UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

RECORD OF DECISION

VISTA GRANDE DRAINAGE BASIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Golden Gate National Recreation Area
California

The Department of the Interior, National Park Service (NPS), has prepared this Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Vista Grande Drainage Basin Improvement Project at Fort Funston in San Francisco, California. This document includes a description of the background for the project, a statement of the decision made, a synopsis of other alternatives considered, a description of the environmentally preferable alternative, the basis for the decision, an appendix detailing measures to minimize environmental harm (Attachment 1), and an overview of public involvement and agency consultation in the decision-making process. Also attached is the Determination of Non-Impairment.

PROJECT BACKGROUND – PURPOSE AND NEED

The City of Daly City (Daly City) is proposing the Vista Grande Drainage Basin Improvement Project (Project) to address storm-related flooding in the Vista Grande Drainage Basin (Basin) while providing the additional benefit of augmenting the water level of Lake Merced. The Vista Grande storm drain system drains the northwestern portion of Daly City and an unincorporated portion of San Mateo County – areas originally within the watershed of Lake Merced. In the 1890s, the Vista Grande Canal and Tunnel were built to divert stormwater away from the lake to an outlet at the Pacific Ocean. The Ocean Outlet and a portion of the Tunnel are located within Fort Funston, part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), which is operated under the authority of the NPS. The existing Canal and Tunnel do not have adequate hydraulic capacity to convey peak storm flows, and this periodically causes backup of Tunnel flows into the Canal and flooding during peak storm events in adjacent low-lying residential areas and along John Muir Drive.

Additionally, the water level of Lake Merced has fluctuated historically from Elevation (El.) 13 feet (San Francisco City Datum) in the 1940s to a low of El. -3.2 feet in 1993. Since then, the water surface elevation (WSE) of Lake Merced has risen due to increases in average rainfall and water additions by the SFPUC. From 2006 to 2010, the lake level ranged from El. 4.8 feet to El. 6.9 feet with an average of approximately El. 5.8 feet. SFPUC has identified a goal of establishing maximum water levels in the lake that would serve beneficial uses and provide a reliable emergency water supply for firefighting and sanitation purposes. The range of potential elevation scenarios that could occur under this Project includes a mean of 6.5 to 8.5 feet, with a maximum high WSE of 9.5 feet.

The purpose and need for the Project is to alleviate flooding in the Vista Grande Drainage Basin and Canal, provide a sustainable source of water for management of Lake Merced water levels and quality, and ensure that the portion of the Project within federally managed lands is constructed, operated, and maintained in a manner that is consistent with the protection and enhancement of resources, values, and uses of lands and waters under federal jurisdiction. In considering whether to authorize such activities, the federal government has engaged in transparent, integrated, and informed decision-making to ensure that

any final decision conforms to applicable laws and regulations. In achieving the purpose and need for the Project, NPS's objectives for implementation of the Project include the following:

- Avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental impacts on park natural and cultural resources;
- During construction, ensure the health and safety of park visitors and staff, maintain access to and through Fort Funston, and minimize impacts on the visitor experience;
- Permanently improve public access to the beach below Fort Funston;
- Minimize disruption to recreational opportunities during construction; and
- Minimize impacts on park assets and sustain or restore all park assets (e.g., facilities, features, grounds) to pre-construction or better conditions.

DECISION (SELECTED ACTION)

The Selected Action is the proposed Project, identified as NPS' preferred alternative in the Final EIR/EIS. The proposed Project would achieve the goal of alleviating flooding in the Vista Grande Drainage Basin by expanding the hydraulic capacity of the Lake Merced Portal to the Tunnel to accommodate peak flows generated by the 25-year design storm. The Project would also provide a sustainable source of stormwater to manage the surface water elevation of Lake Merced. The Project as proposed by Daly City would consist of the following:

