



County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

RENÉE E. BAHL
DIRECTOR

www.sdparks.org

Administrative Office: (858) 694-3030
Fax: (858) 495-5841
Reservations: (858) 565-3600

April 23, 2009
Revised May 27, 2009

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)

1. Project Title:

Oak Country II Trails Project

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Parks and Recreation
9150 Chesapeake Drive, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92123

3. a. Contact: Megan Hamilton, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 966-1377
c. E-mail: megan.hamilton@sdcounty.ca.gov

4. Project location:

The Oak Country II Trails Project is located within a 769-acre site in the unincorporated community of Ramona, San Diego County, California. The project area, approximately 380 acres at the western portion of the site, is bounded by Highland Valley Road to the south (see attached Figures 1 and 2). The main access point to the project occurs just east of the intersection of Highland Valley Road and Archie Moore Road. The project area and site is part of the County-owned and managed Ramona Grasslands Preserve (Preserve). The project site is located within the U.S. Geological Survey San Pasqual quadrangle, Township 13 South, Range 1 West, Sections 11, 14, and 23, and the Santa Maria Land Grant (APNs 276-111-05, 277-050-30, 277-111-52, 277-050-31, 222-111-53, 277-050-32, 277-121-14).

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1151, Grid F/5, F/6, and F/7

5. Project Sponsor name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Parks and Recreation
9150 Chesapeake Drive, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92123

6. General Plan Designation

(20) General Agriculture
(21) Specific Plan

7. Zoning

S88, Specific Plan
A70, Limited Agriculture

8. Description of project:

The proposed Oak Country II Trails project is an approximately four-mile, multi-use trail for hiking, biking, and equestrian users that traverses APNs 276-111-05, 277-050-30, 277-111-52 (the western portion of the total 769 acre site). The trail includes a figure-eight loop with connections to potential future trail easements to the north and west. An approximately one-acre staging area adjacent to Highland Valley Road is also proposed. Approximately two miles of the eastern portion of the loop trail (including the connection to the north) exists in the form of an approximately eight-foot-wide dirt road that remains from prior ranching activity. This existing ranch road will continue to be used for maintenance and emergency vehicular access.

To facilitate a figure-eight configuration and maximize the trail experience, two new loop trails will be constructed to the west of the existing road. The constructed western portion of the trail will have a four-foot tread width consisting of native soil and rock, with brush management requirements of one foot on either side. In addition, the project previously analyzed approximately 0.3 mile of new multi-use trail which would deviate from the existing ranch road in two locations in order to avoid potential impacts to cultural resources. However, the 0.3-mile cultural resource variation is no longer proposed and will not be included as part of the project. In lieu of the cultural resource variation, the project instead proposes to install permanent fencing and signage along both sides of the existing ranch road in locations where the road is adjacent to significant cultural resources in order to discourage incursion into these areas.

The 0.95-acre equestrian staging area has been sited adjacent to Highland Valley Road on a relatively flat area to minimize land disturbance and maintain the existing drainage flow. The surface will be pervious, consisting of either natural soils or decomposed granite (or other similar material) and will retain

naturally vegetated swales. There will be parking space for four horse trailers and 10 cars (with overflow room). Two picnic shade structures will be provided. The entire staging area will be fenced with concrete split-rail fencing.

A small informational kiosk will be provided at the staging area trail head. The trail head will include a vehicular gate to allow vehicle access to the eastern portion of the loop trail for emergency and maintenance vehicles only. A trail gate will allow for pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle passage, but will exclude off-road vehicle access. At the entryway to the staging area from Highland Valley Road there will be a gate such that hours of operation (sunrise to sunset) can be controlled. A sign will be placed at the south entrance of the Oak Country II trails system.

The existing ranch road crosses a fresh water seep. To ensure safe crossing for emergency and maintenance vehicles during all weather, a culvert will be installed within the existing disturbed ranch road foot print. This crossing provides access to the majority of the project site and without it the proposed project cannot move forward.

A skid steer/track loader will be utilized to construct the trail. This small bulldozer-like machinery has a four-foot-wide footprint. Other mechanical equipment that may be utilized includes a tamper (gas powered), quads, mechanical wheel barrow, and pick-up trucks. Where trail alignment is in the vicinity of oak trees, hand clearing and non-mechanized tools only would be used.

The proposed project will be completed in two phases. Phase I will consist of construction of the equestrian staging area, installation of the culvert and trail fencing as described above. Construction of the two new loop trails to the west of the existing ranch road will be completed in Phase II.

It should be noted that the Oak Country Estates project, a 57-lot residential development, was originally proposed for the project site. The Oak Country Estates Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified by the Board of Supervisors on May 10, 2006 (RBF Consulting 2006). That EIR analyzed the eastern portion of the proposed trail loop (i.e., the old ranch road). The residential development has since been abandoned and the County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation (County) acquired the land on September 5, 2008.

The new western portion of the trail was designed to be wholly within the impact bubble associated with the residential development of 57 lots originally analyzed in the Oak Country Estates EIR (RBF Consulting 2006). As a result of the development project being abandoned, and a trail and public access being proposed, potential impacts to the site would be greatly reduced.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

The project site is located in the northwestern portion of the Santa Maria Valley. The Santa Maria Valley, which is drained toward the west by Santa Maria Creek, is approximately five miles long and three miles wide. Most of the eastern portion of the valley has been developed with rural estates, semi-rural single-family residences, and commercial property, but most of the western portion consists of undeveloped, hilly grassland. The project's site's rolling terrain, rural landscape, and agricultural land usage characterize the community of Ramona. Mount Woodson and Starvation Mountain are located within two miles of the project site and can be seen from most locations on the property. The San Pasqual Valley is approximately two miles north of the project site and is visible from off-site locations adjacent to the western boundary of the property.

