessary to comply with the applicable environmental laws and regulations, including, without limitation, hazardous materials spill prevention and response measures. M-HZ-1b The construction contractor shall ensure that no hazardous materials are disposed of or released onto the ground, the underlying groundwater, or any surface water. Totally enclosed containment shall be provided for all trash. All potentially hazardous material construction waste shall be removed to a hazardous waste facility permitted or otherwise authorized to treat, store, or dispose of such materials. M-HZ-1c A hazardous substance management, handling, storage, disposal, and emergency response plan shall be prepared and implemented by the construction contractor. The plan shall include measures that comply with all applicable laws and regulations to ensure that risks of release of materials through use, transport and disposal of	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

		the materials are reduced to the maximum extent practicable. The final plan shall be approved by the County Department of General Services. M-HZ-1d The construction contractor shall ensure that hazardous materials spill kits are maintained onsite for small spills. The construction contractor shall ensure that hazardous materials spill kits are maintained onsite for small spills.	
HZ-2	During demolition and construction, contaminants could be mobilized if contaminated soil is exposed to runoff that could transport hazardous substances outside the work area, which could cause a threat to the public and waters in the vicinity of the project	M-HZ-2a If hazardous waste and/or hazardous materials are encountered during demolition of existing facilities, grading, construction, or operation of proposed facilities, the County shall ensure compliance with CCR Title 23 and Title 26 and health and safety regulations as enforced by the San Diego County DEH. Excavated soils appearing to be impacted by hazardous waste or materials shall be characterized, managed and disposed of in accordance with the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) manual. This determination can be made by a visual (i.e., stained soil) and/or odor assessment. The San Diego County DEH and RWQCB shall be contacted regarding the possible reuse of soils contaminated by hydrocarbons for backfill. M-HZ-2b Due to the potential for residual pesticides to be in the soil on the project site, soil samples shall be collected on the proposed project site prior to construction. Samples shall be analyzed by a certified laboratory for organochlorine pesticides. The sampling program shall be conducted in accordance with the San Diego County SAM manual. If pesticides above permissible exposure limits for	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

		residential uses are detected from the site, a program shall be implemented by San Diego County General Services to properly remediate affected soils in accordance with the County DEH's SAM manual standards. M-HZ-2c Any septic systems and above ground storage tanks located onsite shall be removed and/or closed under permit and approval of County DEH prior to grading.	
HZ-3	The existing LCDF structures may contain hazardous materials such as asbestos and lead paint, and these substances could be released during demolition, also resulting in a significant indirect impact	M-HZ-3a Prior to the start of demolition, an asbestos survey shall be performed by the Department of Environmental Health (DEH), Occupational Health Program (OHP) for all onsite structures that will be disturbed by demolition activities in accordance with County of San Diego Administrative Manual Asbestos Policy 0050-01-9. The survey shall cover the entire building to be demolished, document the location and types of asbestos found, and determine whether any on-site abatement of asbestos containing materials is necessary. If asbestos is located during the survey, an abatement work plan shall be prepared by County DEH in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations for removal of such materials. The work plan shall include specifications for the proper removal and disposal of asbestos. County DEH, OHP, or designee will provide project surveillance of the asbestos work activities to ensure that proper controls are implemented and to ensure compliance with the work plan requirements and abatement contractor specifications. Any necessary asbestos sampling and abatement shall be done by a Cal/OSHA certified asbestos consultant/contractor. In addition, the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

		(Cal/OSHA) have notification requirements pertaining to the disturbance of asbestos containing materials (ACMs). When applicable, these notifications shall be made prior to the activity as follows: a. 10-day notification to APCD for renovation/demolition activities (Note: These are 10 working days; asbestos activities can start on the 11th day. Working days means Monday through Friday including holidays that fall on these days. b. 24-hour notification to Cal/OSHA. M-HZ-3b Prior to the start of demolition, a lead based paint survey shall be performed by a Certified Lead Inspector/Assessor as defined in Title 17, CCR Section 35005 for all onsite structures that will be disturbed by demolition activities in accordance with local, state and federal regulations. The survey shall cover the entire building to be demolished, document the location and types of lead based paint found, and determine whether any on-site abatement of lead based paint is necessary. If lead based paint is located during the survey, an abatement work plan shall be prepared by County DEH in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations for any necessary removal of such materials. The work plan shall include specifications for the proper removal and disposal of lead based paint. County DEH, OHP, or designee will provide project surveillance of the lead based paint work activities to ensure that proper controls are implemented and to ensure compliance with the work plan requirements and abatement contractor specifications.	
HZ-4 & 5	If the BEP document was not updated to account for the additional hazardous materials that could be used, a significant indirect impact could result. Also,	M-HZ-4 & 5 Prior to opening Las Colinas, SDSD shall update its BEP to include the transport, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during operation of the proposed project. These updates shall	HZ-4 & 5: Less than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