- Partial replacement of the existing Vista Grande Canal to incorporate a gross solid screening device, a constructed treatment wetland, and diversion and discharge structures to route some stormwater (and authorized non-stormwater) flows from the Vista Grande Canal to Lake Merced and to allow lake water to be used for summer treatment wetland maintenance, operation of which would be implemented in accordance with the initial Vista Grande Operational Plan, part of the proposed Lake Management Plan;
- Modification of the existing effluent gravity pipeline so that it may be used year round to convey treated effluent from the nearby North San Mateo County Sanitation District Wastewater Treatment Plant to the existing outlet and diffuser by gravity, and abandoning the force main pipeline;
- Modification of the existing lake overflow structure to include an adjustable weir and siphon that allows water from the lake to flow into the Canal and Tunnel;
- Replacement of the existing Vista Grande Tunnel to expand its hydraulic capacity and extend its operating lifetime and replacement of the Lake Merced Portal to the Tunnel;
- Replacement of the existing Ocean Outlet structure and a portion of the existing 33-inch submarine outfall pipeline that crosses the beach at Fort Funston; and
- A prioritized suite of best management practices that may be implemented within the Vista Grande Basin storm drain system upstream of the Vista Grande Canal and/or within the Lake Merced watershed (described in the draft Lake Management Plan).

The federal action consists of approving, with conditions, Daly City's application for a Special Use Permit for the construction, staging and laydown, and access associated with the Tunnel and Ocean Outlet structure within NPS land at Fort Funston; amending the existing easement(s) to accommodate the proposed expanded Tunnel and associated structures within Fort Funston and to clarify the rights and obligations of the parties to the easement(s), including the dimensions of the easement(s) and of the tunnel; and issuing a right-of-way permit for any portions of the Project that lie outside of the easement(s) As documented in the Final EIR/EIS, the proposed Project is also deemed to be the "Environmentally Preferred" Alternative.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

In addition to the Selected Action, the Final EIR/EIS analyzed three alternatives to alleviate flooding and augment water levels in Lake Merced, including a No Project/No Action Alternative. Under NEPA, an EIS must "[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives." (40 CFR 1502.14.) The NPS Director's Order 12 (DO-12) Handbook provides that the EIS must evaluate a "full range of alternatives" that "meet project objectives to a large degree, although not necessarily completely" (Section 2.7(A)). Similar to the Selected Action, these alternatives are based upon park values, effective flood management strategies, NPS policy, and applicable law. Alternatives considered but dismissed from further consideration because they do not meet the selection criteria include 11 drainage tunnel alternatives, a storage/detention alternative, a groundwater replenishment alternative, 4 canal portion alternatives, and 5 water supplies to Lake Merced alternatives.

No Project/No Action Alternative

The No Project/No Action Alternative would result in no construction of the physical components of the proposed Project. None of the proposed operational changes to stormwater routing or Lake Merced water management would be made. The NPS would not grant the Special Use Permit or amend the existing easement, and no construction could occur within NPS-managed lands. Annual Canal sediment removal activities would continue, as well as as-needed maintenance activities. Because Canal and Tunnel capacity would not be improved, occasional flooding of the Canal and associated flooding of John Muir Drive into Lake Merced and in local neighborhoods would continue. This alternative serves as the environmental baseline to which potential effects of the "action" alternatives were compared.

Tunnel Alignment Alternative

The Tunnel Alignment Alternative would include the construction of a replacement tunnel south of the existing tunnel, which would be located within an area between the existing tunnel and a line approximately 50 feet to the south, to avoid positioning structures in areas of geologic instability and sensitive biological resources. The exact alignment within this area would be determined during final design and following additional geotechnical investigation. This alternative would replace the proposed Project's Lake Merced (East) Portal and Vista Grande Tunnel improvement components with an entirely new tunnel and a different east portal structure. The components of the Tunnel Alignment Alternative could be paired with the proposed Canal components, or could be paired with the alternative Canal components described for the Canal Configuration Alternative.