The Mount Woodson Golf Club and residential community is approximately one mile southwest of the project site, via Archie Moore Road. Undeveloped land and single-family residences with a minimum lot size of eight acres are located along the hillside adjacent to the western boundary of the property. On the southern side of Highland Valley Road, single-family residences, some with equestrian facilities, are located on lots with a minimum lot size of four acres. Mount Woodson Elementary School is located adjacent to the southwest corner of the property. The Ramona Municipal Water District effluent spray fields and undeveloped land are found to the northeast of the project site. The Ramona Airport is located approximately one mile from the eastern boundary of the proposed project.

The Santa Maria Creek bisects the eastern portion of the project site, entering the property at the southeast corner near the intersection of Highland Valley Road and Rangeland Road and exiting the site along the northeast boundary. The creek drains westerly to Lake Hodges and the San Dieguito River, eventually entering the ocean through the San Elijo Lagoon. Several minor drainage courses traverse the hillside from west to east toward the Santa Maria Creek, creating a variety of minor hilltops and valleys.

The easterly portion of the project property is relatively flat, varying in elevation from 1,335 to 1,390 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The vegetation on this portion of the site can be characterized as non-native grasslands with scattered oak trees and rock outcroppings. Vernal pools were also identified on this portion of the property. The westerly portion of the project site, where the trails and staging area are proposed, gently rises from 1,350 feet AMSL to elevations up to 1,550 feet AMSL. Isolated small areas of slopes greater than 25 percent have been identified along the westerly property boundary of the site. The slopes generally face east toward the eastern grasslands of the project site. A ridgeline is located 1,000 feet west of the property boundary and rises approximately 100 feet higher in elevation than the project site. The vegetation in this area is comprised primarily of southern mixed chaparral with areas of rock outcroppings. The project's southern portion consists of oak woodland, southern

willow scrub, and buckwheat scrub. In the northwestern 121.5 acres of the project site, southern willow scrub and non-native grassland were identified. Archaeological sites are located throughout the eastern central portion of the site.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Permit Type/Action	Agency
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1602 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Section 7 Consultation – Incidental Take	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or a “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz. Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Parks and Recreation finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Parks and Recreation finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Parks and Recreation finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Date

Megan Hamilton
Printed Name

Group Program Manager, DPR
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project is located near or within the viewshed of a scenic vista. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying land cover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The visual environment of the subject scenic vista extends from Highland Valley Road to the north and Rangeland Road to the west. The project site consists of grasslands, chaparral, oak trees, and rock outcroppings. Santa Maria Creek traverses the project site, entering the southeast corner of the property, near the intersection of Highland Valley Road and Rangeland Road. The project site itself is undeveloped, but the areas to the west and south of the project site are developed with single-family residences. To the east of the project site is the Ramona Municipal Airport and undeveloped grasslands. The property to the northeast of the proposed project site is owned by the Ramona Municipal Water District and consists of effluent spray fields.

The project proposes to develop a trail through the flat grassland terrain in the eastern portion of the project area, and hilly terrain predominantly consisting of southern mixed chaparral in the western portion of the project area. The trail will consist of an existing dirt ranch road in the east and a newly constructed portion in the west with a four-foot tread of native soil and rock. The proposed staging area is less than one acre (0.95 acre) and will remain unpaved with natural substrates. Neither the staging area nor the trail is expected to be highly visible. The proposed project is compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality for the following reasons: (1) construction of the staging areas and trails will not result in a substantial modification of the existing landform, substantial amounts of grading, or the creation of visually prominent cut and fill slopes, and (2) no blockage of views would result from the

construction of the trails or staging area. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because the cumulatively related projects do not involve substantial modification of the existing landforms or the blockage of views. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic ([Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program](#)). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. There are no scenic highways designated within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding area varies from open space and agricultural lands to spaced rural residential/single-family development. The project site is interspersed with coast live

oak trees and large rock outcroppings, and transitions from relatively flat grasslands in the east to more hilly terrain in the west consisting predominantly of southern mixed chaparral.

The proposed project is the development of a multi-use trail and equestrian staging area. The trail will consist of an existing dirt ranch road in the eastern portion of the project area and a newly constructed portion in the west with a four-foot tread of native soil and rock. The proposed staging area is less than one acre (0.95 acre) and will remain unpaved with natural substrates. Neither the staging area nor the trail is expected to be highly visible. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: (1) construction of the staging areas and trails will not result in a substantial modification of the existing landform, substantial amounts of grading, or the creation of visually prominent cut and fill slopes, and (2) no blockage of views would result from the construction of the trails or staging areas.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: none of the cumulatively related projects will result in the construction of structures that would block existing views or be incompatible with the existing visual character of the area. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties, such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Within the project vicinity there are lands designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance and grazing land. However, based on the historic use, climate, water cost, and soil constraints within the project area, the potential future use of the site is limited to grazing. Portions of the project site have been used for cattle grazing in the past and this agricultural use will continue to be allowed on site in accordance with Resource Management Plan requirements. The construction of the proposed project would not have significant adverse project or cumulative level impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use because none of the existing agricultural uses in the valley or onsite would be displaced nor would future agricultural uses be precluded as a result of construction and use of the staging area and trails. Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this proposed project.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: A portion of the project site is zoned A70, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, based on the historic use, climate, water cost, and soil constraints, the potential future use is limited to grazing. Portions of the project site have been used for cattle grazing in the past and this agricultural use will continue to be allowed on site in accordance with Resource Management Plan requirements. The proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use because none of the existing agricultural uses in the valley or onsite would be displaced nor would future agricultural uses be precluded as a result of construction and use of the staging area and trails. Additionally, the project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project area contains land designated as prime farmland; however, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use because none of the existing agricultural uses in the valley or onsite would be displaced nor would future agricultural uses in the valley or onsite be precluded as a result of construction and use of the staging area and trails. Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this proposed project.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Operation of the project will not result in an increase of criteria pollutant emissions compared to the existing use of the subject area that was anticipated by the RAQS. The project will not emit toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. Therefore, the project will not conflict or obstruct with the implementation of the RAQS nor the SIP on a project or cumulative level.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g., stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