	the project's potential to emit and/or handle hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of schools would be potentially significant.	include the use of chemicals currently used at the LCDF, as well as any new chemicals to be used at the new facility. The updated BEP shall be submitted to the San Diego County DEH for review and approval. All chemicals shall be managed in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (Health and Safety Code Division 20, Chapter 6.5) and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (CCR, Title 22, Division 4.5). Also, prior to construction, the State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) shall be contacted to determine if a DTSC permit is required.	
2.6 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.6.2.1 Water Quality Standards			
HY-1	Without proper management of sediment and pollutants, the project could violate water quality standards	M-HY-1 The County shall implement Low Impact Development Integrated Management Practices (LID IMPs) to reduce stormwater runoff rates and duration. The LID IMPs shall provide at least a 19.1 percent reduction in stormwater runoff rates to achieve no net increase in flow quantities and rates discharged from the project site. This reduction shall be accomplished by strategic placement of LID IMPs uniformly throughout the project site to mimic the natural flow regime and capture any net increase in runoff through increased infiltration. The following specific LID IMPs shall be considered in the project's final design to meet the 19.1 percent reduction in stormwater runoff: • Vegetated roof systems • Infiltration trench/islands/beds • Vegetated or rock swales/filter strips • Rain water harvesting (cisterns/rain barrels) • Bioretention • Permeable pavement and materials	Less than Significant

Table S-1 (Continued)
Summary of Significant Effects

2.6.2.3 Existing or Planned Drainage System			
HY-2	The project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces compared to the existing conditions on the site, resulting in the potential for direct impacts to the existing drainage system	M-HY-2 The City of Santee has established drainage fees, which are typically collected upon issuance of a building permit for projects within City limits. While the County is not required to obtain a building permit from the City, the County shall pay a fee based on City's development impact fee worksheet. The County shall pay the fee before the start of construction.	Less than Significant

S.3 Areas of Controversy

Respondents to the NOP public scoping period expressed concern about several environmental issues. Key issues include configuration of the proposed project, compatibility with surrounding land uses, public safety, and project alternatives. These concerns have been identified as areas of known controversy and are analyzed in the corresponding issue areas in this EIR. *Appendix A* contains the comment letters received in response to the NOP.

S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

The issues to be resolved by the decision-making body, the Board of Supervisors, include the choice among alternatives and whether and how to mitigate the significant effects. In addition the Board of Supervisors will have to determine if the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the potential significant unavoidable impacts related to Cultural Resources and Transportation/Traffic. In making this decision, the Board will have to balance the benefits of the proposed project against the project's unavoidable significant effects.

S.5 Project Alternatives

A brief summary of each project alternative is provided in *Table S-2*. A summary of significant impacts resulting from the proposed project compared to impacts resulting from the project alternatives is provided in *Table S-3*.

Table S-2
Descriptions of Project Alternatives

Alternative	Description
Mid-rise Alternative (see *Section 4.2.1*)	This alternative assumes that the existing LCDF would be demolished and a new facility would be built on 16 acres of County-owned land. Development of a replacement women's detention facility using a multi-story mid-rise facility is designed to use less ground space than proposed for the project. The 16-acre site would be immediately east of and adjacent to the existing LCDF. Development would require a four-story facility and approximately 120,000 to 150,000 square feet on approximately eight of the acres, with the remaining eight acres used for recreation, parking, and buffer. This alternative would accommodate 1,216 female inmates, the same as proposed by the project. The same staff levels would be required as under the Proposed Project. With implementation of the Mid-rise Alternative, at least one of the three historical buildings, the Santa Maria Building, would still be impacted. Therefore, while impacts would be reduced when compared to the Proposed Project by avoiding impacts to the Dietary Building and the Rehabilitation Building, significant unmitigable impacts to historical resources would still result. Regarding biological resources, this alternative would result in similar impacts to nesting birds/raptors, avoid the Proposed Project's impacts to coastal sage scrub and one coast live oak tree, and reduce impacts to unvegetated waters and non-native grassland. For traffic, the EIR analysis indicates that the Proposed Project would result in traffic impacts that would be significant and not mitigated, since no feasible, available mitigation measures have been identified in this EIR to reduce significant impacts to below a level of significance. The Mid-rise Alternative would not avoid the significant impacts of