The intent of this alternative was to avoid or further reduce some of the impacts on historic resources associated with replacement of the existing Vista Grande Tunnel with a larger tunnel. However, upon evaluation by the Project's engineering consultant, it was determined that the existing Vista Grande Tunnel could not, safely and within the terms of existing easements and ROWs, be abandoned in place unless filled with concrete to prevent collapse and subsequent potential for ground subsidence above the tunnel alignment. Thus, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.5-1 and 3.5-2 (see Appendix 1), the impact of the Tunnel Alignment Alternative on historic resources would not be reduced compared to the proposed Project.

Additionally, it was determined that the Tunnel Alignment Alternative would result in additional substantial impacts compared to the proposed Project, including increased visual impacts due to the presence of a new structure at the beach and toe of the cliff below fort Funston, increased potential to impact an archaeological resources (the wreck of the 1882 schooner Neptune), and inconsistency with NPS Management Policies due to introducing a new development in an area subject to wave erosion or active shoreline processes when a practicable alternative (i.e., the proposed Project) is available. As a result of the increased impacts that would result from this alternative, as well as its inability to reduce significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Project, this alternative is not considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

Canal Configuration Alternative

The Canal Configuration Alternative would minimize changes to the existing Canal while still allowing for some discharges to Lake Merced. This alternative would not construct the box culvert replacing the first 1,000 feet of the Canal; rather, the diversion structure described for the proposed Project would be relocated to the southern (upstream) end of the Canal. The box culvert under John Muir Drive also would be relocated and would cross under John Muir Drive close to the southern end of the Canal. The design of the diversion structure, box culvert under John Muir Drive, and Lake Merced Outlet would be approximately the same as for the proposed Project. The diversion structure would replace the first approximately 350 feet of the Canal, and the rest of the Canal would be unchanged except as needed for the Lake Merced Tunnel Portal. Under the Canal Configuration Alternative, one wetland cell of approximately 1.7 acres would be constructed, providing a reduced water treatment capacity compared to the Project. The components of the Canal Configuration Alternative could be paired with the proposed Tunnel or could be paired with the alternative Tunnel and East Portal components described for the Tunnel Alignment Alternative.

The intent of this alternative was to reduce some of the impacts on historic resources and federally jurisdictional "other waters" associated with replacement of a portion of the existing Vista Grande Canal with a box culvert. This alternative would reduce the portion of the Vista Grande Canal and Tunnel system to be removed by approximately 1,000 feet or 15 percent of the total length of the system. It would reduce the impact on historic resources compared to the proposed Project.

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIR/EIS, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) determined that the Vista Grande Canal was not considered to be federally jurisdictional "other waters," due to the age of the channel, the brick- and concrete-lined invert, and the relatively low physical and biological functions of the channel. Therefore, reducing impacts on this structure for the purposed of reducing impacts on "other waters" is no longer an objective of the alternatives analysis and selection process.

Although the Canal Configuration Alternative would reduce impacts on historic resources and reduce construction-related air quality and traffic impacts because less construction would occur, it would also result in additional significant and unavoidable construction-related impacts compared to the proposed Project. As a result of the decreased benefits and increased short-term significant and unavoidable impacts that would result from this alternative, as well as its inability to reduce significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Project, this alternative is not considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

Alternatives Considered and Rejected from Detailed Analysis

Alternatives were considered in Daly City's 2007 draft Alternatives Evaluation Report (AER) which were not included for evaluation in the EIR/EIS. Alternatives considered but not carried forward in the EIS included additional tunnel alignments, a large-capacity stormwater detention structure, groundwater replenishment, canal portion alternatives, and alternative water supplies.

The AER analyzed several tunnel alignments in varying degrees of detail, only one of which was carried forward for further analysis. These alternative tunnel alignments were not carried forward due to several reasons - their failure to meet most of the basic project objectives; failure to reduce any of the proposed Project's significant environmental effects; infeasibility based on economic, environmental, legal, social, technological or other factors; and/or due to their similarity to Project alternatives already being evaluated in this EIR/EIS.