Less than Significant Impact: The project will use machinery to construct the trail. However, the limited grading operations associated with the project would be subject to Section 7 permitting requirements which require the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the use of any equipment would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in approximately 56 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills,

agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Less than Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also as the result of increase of traffic from project implementation. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to Section 7 permitting requirements which require the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in approximately 56 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM10, or any O₃ precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

Less than Significant Impact: The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: Mount Woodson Elementary School. However, this project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. In addition, the

project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB 2008), the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, the Biological Resources Technical Report for the proposed Oak Country Estates project, dated January 2005, prepared by Mooney & Associates and included in the May 2006 certified Oak Country Estates Final EIR as Appendix C (RBF Consulting), the Biological Assessment for the Oak Country II Trails Project, dated October 2008, prepared by EDAW, Inc. and the Biological Resources Report, dated March 2009, prepared by EDAW, Inc., the 380-acre project area supports native habitat including dense, open, and disturbed coast live oak woodland (26.1 acre), southern willow scrub (0.57 acre), buckwheat scrub (6.95 acre), southern mixed chaparral (169.69 acre), mulefat scrub (6.68 acre), freshwater seep (7.07 acre), disturbed wetland (0.05 acre), open water (0.84 acre) and nonnative grassland (157.17 acre) that includes 1.75 acres of non-vegetated channel.

Potential Impacts

Plants. Three County sensitive plant species were observed within the project survey area: southern tarplant (*Centromadia parryi* ssp. *australis*), graceful tarplant (*Holocarpha virgata* ssp. *elongata*), and one Engelmann oak (*Quercus engelmannii*). These Group A (southern tarplant) and Group D (graceful tarplant and Engelmann oak) species are located within the eastern portion of the project site. The tarplants and the Engelmann oak will be avoided through site-specific project design and no impacts to these species will occur as a result of the proposed project.

Crustaceans. The San Diego fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta sandiegonensis*), a federally endangered species and County sensitive species (Group 1), was observed on the adjacent parcel to the east during vernal pool surveys for Oak Country Estates. The proposed action area, which includes the trails, staging area, a 500-foot buffer, and all areas between buffers, coincides with areas of designated critical habitat for the San Diego fairy shrimp. However, no suitable vernal pool habitat that would support San Diego fairy shrimp occurs within the project area. No direct effects to San Diego fairy shrimp, or vernal pools occupied by San Diego fairy shrimp, are expected to occur. Indirect effects to vernal pools occupied by San Diego fairy shrimp may occur as a result of increased watershed alteration, sedimentation or runoff from construction areas, human use of the area, and human trespass off of trails into areas of vernal pools occupied by San Diego fairy shrimp.

Reptiles. The Coronado skink (*Eumeces skiltonianus interparietalis*), a State species of special concern and County sensitive species (Group 2), and the two-striped garter snake (*Thamnophis hammondi*), a State species of special concern and County sensitive species (Group 1), were detected within the biological study area during surveys for arroyo toad. Although not observed within the project footprint, suitable habitat for these species would be impacted by the proposed project; therefore direct and indirect impacts to these species may occur as a result of the proposed project. However, impacts to these species would be minimized due to avoidance through the project design, limited construction impacts, and extent of open space that will be preserved on site.

Amphibians. Two sensitive amphibians were detected on site during field surveys: arroyo toad (*Bufo californicus*) and western spadefoot (*Spea hammondi*). The arroyo toad, a federally endangered species and County sensitive species (Group 1), was observed within portions of the Santa Maria Creek located onsite. Although no arroyo toads were observed in areas outside of the limits of the creekbed and associated sandy benches, this species is known to use upland habitats for foraging and burrowing. The proposed project would maintain a 400-foot undeveloped buffer from the Santa Maria Creek and locations of suitable arroyo toad breeding habitat. However, direct impacts may occur during construction grading if arroyo toads forage or burrow within upland portions of the property in the future. In addition, indirect impacts may occur as a result of increased human, domestic pet and exotic species presence.

The western spadefoot, a California Species of Special Concern and County sensitive species (Group 2), was also observed within the Santa Maria Creek during focused surveys for the arroyo toad. Although no spadefoot were observed within the project footprint, this species has the potential to utilize other portions of the property in the future. Therefore, the proposed project may result in direct impacts to this species as a result of construction or indirect impacts as a result of increased human, domestic pet and exotic species presence.

Mammals. One sensitive mammal, the Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR) (*Dipodomys stephensi*) was detected on the adjacent parcel to the east during surveys for Oak Country Estates. SKR, a federally endangered species and County sensitive species (Group 1), was observed east of the Santa Maria Creek. Since no SKR or habitat occupied by SKR occurs within the proposed project area, no direct effects to SKR are anticipated. However, indirect effects to SKR may occur as a result of increased human use of the area or human trespass into suitable habitat.

Birds. One individual coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*), a federally threatened species and County sensitive species (Group 1), was detected on site during general wildlife surveys in 2000, within buckwheat scrub. No gnatcatchers were detected during subsequent focused surveys. However, the presence of suitable habitat and the sighting of one individual may indicate that gnatcatchers utilize the habitat on site for dispersal to other areas. No impacts to buckwheat scrub would occur as a result of trail or staging area construction and, thus no direct effects to breeding coastal California gnatcatcher or occupied gnatcatcher habitat are expected as a result of construction of the proposed project. Indirect effects to dispersing individuals may occur as a result of increased human use of the area of human trespass into suitable habitat.