Table S-2 (Continued)
Descriptions of Project Alternatives

Alternative	Description
	the Proposed Project, since the same number of beds and same staffing levels would be required; therefore, traffic impacts would be similar. This alternative would result in greater visual impacts due to the height of four-story structures. This alternative would meet three of the project objectives, but would not meet the County's project objective 4. The development of a mid-rise facility would inhibit implementation of the SDSD's inmate management philosophy, because that philosophy requires a physical layout with clear lines-of-sight. Without clear lines-of-sight, some independent inmate movement would not be permitted and SDSD's "choice and change" management approach would not be implemented.
20-Acre Alternative (see *Section 4.2.2*)	This alternative assumes that the existing LCDF would be demolished and a new facility would be built on 20 acres of County-owned land immediately east of the existing LCDF. This alternative would implement Phase I of the proposed project, but would not construct additional facilities beyond Phase I. The alternative would accommodate 800 female inmates, instead of the 1,216 inmate capacity provided by the proposed project. All structures would be one or two stories, and would result in more two story buildings when compared to the Proposed Project in order to accommodate all the same programs and facilities on a smaller campus. With implementation of the Mid-rise Alternative, at least one of the three historical buildings, the Santa Maria Building, would still be impacted. Therefore, while impacts would be reduced when compared to the Proposed Project by avoiding impacts to the Dietary Building and the Rehabilitation Building, significant unmitigable impacts to historical resources would still result. Regarding biological resources, this alternative would result in similar impacts to nesting birds/raptors, avoid the Proposed Project's impacts to coastal sage scrub and one coast live oak tree, and reduce impacts to vegetated waters and non-native grassland. For traffic, the EIR analysis indicates that the Proposed Project would result in traffic impacts that would be significant and not mitigated, since no feasible, available mitigation measures have been identified in this EIR to reduce significant impacts to below a level of significance. The 20-acre Alternative would reduce some of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project, since the same number of beds would be reduced from 1,216 to 800. However, since most of Proposed Project's traffic impacts are cumulative, traffic impacts resulting from this alternative would be reduced but still significant and unmitigated. This alternative would meet three of the County's project objectives, but would not meet project objective 2, since only 800 beds would be provided.
Otay Mesa Alternative (see *Section 4.2.3*)	Under this alternative, the existing LCDF in Santee would be closed and demolished, and a new women's detention facility would be developed on the Otay Mesa Alternative site. This alternative would accommodate 1,216 inmates, the same capacity as the proposed project. It is anticipated that significant impacts to cultural resources at the alternative site could be mitigated. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources would be reduced with the Otay Mesa Alternative when compared to the proposed project as a result of avoiding significant historical resources. The Otay Mesa Alternative would require the development of an undeveloped 45-acre site, which would impact sensitive vegetation (non-native grassland) on the site. These biological impacts would be greater than those of the proposed project. The Otay Mesa Alternative would avoid traffic impacts, while the proposed project would result in a significant and unmitigable traffic impacts. The Otay Mesa Alternative would meet project objectives 1 and 2, but would not meet project objectives 3 and 4. Specifically, under this alternative, a women's detention facility would not be built in a location that facilitates the transporting of arrested female offenders from throughout the County to the detention facility, court facilities, and other service providers such as medical and mental health facilities (objective 3), and it would inhibit the implementation of the SDSD's inmate