The other alternatives related to a large-capacity stormwater detention structure, groundwater replenishment, canal portions, and alternative water supplies. These alternatives were not carried forward due to not meeting the project's objectives or increased environmental impacts from construction or operation.

ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The CEQ Regulations and NPS policies on implementing NEPA require that "the alternative or alternatives which were considered to be environmentally preferable" be identified (40 CFR 1505.2). Environmentally preferable is defined as the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in NEPA Section 101 (42 USC §4331). Ordinarily, this means the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative that best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources.

The NPS has determined the proposed Project would best achieve the purposes and goals of the project by providing enhanced flood protection, augmenting water supplies to Lake Merced, and constructing and operating the project in a manner that is consistent with the protection and enhancement of resources, values, and uses of lands and waters under federal jurisdiction. In comparison to the Tunnel and Canal Alternatives, the proposed Project would result in the least invasive tunneling as the existing tunnel alignment would be used, as well as the smallest amount of noise impacts due to the main construction location being located further away from existing residences.

The No Project/No Action Alternative is included to provide a baseline and a comparison for the other projects. With no action, occasional flooding of the Canal and associated flooding of John Muir Drive into Lake Merced and in local neighborhoods would continue. Lake water levels would not be augmented by treated stormwater under the No Project Alternative.

The Tunnel Alternative would include construction of an additional tunnel and potential construction of a new outfall south of the existing tunnel. Because of the visual impact of the new outfall structure for visitors to the park, this alternative would have increased aesthetic and environmental impacts compared to the proposed Project. Additionally, it has been determined that for safety and liability reasons, the existing Tunnel would need to be backfilled with concrete if left in place. This would negate the potential benefits of leaving the existing Tunnel intact because its value as a historic property would be substantially diminished and it would become inaccessible; thus, the significant unavoidable impact of destroying the Tunnel would not be avoided or substantially lessened. Therefore, the Tunnel Alignment Alternative is not superior to the proposed Project from a cultural resources perspective.

The Canal Alternative is not preferable to the proposed Project. This alternative would have an increased impact on the habitat in the South Lake due to the new outfall structure and 0.4 acres less of wetland due to the upstream location of the treatment wetlands. Additionally, this alternative would have an increased noise impact during construction due to its location further upstream along the canal and therefore closer to existing residences. The Canal Configuration Alternative would not decrease the amount of canal and tunnel affected as historic resources below the level of significant and unavoidable. As a result of the decreased benefits and increased short-term significant and unavoidable impacts that would result from this alternative, as well as its inability to reduce significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Project, this alternative is not considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

A more thorough comparison of the impacts of these alternatives is provided in Table 2-8 in Section 2.9 of the EIR/EIS.

BASIS FOR DECISION

After careful consideration of the environmental impacts of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS, the extent to which they would achieve the project purpose and need, and the public comments received throughout the planning process, including comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, the NPS selected the proposed Project for approval. The Selected Action best accomplishes the project purpose and NPS' objectives for implementation of the Project, described under "Purpose and Need for the Project," including avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating environmental impacts on park natural and cultural resources, as described under "Environmentally Preferred Alternatives." Although each of the alternatives

achieves NPS' stated objectives to some extent, the proposed Project is the alternative that most successfully meets these objectives.

After comparing the degree to which each alternative would meet these objectives, the NPS identified the proposed Project as representing the greatest advantage for park resources and values while achieving the project purpose. While the No Project/No Action Alternative would avoid the adverse construction impacts that would result from the other alternatives, it would not alleviate flooding in the Vista Grande Drainage Basin and Canal, provide a sustainable source of water for management of Lake Merced water levels and quality, nor would it improve public access to the beach below Fort Funston. The Tunnel Alignment Alternative would not reduce impacts on cultural resources compared to the proposed Project because the abandoned tunnel would need to be filled with concrete to prevent collapse, and the construction of a new tunnel would increase construction impacts at Fort Funston. The Canal Configuration Alternative would reduce the historic resource impacts on the Vista Grande Canal, but would not avoid a major adverse impact on the historic property. Additionally, the major temporary noise impacts from construction under the Canal Configuration Alternative would be increased compared to the proposed Project, as would permanent natural resources impacts at Lake Merced.