Several species of raptors, including ferruginous hawk (*Buteo regalis*) and sharp-shinned hawk (*Accipiter striatus*), were observed foraging on site. No raptor nests were observed during field surveys; however, the potential exists for these species to utilize the habitats on site for nesting.

General Avoidance and Minimization Measures

Trail routes were selected to avoid and minimize potential impacts to sensitive habitats, and plant and wildlife species to the maximum extent practicable. The existing trail (i.e., the old ranch road) was incorporated into the project to avoid additional project impacts. Additionally, the following design measures will be implemented prior to, and during, construction to avoid and minimize biological resource impacts:

1. Numerous standard storm water and flood control measures ~~contribute to the avoidance and minimization of impacts to habitat occupied by San Diego fairy shrimp, western spadefoot, and arroyo toad.~~ These include will be implemented including:
 - a. Installation of silt fencing prior to land disturbance at the proposed staging area and culvert installation location;

- b. Utilization of natural topography when locating the staging area and trails to avoid erosion potential;
 - c. Natural vegetation swales will be retained within the staging area; and
 - d. Soil-tracking Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented to limit off-site transport of sediment from construction areas by implementing tire-cleaning measures such as stabilized construction entrance/exit designs at access points.
2. All erosion and sediment control measures will be inspected/maintained to ensure proper integrity and function during the entire construction period. All stabilization and structural controls will be inspected at least monthly or after any significant storm event for the duration of the construction activities and will be repaired or maintained for optimum performance.
 3. Prior to construction activities, but after exclusionary fencing has been installed, at least three surveys for arroyo toads will be conducted within the fenced area by a Service-approved biologist¹. Surveys will be conducted during appropriate climatic conditions during the appropriate time of day or night to maximize the likelihood of encountering arroyo toads. If climatic conditions are not appropriate for arroyo toad movement during the surveys, the biologist may attempt to illicit a response from the arroyo toads, during nights (i.e., at least one hour after sunset) with temperatures above 50 degrees Fahrenheit, by spraying the project area with water to simulate a rain event. If an arroyo toad is found within the project site during the surveys or the construction activities, all work will cease and a formal section 7 consultation will be initiated with the Service. Work will continue once a biological opinion is issued by the Service that addresses adverse effects to the arroyo toad.
 4. The Service-approved biologist will conduct a training session for all project personnel prior to proposed construction activities. At a minimum, the training will include a description of the arroyo toad and gnatcatcher, the general provisions of the Act, the need to adhere to the provisions of the Act, the penalties associated with violating the Act, the general measures that are being implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to listed species, and construction activity boundaries.
 5. A Service-approved biologist will be present during initial ground disturbing activities and habitat disturbance to monitor the site for arroyo toads and gnatcatchers. After this time, the contractor or permittee will designate a person to monitor on-site compliance with all minimization measures. The project biologist will be empowered to halt work activity if necessary and to confer with staff from the Service to ensure proper implementation of species and habitat protection measures. If during project implementation an arroyo toad or gnatcatcher is found within the project site, all work will be halted and formal section 7 consultation will be initiated with the Service. Work will

¹ A Service-approved biologist will be able to identify arroyo toads visually and vocally and will have a minimum of 20 hours of survey experience for this species. To receive approval, the biologist will submit his/her resume and references to the Service for review and approval at least 30 days prior to initiation of project-related activities.

- continue once a biological opinion is issued by the Service that addresses adverse effects to the arroyo toad and/or gnatcatcher.
6. "Stay on Trail" signage will be placed throughout the trail to avoid and minimize potential effects to listed and sensitive species utilizing habitats adjacent to the trail. In addition, fencing will be placed around the boundaries of the proposed staging area.
 7. The County proposes to fence the staging area and to manage the trail within the Preserve in accordance with a Resource Management Plan that will be prepared by the County. Ongoing adaptive management of the Preserve will identify unauthorized trail use or other adverse effects associated with increased human use (e.g., trash, off-road activity) or domestic animals. Such issues will be addressed through construction of fence segments, maintenance of trash receptacles, or other means to prevent impacts resulting from increased human use on the site.

Species Specific Avoidance and Minimization Measures

8. No construction activities will take place during the arroyo toad breeding season (March 15 - July 31) within suitable arroyo toad breeding habitat.
9. Access to the sites will be via preexisting access routes to the greatest extent possible. Project-related vehicle travel will be limited to daylight hours as arroyo toads use roadways primarily during nighttime hours.
10. Activities that attract small insects (e.g., ants) and toad predators will be minimized by keeping the project site as clean as possible. All food-related trash will be placed in sealed bins or removed from the site regularly.
11. Dust control (i.e., water truck spraying) will be performed in a manner that does not attract toads into the action areas by performing when toad exclusion fence is up and minimizing overspray.
12. Prior to construction, To preclude arroyo toads from the proposed staging area and culvert installation work sites, arroyo toad exclusionary fencing will be installed around the perimeter of all work areas within potential arroyo toad upland habitat where active trail construction is taking place proposed staging area and culvert installation location prior to implementation of construction activities. Work on the trail will be broken up into segments of the total four-mile trail, so fenced active work areas will be confined to smaller portions of the proposed trail. The purpose of the fence is to exclude arroyo toads from the active work sites. Such The fencing will consist of woven nylon netting fabric or plastic at least approximately two feet in height high, attached to wooden stakes staked firmly to the ground with the lower one foot of material stretching outward along the ground and secured with a continuous line of gravel bags. Prior to installing the fencing, a narrow trench approximately one to two inches in depth will be excavated and the fence buried, to prevent burrowing beneath the fence. No digging or vegetation removal will be associated with the installation of this fence and A all fencing materials (i.e., mesh, stakes, etc.) will be removed following construction within the work area when the Project is complete. Ingress and egress of equipment and personnel will use a single access point to the site. This access point will be