Table S-2 (Continued)
Descriptions of Project Alternatives

Alternative	Description
	management philosophy because the site does not have convenient access to public transportation services that support the visitation program (objective 4). The proposed project includes a centrally-located booking facility that serves all regional law enforcement agencies. Moving the booking facility to the Otay Mesa Alternative site would result in a net increase in the amount of time law enforcement officers would spend transporting female offenders and would correspondingly decrease the time these officers are available in their respective communities. In contrast, the proposed project would allow law enforcement officers to spend more time on their patrol beats while also reducing staffing costs (overtime), fuel expenditures, and vehicle maintenance (wear-and-tear). The proposed project also offers overall savings in staffing, drive time and mileage for SDSD's other units, including the prisoner bussing program and court security, due to the shorter distance between the County Operations Center and most of the County's justice facilities and health and mental health providers. The Otay Mesa Alternative would not effectively meet project objective 4 due to the lack of convenient public transit options. The proposed project includes an expanded visitation center to encourage productive inmate visits and to support the rehabilitation program. The closest MTS bus stop to the Otay Mesa Alternative is 1.1 miles from the site, and the pedestrian route does not have continuous sidewalks or street lighting for safe pedestrian access. No other public transportation is available in the vicinity of the Otay Mesa Alternative. In contrast, the proposed project offers two means of public transportation within a more reasonable distance (1,130 feet to MTS bus stop and 2,500 feet to Trolley) and with safe access.
Camp Elliott Alternative (see *Section 4.2.4*)	With implementation of the Camp Elliott Alternative, the existing LCDF in Santee would be closed and demolished and a new multi-custody women's detention facility capable of accommodating 1,216 women inmates would be built on the Camp Elliott site, which is an undeveloped piece of land between Scripps Ranch and Highway 52. It is anticipated that significant impacts to cultural resources could be mitigated for the alternative site, and therefore impacts to cultural resources would be reduced with the Camp Elliott Alternative when compared to the Proposed Project, as a result of avoidance of significant historical resources. The area around the site is dominated by sensitive biological resources and constitutes one of the largest and biologically most important remaining open space areas in San Diego. Biological impacts resulting from this alternative would be greater than those of the proposed project due to known sensitive resources onsite and impacts resulting from access road construction. Grading impacts are also greater when compared to the proposed project due to the site's hilly terrain and the potential for landslides. Due to the potential presence of hazardous materials and nearby MCAS operations, impacts resulting from hazards and hazardous materials are greater than those anticipated under the proposed project. Implementation of the Camp Elliott Alternative is not anticipated to generate significant impacts to traffic. Implementation of this alternative would require development of access and would result in additional impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, air quality, noise and hydrology. Therefore, while the alternative would avoid significant impacts of the Proposed Project (traffic), it would result in additional impacts in other issue areas. This alternative would meet project objectives 1 through 3. It would not meet project objective 4 as it would not provide convenient public transportation.
Campo Alternative (see *Section 4.2.5*)	Under this alternative, the existing LCDF in Santee would be closed and demolished, and a new women's detention facility would be developed on the County's JRF property in the community of Campo in Eastern San Diego County. This alternative would accommodate 1,216 inmates, the

Table S-2 (Continued)
Descriptions of Project Alternatives

Alternative	Description
	same capacity as the proposed project. It is anticipated that any impacts to cultural resources at the alternative site could be mitigated. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources would be reduced with the Campo Alternative when compared to the Proposed Project due to avoidance of significant impacts on historical resources. Biological impacts with this alternative would be greater than those of the proposed project due to sensitive resources onsite and impacts resulting from developing an undeveloped site. Because the site has hilly terrain, more grading would be required at this site than at the proposed project site, and geological impacts are anticipated to be greater. The Campo Alternative would meet project objectives 1 and 2, but would not meet project objectives 3 and 4. Specifically, under this alternative, a women's detention facility would not be built in a location that facilitates the transporting of arrested female offenders from throughout the County to the detention facility, court facilities, and other service providers, such as medical and mental health facilities (objective 3), and it would inhibit the implementation of the SDSD's inmate management philosophy because the site does not have convenient access to public transportation services that support the visitation program (objective 4). The proposed project includes a centrally-located booking facility that serves all regional law enforcement agencies. Moving the booking facility to the Campo Alternative site would result in a net increase in the amount of time law enforcement officers would spend transporting female offenders and would correspondingly decrease the time these officers are available in their respective communities. In contrast, the proposed project would allow law enforcement officers to spend more time on their patrol beats while also reducing staffing costs (overtime), fuel expenditures, and vehicle maintenance (wear-and-tear). The proposed project also offers overall savings in staffing, drive time and mileage for SDSD's other units, including the prisoner bussing program and court security, due to the shorter distance between the County Operations Center and most of the County's justice facilities and health and mental health providers. The Campo Alternative would not effectively meet project objective 4 due to the lack of convenient public transit options. The proposed project includes an expanded visitation center to encourage productive inmate visits and to support the rehabilitation program. Public bus service is available in Campo from MTS (route 888), but would not provide convenient access to this alternative site because the closest bus stop is 2.5 miles to the north and the bus runs only on Mondays and Fridays. No other public transportation is available for the Campo Alternative. In contrast, the proposed project offers two means of public transportation within a more reasonable distance (1,130 feet to MTS bus stop and 2,500 feet to Trolley).
No Project Alternative (see *Section 4.2.6*)	With implementation of the No Project Alternative, the existing LCDF would stay in its same location and the surrounding land would be built out consistent with the City of Santee Town Center Specific Plan Amendment, which calls for business park commercial/office uses. The old structures and deficiencies at the LCDF would not be replaced with modern facilities or expanded to meet the County's projected needs for multi-custody women offenders, thereby threatening SDSD's ability to meet the urgent need to provide modern facilities that will reduce overcrowding and deficient conditions at the existing LCDF. The proposed project's identified significant impacts would generally be the same under the No Project Alternative. Impacts to traffic would be greater due to increased vehicle trips associated with commercial development that would occur without the construction of the new LCDF.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table S-3
Comparison of Proposed Project and Alternatives' Impacts