The NPS also considered comments received from individuals, organizations, and government agencies, including eight scoping letters, seven comment letters on the Draft EIR/EIS, and one letter following publication the Final EIR/EIS. These letters raised no significant concerns that could not be addressed by minor modifications to the analysis and/or mitigation measures. Where appropriate, recommended changes were made to provide more clarity, refine proposed management strategies, or provide factual corrections, and were reflected in the Final EIR/EIS.

Ultimately, after weighing the results of the environmental impact analysis and the comments received, the NPS selected the proposed Project for approval because it provides the best combination of drainage improvement and lake management benefits while also avoiding and minimizing, or mitigating as necessary the environmental impacts on park natural and cultural resources. The Selected Action also best maintains and improves the visitor experience and access to recreational opportunities at Fort Funston during and after construction.

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING TO MINIMIZE ENVIRONMENTAL HARM

The NPS has investigated all practical means to avoid or minimize environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the selected action. The measures have been incorporated into the selected action and are presented in detail in the Final EIR/EIS. A set of mitigation measures will be applied consistently to the selected action through the processes described in Attachment 1 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The results from this program will guide and assure that compliance monitoring, biological and cultural resource protection, noxious weed control, visitor safety and the protection of visitor experience, and other mitigation measures are implemented as required by NPS.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT IN THE EIS PROCESS

Scoping for the EIR/EIS

The scoping period for the Vista Grande Drainage Basin Improvement Project remained open for 100 days, from February 28, 2013 to June 7, 2013. During that period, the lead agencies held two public meetings, which were attended by approximately 54 people in total. By the close of the comment period, the lead agencies had received 10 comment letters, including four from government agencies, three from a business, one from a civic group, and two from the general public.

On February 28, 2013, Daly City issued a joint Notice of Preparation and Notice of Intent (NOP/NOI) to prepare a joint Draft EIR/EIS for the Project. The NOP/NOI described the Project, announced the dates and locations of public meetings in support of the scoping process, and requested comments on the scope of the Draft EIR/EIS by April 26, 2013 (the scoping period was subsequently extended to June 7). Notices

were mailed to 183 recipients, including the State Clearinghouse; federal, state, and local agencies; organizations; and individuals. Additionally, Daly City posted notices of a public scoping meeting at the Daly City Department of Water and Wastewater Resources Administration Office, Daly City Office of the City Clerk, and the Westlake and John Daly Libraries. On March 21, 2013, a notice was published in the San Mateo County Times.

On March 4, 2013, the NPS sent an electronic mail (e-mail) message to 1,317 recipients, inviting them to an open house featuring the proposed Project and other projects within the GGNRA. The e-mail message provided a link to Daly City's Vista Grande Project website, where visitors could access the NOP/NOI. Additionally, the NPS posted a notice at various locations within Fort Funston, notifying the public about the Project and Daly City's scoping meeting. The NPS published a NOI to prepare the Draft EIR/EIS in the Federal Register on May 8, 2013 (78 FR 26807). The comment period for the NOI published in the Federal Register ended on June 7, 2013.

The scoping process presented an opportunity for governmental agencies, organizations, businesses, and the public to provide comments on the issues and scope of the Draft EIR/EIS. During the scoping period, the lead agencies received 10 comment letters. Scoping comments ranged from general suggestions for approaching the impact analysis to more pointed concerns for specific species and the need for specific authorizations from affected public agencies. The majority of comments concerned the Project's potential impacts on biological resources.