- as narrow as possible and will be closed off by exclusionary fencing when personnel are not on the project site.
13. Excavations will be properly covered to prevent toads from entering any open pits.
 14. The Service-approved biologist will be on call and available as needed in the event that a toad is encountered during the activities. The project biologist will be present on-site full-time, for two to three days, following any measurable rainfall.
 15. Brushing, clearing, and/or grading will not occur within 300 feet of suitable habitat, including buckwheat scrub habitat, during the breeding season of the California gnatcatcher (February 15 - August 31). This condition can be waived by the CDFG and the USFWS Service if surveys described below determine that no active nests occur on-site.
 - a. Within one week of commencement of clearing or activities associated with project construction, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for California gnatcatcher. If the biologist finds any evidence of an active nest, the biologist shall (a) notify the County, and (b) ensure that no clearing or construction activities occur within 300 feet of an active nest.
 16. Brushing, clearing, and/or grading will not occur within 500 feet of suitable habitat, including coast live oak woodland and non-native grassland habitat, during the raptor breeding season (February 1 - July 15). This condition can be waived by the CDFG and the USFWS Service if surveys described below determine that no active nests occur on-site.
 - a. Within one week of commencement of clearing or activities associated with project construction, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for nesting raptors. If the biologist finds any evidence of an active nest, the biologist shall (a) notify the County, and (b) ensure that no clearing or construction activities occur within 500 feet (800 feet for ground dwelling raptors) of an active nest.
 - b. If an active bird nest is present, the condition may still be waived if additional clearing mitigation measures are implemented as specified in writing by the Wildlife Agencies.
 17. The permittee will ensure that the following conditions are implemented during construction activities:
 - a. Pets of project personnel will not be allowed on the project site;
 - b. Disposal or temporary placement of excess fill, brush or other debris will not be allowed in waters of the United States or their banks;
 - c. All equipment maintenance, staging or any other such activities will occur in designated areas outside of waters of the United States within the fenced project impact limits. These designated areas will be located in previously compacted and disturbed areas to the maximum extent practicable in such a manner as to prevent any runoff from entering waters of the United States, and will be shown on the construction plans. Fueling of equipment and dispensing of oil coolant or other such activities will take place offsite. Contractor equipment will be checked for leaks prior to operation and repaired as necessary.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation for unavoidable direct effects to habitat occupied by arroyo toad and other sensitive species as a result of loss of habitat will be mitigated according to ratios outlined in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements (County of San Diego 2008) and permitting requirements. Direct effects will be compensated at a ratio of 3:1 for wetlands, 2:1 for coast live oak woodland, 1:1 for nonnative grassland, and 0.5:1 for southern mixed chaparral.

Direct impacts to a total of 3.29 acres of occupied toad habitat as a result of construction of the proposed project would require 2.95 acres of occupied toad habitat compensation that will include 2.07 acres of nonnative grassland, 0.53 acres of southern mixed chaparral, 0.09 acres of wetlands, and 0.26 acres of oak woodland. Compensation would be accomplished by off-site preservation of occupied toad habitat within the Wilderness Gardens property along the San Luis Rey River. A Resource Management Plan for this site will be prepared and reviewed by the Wildlife Agencies prior to its approval.

No loss of habitat occupied by the San Diego fairy shrimp, coastal California gnatcatcher, and Stephens' kangaroo rat would occur. Thus, no additional compensation would be required.

Therefore, as a result of project design considerations and the mitigation measures discussed above, potential direct or indirect impacts to sensitive and/or listed species or their habitats have been reduced to less than significant.

Additionally, development of the proposed project would not contribute to any significant cumulative impacts to biological resources that are anticipated to occur through implementation of past, present, and foreseeable projects in the Ramona area. The Specific Plan Area is consistent with regional conservation planning principles, as it would preserve large contiguous blocks of undisturbed and sensitive habitats and would maintain connectivity with adjacent undeveloped lands. Furthermore, the Oak Country II property is considered part of the Ramona Grasslands Preserve. The Preserve is a multi-agency project working to protect the unique natural and cultural heritage of the Ramona Grasslands and to improve water quality in the Santa Maria Creek. The addition of the Oak Country II property brings the total preserved acreage to 3,521 acres.

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on the Biological Resources Technical Report for the proposed Oak Country Estates project, dated January 2005, prepared by Mooney & Associates and included in the May 2006 certified Oak Country Estates Final EIR as Appendix C (RBF Consulting), and the Biological Resources Report dated March 2009, prepared by EDAW, Inc., it has been determined that the proposed project site contains buckwheat scrub, coast live oak woodland (open, dense, and disturbed), nonnative grasslands, southern willow scrub, mulefat scrub, nonvegetated channel, southern mixed chaparral, and riparian/wetlands (including freshwater seep and disturbed wetlands) within the project boundaries. However, the areas proposed for development will completely avoid direct impacts to any portion of the buckwheat scrub, disturbed coast live oak woodland, mulefat scrub, southern willow scrub, and nonvegetated channel. In addition, construction of the trail would not remove or otherwise affect mature oak trees or oak tree recruitment as trail impacts are considered minimal and all work through coast live oak woodland will be achieved by hand.

Direct impacts to sensitive and riparian habitat associated with development of the proposed trail and staging area will consist of: 0.13 acre of coast live oak woodland (open and dense), 2.07 acres of nonnative grassland, 1.06 acres of southern mixed chaparral, 0.01 acre of freshwater seep, and 0.02 acre of disturbed wetland. Impacts will be mitigated for at the following recommended compensation ratios: 2:1 for coast live oak woodland (0.26), 1:1 for nonnative grasslands (2.07 acres), 0.5:1 for southern mixed chaparral (0.53 acre), and 3:1 for riparian/wetlands (freshwater seep and disturbed wetland) (0.09 acre). The proposed mitigation for these impacts will consist of off-site conservation of 7.9 acres of in-kind habitats at the Rowan parcel of the County-owned Wilderness Gardens located along the San Luis Rey River. It should be noted that the 7.9-acre proposed mitigation area will conserve additional acreage in excess of the recommended compensation ratios for all habitat types.