Issue Area	Proposed Project	Mid-rise Alternative	20-acre Alternative	Otay Mesa	Camp Elliott	Campo	No Project*
Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project							
Cultural Resources	Significant and unmitigable.	Similar when compared to the Proposed Project since it would still result in significant unmitigable impacts to at least one historical building.	Similar when compared to the Proposed Project since it would still result in significant unmitigable impacts to at least one historical building.	Less than the Proposed Project since this alternative would not likely result in unmitigable impacts.	Less than the Proposed Project the Proposed Project since this alternative would not likely result in unmitigable impacts.	Less than the Proposed Project the Proposed Project since this alternative would not likely result in unmitigable impacts.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.
Biological Resources	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	Less than the Proposed Project.	Less than the Proposed Project.	Greater than the Proposed Project due to the requirement to develop an undeveloped 45-acre site, and presence of sensitive onsite vegetation communities.	Greater than the Proposed Project due to known sensitive resources onsite and impacts resulting from access road construction.	Greater than the Proposed Project due to undeveloped nature and resources present.	The same as the Proposed Project.
Geology/Soils	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.	Greater than the Proposed Project due to hilly terrain and potential for landslides.	Greater than the Proposed Project due to hilly terrain.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.	Less than the Proposed Project due to lack of nearby sensitive receptors.	Greater than the Proposed Project due to ordnance hazard potential and nearby MCAS operations.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.

Table S-3 (Continued)
Comparison of Proposed Project and Alternatives' Impacts

Issue Area	Proposed Project	Mid-rise Alternative	20-acre Alternative	Otay Mesa	Camp Elliott	Campo	No Project*
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.	Less than the Proposed Project as the site is not within a 100-year floodplain.	Less than the Proposed Project as site is not within 100-year floodplain.	Less than the Proposed Project as the site is not within a 100-year floodplain.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.
Transportation/Traffic	Significant; no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts to less than significant; therefore impacts are assumed to be unmitigated.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.	The same or similar as the Proposed Project.	Less than the Proposed Project.	Less than the Proposed Project.	Less than the Proposed Project.	Greater than the Proposed Project due to increased vehicle trips associated with commercial development.

* Describes impacts under the assumption that if the Proposed Project is not approved, the LCDF would stay in its current location, and the surrounding land would be built out consistent with the City of Santee Town Center Specific Plan Amendment.

INTRODUCTION

In April 2008, the County released the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Las Colinas Detention Facility Project for public review and comment. The County received numerous comments on the Draft EIR, some of which stated that the County should add more information to the EIR and recirculate it. In response to the comments, the County made substantial revisions to the Draft EIR. A summary of the major revisions is as follows:

- Clarify and expand the project description to include project design features, such as restrictions on lighting, restrictions on and description of outdoor announcement system, description of landscaping, description of security fencing, reduce the number of parking spaces and explain that energy plant does not produce electricity.
- Change the project description to include construction of a portion of Riverview Parkway to provide access to the proposed facility and revise the analysis of project impacts accordingly.
- Update the list of reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects.
- Change the project description to include a possible realignment of the existing 15-inch sewer line on site that currently serves LCDF, rather than connecting to the future 18-inch sewer proposed within Riverview Parkway.
- Move the analysis of urban decay to the Land Use section and expand the analysis.
- Change the conclusion on mitigation of cumulative traffic impacts to infeasible and explain why mitigation is infeasible.
- Delete information from the Land Use section regarding the project's consistency/compatibility with Santee's General Plan and Town Center Specific Plan.
- Clarify the discussion of the Gillespie Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP).
- Clarify the discussion of the project's Emergency Evacuation Plan.
- Add information to analysis of potential noise impacts.
- Add information to section on Aesthetics regarding potential lighting impacts and potential visual character impacts.
- Revise the analysis of impacts to schools.
- Add information to Utilities and Service Systems regarding water supply.

- Revise the Otay Mesa Alternative to add information on travel time and distance for law enforcement agencies bringing women to LCDF for booking, and additional technical analyses.

Given the extensive changes to the Draft EIR in response to the comments, the County prepared this Revised Draft EIR for the proposed project and is recirculating the revised document for public review and comment. Because the County is recirculating the entire Revised Draft EIR, the County will not prepare written responses to the comments that were submitted on the April 2008 Draft EIR for inclusion in the final EIR. However, those comments will be included in the administrative record. The County will prepare written responses only to comments submitted on this recirculated Revised Draft EIR, and those written responses will be included in the final EIR. See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5(f)(1).