Public Meetings and Outreach

The NPS held an open house on March 19, 2013, at the General's Residence in Fort Mason. Several projects and topics were covered at the open house, including the Vista Grande Project. Daly City staff and consultants attended the open house and spoke with attendees about the Project. Approximately 50 members of the public attended the open house. Posters depicting the Project location and proposed components were available for viewing, and copies of the NOP/NOI were made available for attendees. Comment cards were also given to interested attendees to solicit written comments on the scope of the Draft EIR/EIS.

On March 28, 2013, Daly City held a public scoping meeting at the Doelger Senior Center Café/Kitchen to educate members of the public about the Project and to solicit comments on the scope of the Draft EIR/EIS. Four members of the public attended. Oral comments provided by attendees were documented by meeting organizers. All attendees were encouraged to submit written comments and comment cards were made available for that purpose.

Release of the Draft EIR/EIS

The Draft EIR/EIS for the proposed project was published on April 28, 2016 and circulated to federal, state, and local agencies and to interested organizations and individuals for a 60-day public review period that ended on July 1, 2016. Both Daly City and NPS made the Draft EIR/EIS available for download on their respective project websites, the addresses for which were included in each agency's public notices. Paper copies of the Draft EIR/EIS were made available for public review at the following locations: (1) the Daly City Office of the City Clerk, 333 90th Street, Daly City, California; and (2) the Westlake Branch of the Daly City Public Library, 275 Southgate Avenue, Daly City, California. On April 28, 2016, Daly City also distributed notices of availability of the Draft EIR/EIS, published notification of its availability in a newspapers of general circulation in Daly City and San Francisco, and posted notices at locations within the project area. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the NPS also published notices of availability in the Federal Register on April 29, 2016 (81 FR 25666; 81 FR 25707).

During the 60-day public review period, Daly City conducted a public meeting to provide an opportunity for the public and regulatory agencies to learn about the project and be informed about how to submit comments on the adequacy and accuracy of the Draft EIR/EIS. The public meeting was held on May 26,

2016 at City Council Chambers, 333 90th Street, Daly City. One member of the public attended the meeting.

During the Draft EIR/EIS public review period, the lead agencies received seven comment letters. Four agencies provided comments: the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), the California State Lands Commission, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Three organizations and private entities also commented: California Trout, Golden Gate Audubon Society, and the Olympic Club. Concerns raised in these comment letters related to construction impacts on lake uses and water quality, impacts on public access and recreation, (specifically, appropriate mitigation measures for impacted public access at the ocean outfall and the treatment wetlands), and impacts on wildlife populations from construction and treatment wetlands. The Final EIR/EIS provides the full comments and written responses to comments received during the public review period.

Release of the Final EIR/EIS

The Final EIR/EIS consists of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Responses to Comments document, which contains agency-initiated changes and changes made in response to comments to the text of the Draft EIR/EIS. These are shown in Chapter 4 of the Responses to Comments document. Additionally, following publication of the Draft EIR/EIS, Daly City determined that the provision of temporary construction power via a PG&E service connection may be infeasible, for example, if no power distribution lines of adequate voltage are within close enough proximity to the staging area to make a temporary connection. Daly City is continuing to pursue the opportunity to provide construction power to the Fort Funston staging area via a PG&E electrical service connection. However, to provide flexibility in the event that this is infeasible, Daly City included an option in the Final EIR/EIS to provide temporary construction power at the Fort Funston staging area using a portable diesel-powered generator in the description of the proposed Project. Additional analysis of this option is provided in Chapter 4 of the Responses to Comments document, in which staff-initiated text changes are shown for Draft EIR/EIS Chapter 2 and Sections 3.3, Air Quality; 3.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change; 3.11, Noise; and 4.2, Energy Conservation. No new significant and unavoidable impacts have been identified as a result of the minor change in construction equipment described in these staff-initiated revisions.