Construction of the proposed trail and staging area could also result in impacts to sensitive habitat by increasing human access to the site. Such human-related impacts could include destruction of vegetation through trampling and unauthorized off-trail use. Impacts associated with increased human activity on the site and competition from domestic animals would be considered potentially significant. The project may result in the introduction of pests or exotic species to the site. In order to mitigate for potential impacts to sensitive habitat through increasing human access to the site, the County proposes to manage the Preserve in accordance with a Resource Management Plan that will be prepared by the County. Ongoing adaptive management of the Preserve will identify unauthorized trail use or other adverse effects associated with increased human use (e.g., trash) or domestic animals. Such issues will be addressed through construction of fence segments, installation of signs, or other means to prevent impacts resulting from increased human use at the Preserve.

Thus, through project design considerations and mitigation measures, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Furthermore, no off-site impacts have been identified within or immediately

adjacent to the riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities. Therefore, project impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations, are considered less than significant.

Additionally, development of the proposed project would not contribute to any significant cumulative impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive communities that are anticipated to occur through implementation of past, present, and foreseeable projects in the Ramona area. The project is consistent with regional conservation planning principles, as it would preserve large contiguous blocks of undisturbed and sensitive habitats and would maintain connectivity with adjacent undeveloped lands. Furthermore, the Oak Country II property is considered part of the Ramona Grasslands Preserve. The Preserve is a multi-agency project working to protect the unique natural and cultural heritage of the Ramona Grasslands and to improve water quality in the Santa Maria Creek. The addition of the Oak Country II property brings the total preserved acreage to 3,521 acres.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The project site contains federally protected wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act that include freshwater seep, disturbed wetland, and nonvegetated channel habitat(s). A formal wetland delineation was conducted for the project site and results are detailed in the report entitled Oak Country II Trails Project Jurisdictional Delineation Report for Waters of the U.S. and State of California prepared by EDAW, Inc., dated October 2008. Within the survey area there are approximately 2.15 acres of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. Of the aforementioned acreage, a total of 0.03 acre of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. is within the footprint of the proposed project.

As part of trail construction, a single culvert will be built across one nine-foot-wide portion of the existing ranch road where a channel and adjacent freshwater seep wetland results in flooding during the wet season. The culvert will consist of a 12-inch pipe and associated fill and rip rap. Additionally, the western portion of the trail will traverse jurisdictional waters resulting in minimal vegetative clearing (on the order of one thousandth of an acre). Construction of the trail would therefore result in minimal impacts (less than 0.03 acre) to these jurisdictional features. The project is expected to qualify for a CWA Section 404 Nationwide Permit (NWP) under NWP 42 (Recreational

Facilities). Impacts less than 0.1 acre do not require wetland creation mitigation to qualify.

Based upon project design, avoidance and minimization measures, potential permanent impacts to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are not anticipated to exceed 0.03 acre. The proposed mitigation for these impacts will consist of off-site conservation of a 7.9-acre area at the Rowan parcel of the County-owned Wilderness Gardens located along the San Luis Rey River which includes 2.5 acres of riparian/wetland habitat. It should be noted that the 2.5 acres proposed for mitigation is in excess of the recommended 3:1 compensation ratio for wetlands. Therefore, impacts to federally protected wetlands would be considered less than significant.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Wildlife corridors provide a pathway for animal movement through an area. They generally tend to occur in areas of suitable habitat that exist along drainages or along ridges. The primary wildlife corridor in the project area is located along the Santa Maria Creek where there are vegetation and topographical features that provide cover. Regional linkages allow wide-ranging animals to access foraging and hunting areas and water sources. The undeveloped areas of the Santa Maria Creek Valley form the linkage in proximity to the project and connect undeveloped areas to the north and to the east. Core habitat generally provides a block of habitat that includes the entire territory collectively used by a wide variety of animals.

However, the proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of wildlife as impacts would be limited to a fenced 0.95-acre unpaved staging area and approximately four miles of native substrate trail up to four-feet wide with one-foot of brush management area along each side. Total impacts to 3.54 acres of upland habitat and 0.03 acre of wetland/riparian habitat on site would not impact wildlife mobility, and mitigation measures, such as avoiding work during the bird breeding season, will ensure that there will be no interference with a wildlife nursery site. These limited impacts also would not prevent or interfere with connectivity to adjacent preserve areas in the Ramona Grasslands or adjacent reaches of the Santa Maria Creek. Thus, impacts as a result of the proposed project are considered to be less than significant.

Implementation of the proposed project would permanently impact a total of approximately 3.57 acres. The permanent loss of this amount of habitat would not significantly affect the use of the site as a wildlife corridor because development would

be concentrated in the western portion of the site (ranging from 300 to over 1,500 feet from the Santa Maria Creek riparian corridor) and a majority of the habitat on site (376.43 acres), including the entire length of Santa Maria Creek located on site, would remain undisturbed. Therefore, sufficient habitat would be preserved to facilitate the movement of wildlife through the site. These areas would include the majority of the grasslands, the Santa Maria Creek corridor, and the majority of its tributaries.