The NPS's Notice of Availability for the Final EIR/EIS was published in the Federal Register on September 11, 2017. Following the USEPA's notice of filing published in the Federal Register on September 15, 2017 the waiting period for preparation of the Record of Decision ended on October 15, 2017. The Final EIR/EIS was posted on the NPS park planning website and a notification of its availability was mailed to interested parties, including agencies and organizations which had received notification of the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS and all those who commented on the Draft EIR/EIS or requested to be notified of the Final EIR/EIS. The Vista Grande Final EIR/EIS was distributed to the city clerks in Daly City and San Francisco, to the San Mateo County Clerks, and to libraries in Daly City and San Francisco.

AGENCY AND NATIVE AMERICAN COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION INVOLVEMENT

National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 Consultation

Section 106 consultation between the NPS and the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) is ongoing and the project would not be implemented until consultation is complete. Historic properties eligible for inclusion in the National Register have been identified. The SHPO has concurred with NPS that the Vista Grande Canal and Tunnel is eligible for listing in the National Register under Criteria A and C with a period of significance of 1877 to 1934, and has concurred with NPS regarding the finding of effects of the project on the Vista Grande Canal and Tunnel. Any stipulations NPS and SHPO agree upon with completion of the ongoing consultation would be incorporated with the implementation of the Selected Action in order to resolve adverse effects in accordance with 36 CFR 800.6.

Native American Consultation

The project consultant (ESA) contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on November 6, 2012 to request a database search for sacred lands or other cultural properties of significance within or adjacent to the Area of Potential Effect (APE). ESA received a response on November 21, 2012. The NAHC database search of the sacred lands file failed to identify the presence of cultural resources in the vicinity of the APE. The NAHC provided a list of Native American contacts that might have further knowledge of cultural resources in the vicinity of the APE. NPS sent letters to the list of contacts on October 29, 2014 requesting knowledge of resources in the APE to which they may attach cultural or religious significance. Following this, notices of availability of the Draft EIR/EIS and Final EIR/EIS were mailed to these Native American contacts. To date, no comments on the EIR/EIS or other responses from these contacts have been received.

Coordination with other State, Local, and Federal Agencies

Daly City prepared and submitted a Preliminary Delineation of Waters of the United States (Preliminary Delineation) to the USACE in January 2014. Following a field verification in April 2014, Daly City submitted a revised Preliminary Delineation in September 2014.

NPS and Daly City representatives attended an interagency meeting hosted by the USACE on August 13, 2014 and Daly City representatives gave a presentation describing the proposed Project. Daly City representatives also met with USACE staff in November 2014 and May 2015 to discuss the proposed Project components, review the USACE's jurisdiction, identify resource issues that should be considered in the EIR/EIS, and discuss potential permitting approaches and requirements.

In addition to meeting with USACE staff, Daly City representatives conducted meetings with the California Coastal Commission (CCC), the California State Lands Commission (CSLC), the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), to review the agencies' jurisdictions, identify resource issues that should be considered in the EIR/EIS, discuss permitting requirements, and discuss any additional key regulatory issues.

CONCLUSION

The Selected Action provides the most comprehensive and effective method among the alternatives considered for meeting the NPS purpose, goals, and objectives for the project, including avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating environmental impacts on park resources; alleviating flooding in the Vista Grande Drainage Basin by expanding the Vista Grande Tunnel's hydraulic capacity and extend its operating lifetime; and augmenting Lake Merced's water levels with a sustainable supply of stormwater. The environmental impact analyses demonstrate that the Selected Action is the environmentally preferred alternative and that it is fully consistent with the Park Service's mission and policies, the policies and programs of Daly City and other pertinent laws and regulations. The completed environmental impact analysis process is a thorough and rational effort, supported by extensive outreach efforts to the community, stakeholders, regulatory agencies, and park partners.

Approved:

for Marshall

Stan Austin, Regional Director
Pacific West Region, National Park Service

7/26/18
Date