Additionally, development of the proposed project would not contribute to any significant cumulative impacts to biological resources that are anticipated to occur through implementation of past, present, and foreseeable projects in the Ramona area. The project is consistent with regional conservation planning principles, as it would preserve large contiguous blocks of undisturbed and sensitive habitats and would maintain connectivity with adjacent undeveloped lands. Furthermore, the Oak Country II property is considered part of the Ramona Grasslands Preserve. The Preserve is a multi-agency project working to protect the unique natural and cultural heritage of the Ramona Grasslands and to improve water quality in the Santa Maria Creek. The addition of the Oak Country II property brings the total preserved acreage to 3,521 acres.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources. The proposed project site is located within the boundaries of the County's North County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), a subarea plan under the County's MSCP that is not yet approved. While specific criteria requirements have not yet been established for the North County subarea plan, the proposed multi-use trail and staging area are compatible with the general Public Use Guidelines for the Multi-Habitat Planning Area as specified in Section 6.2.1 of the Final MSCP Plan dated August 1998. Additionally, the project will not preclude or prevent the preparation of the North County MSCP nor will it preclude connectivity between areas of high habitat value. The project would not result in impacts to habitats subject to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance; therefore, a Habitat Loss Permit will not be necessary.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and surveys of the property conducted between April 17, 2001 and October 17, 2001 by archaeologists, Richard L. Carrico, Theodore G. Cooley, and Stacy Jordan, it has been determined that while archaeological resources exist within the project site, no historical resources occur on site. Therefore, there will be no impact to historical resources. The results of the survey are provided in a cultural resources report titled, Cultural Resources Report of the Survey and Testing Programs for the Oak Country Estates Development in Ramona, San Diego County, California, prepared by Mooney & Associates, dated January 2005. This report is included in the May 2006 certified Oak Country Estates Final EIR as Appendix E (RBF Consulting).

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of records and surveys of the property conducted between April 17, 2001 and October 17, 2001 by archaeologists Richard L. Carrico, Theodore G. Cooley, and Stacy Jordan, it has been determined that 32 archaeological resources are present within the previously delineated Oak Country Estates project boundary. An archaeological technical study entitled, Cultural Resources Report of the Survey and Testing Programs for the Oak Country Estates Development in Ramona, San Diego County, California, prepared by Mooney & Associates, dated January 2005, evaluated the significance of the archaeological resources based on subsurface testing, analysis of recovered artifacts, and other investigations. Testing of these resources indicated that the artifact assemblages of these sites resembled the hypothesized settlement pattern of a dispersed village settlement. Of the 32 prehistoric sites identified, 12 were found to be significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Additionally, several sites have also been designated as sacred sites and are listed by the California Native American Heritage Commission as sacred sites. These sacred sites have been evaluated as significant under CEQA.

Only eight of the 32 sites are located within the current project site boundary. These resources include CA-SDI-7325, CA-SDI-7753, CA-SDI-7754, CA-SDI-7755, CA-SDI-

7756, CA-SDI-7757, CA-SDI-7758, and CA-SDI-7759. These prehistoric sites all contain bedrock milling features with multiple milling slicks, basins, and mortars, as well as some artifactual debris. These sites have been identified as being of particular interest for their value individually, and as elements of a settlement pattern that represents the village of Pa'mo, a well known village site for the Mesa Grande Band of Kumeyaay Indians.

The project design has avoided significant archaeological sites to the extent practicable and no direct impacts to cultural resources from construction of the trail and staging area are anticipated. However, these sites may be indirectly impacted by increased pedestrian and equestrian traffic on trails. In combination with the project's designed avoidance of cultural resources, the project will implement the following mitigation measures which will reduce the project impacts with respect to cultural resources to a level of less than significant:

- In order to discourage incursion into significant site areas, permanent preventive fencing with signage (e.g., signs that read "Please Stay on Trail") shall be placed along both sides of the existing ranch road in locations where the road is adjacent to significant sites. The fencing shall be of a split rail construction (either concrete or wood).
- All ground disturbing activities shall be monitored by a qualified archaeological monitor. Additionally, where there are previously known significant sites as depicted in confidential archaeology maps, a Native American monitor will also be present. In the event that previously unknown archaeological resources are discovered, a Native American monitor will be contacted to aid in identification and evaluation of these resources. In addition, the Both an archaeological monitor and Native American monitor will oversee the surface removal of artifacts along the existing ranch road prior to trail opening. All artifacts and associated records that may be discovered during monitoring shall be appropriately curated with an appropriate institution.

The mitigation identified above to address significant project-level impacts to cultural resources would also adequately address cumulative cultural resources impacts. More specifically, the application of criteria and measures provided in CEQA provides a framework for addressing impacts, both project-specific and cumulative. In accordance with CEQA, the significant cultural resources within the proposed project would be preserved through establishment of accurate surveys and maps, fencing, and avoidance. As required by CEQA, the resource sites determined to be significant would not be affected by development or other features of project implementation. Monitoring would be required during ground disturbing construction activities to further ensure that no portions of the preserved sites would be inadvertently affected. Through preservation, fencing, limited access, and monitoring, the potential for effects to the sites, and therefore for cumulative impacts, would be reduced to a level below significant.

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

No Impact: The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact Based on an analysis of records and surveys of the property conducted between April 17, 2001 and October 17, 2001 by archaeologists, Richard L. Carrico, Theodore G. Cooley, and Stacy Jordan, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in a cultural resources report titled, Cultural Resources Report of the Survey and Testing Programs for the Oak Country Estates Development in Ramona, San Diego County, California, prepared by Mooney & Associates, dated

January 2005. This report is included in the May 2006 certified Oak Country Estates Final EIR as Appendix E (RBF Consulting).

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The *Uniform Building Code* (UBC) and the *California Building Code* (CBC) classifies all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. However, the proposed project is not located within five kilometers of the centerline of a known active-fault zone as defined within the *Uniform Building Code's Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source Zones in California*. The project does not propose structures, only the construction of a trail and staging area. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Although there may be some areas within the project site that are located within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards, the scope of the project is such that there will be no structures built and no exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site contains small, dispersed areas identified as “Landslide Susceptibility Areas”. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. However, the area does not show evidence of either pre-existing or potential conditions that could become unstable and result in landslides. The project is for the construction of a trail and staging area. No structures are proposed and there will be no landform modification (except for some small ground disturbance to build a trail approximately four feet wide). Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from adverse effects of landslides.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Cieneba-Fallbrook, Fallbrook, Placentia, Ramona, Tujunga, and Visalia soil associations. These soils have erodibility ratings that range

from "slight" to "moderate" and "high" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project will include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure sediment does not erode from the proposed project site.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of: the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), San Diego Region Order No. R9-2007-0001, NPDES No. CAS0108758, issued January 24, 2007; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9926 revised March 2008); and County Storm Water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended August 5, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9589). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. Additionally, the project will not alter the land in any way as to create unstable conditions as the project does not propose landform alteration. For further information refer to VI. Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
|---|--|

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site contains two small areas of Placentia sandy loam, which is considered an expansive soil as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not have any significant impacts because the project does not involve construction of structures or landform alteration. Therefore, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for a multi-use trail and equestrian staging area. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related

to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Although the project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing school, the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit and records search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project is located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Ramona Airport and falls within the designated Traffic Pattern Zone which is identified as having a low risk level. However, the project is for a multi-use trail (hiking, biking, and equestrian use) and equestrian staging area, and will not result in hazards to airport safety or surrounding land uses for the following reasons:

- The project will comply with Airport Land Use Compatibility Policies for the Ramona Airport, including: Noise, Safety, Airspace Protection, and Overflight Compatibility Policies.
- The project does not propose any distracting visual hazards including but not limited to distracting lights, glare, sources of smoke or other obstacles or an electronic hazard that would interfere with aircraft instruments or radio communications. Therefore, the project complies with the Federal Aviation Administration Runway Approach Protection Standards (Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77 – Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace).
- The project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.
- The project does not propose any artificial bird attractor, including but not limited to reservoirs, golf courses with water hazards, large detention and retention basins, wetlands, landscaping with water features, wildlife refuges, or agriculture (especially cereal grains).

Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project is within habitat that may be considered wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because no habitable structures are proposed.

h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (three days) or more (e.g., artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as agricultural operations (e.g., chicken coops, dairies, etc.), solid

waste facility or other similar uses. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project will be required to implement site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. The project design provides for minimal grading and will utilize the natural topography to maintain the existing drainage flow on site. Additionally, the native vegetation surrounding the trail and staging area will remain undisturbed and will act as a natural biofilter. BMPs will include, but are not limited to, stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, permeable surfaces (no impervious surfaces proposed), and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls would be specified to minimize surface transport of sediments. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (RWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project lies in the 905.41 Ramona hydrologic subarea within the San Dieguito River hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, a portion of this watershed at the Pacific Ocean and San Dieguito River is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents of concern in the San Dieguito watershed include coliform bacteria, nutrients, sediment, lowered dissolve oxygen, and trace metals. The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: minimal amounts of ground disturbance associated with construction of a trail and staging area. However, site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters. The project design provides for minimal grading and will utilize the natural topography to maintain the existing drainage flow on site. Additionally, the native vegetation surrounding the trail and staging area will remain undisturbed and will act as a natural biofilter. BMPs will include, but are not limited to, stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, permeable surfaces (no impervious surfaces proposed), and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls would be specified to minimize surface transport of sediments.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with the regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), San Diego Region Order No. R9-2007-0001, NPDES No. CAS0108758, issued January 24, 2007; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance No. 9926, revised March 2008); County Storm Water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended August 5, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9589). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9926 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9589 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9926 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the 905.41 Ramona hydrologic subarea, within the San Dieguito River hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes construction of a multi-use trail and staging area. Site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. The project design provides for minimal grading and will utilize the natural topography to maintain the existing drainage flow on site. Additionally, the native vegetation surrounding the trail and staging area will remain undisturbed and will act as a natural biofilter. BMPs will include, but are not limited to, stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, permeable surfaces (no impervious surfaces proposed), and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls would be specified to minimize surface transport of sediments.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with the regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g., ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes the construction of a trail and staging area. The proposed project will implement site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable. The project design provides for minimal grading and will utilize the natural topography to maintain the existing drainage flow on site. Additionally, the native vegetation surrounding the trail and staging area will remain undisturbed and will act as a natural biofilter. BMPs are required during construction activities and will include, but are not limited to, features such as stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, permeable surfaces, and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls would be specified to minimize surface transport of sediments. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (RWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not

contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons:

- The project design utilizes the natural topography and will maintain the existing drainage flow on site.
- Drainage will be conveyed to natural drainage channels.
- Native vegetation surrounding the trail and staging area will remain undisturbed and will act as a natural biofilter.
- The project will not increase water surface elevation in the Santa Maria Creek or its tributaries.
- The project will not increase surface runoff exiting the project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There are no existing or planned storm water drainage systems proposed by the project, nor does the project require such systems.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project does not propose polluted runoff. To ensure that sediment does not leave the site, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, use of permeable surfaces, and silt fencing. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve the placement of housing.

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No structures are proposed and, therefore, no impact will occur.

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for the construction of a trail and staging area and does not propose structures and thus will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County, and is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Additionally, the project is for the construction of a trail and staging area and, therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The project site contains small, dispersed areas identified as "Landslide Susceptibility Areas". However, the project proposes minimal land disturbance that will expose a small amount of unprotected soils and it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 2.6 Special Purpose Designations and General Plan Land Use Designations (20) General Agriculture and (21) Specific Plan. The project is consistent with the General Plan because recreational trail systems are considered compatible with agriculture and are therefore permitted within lands under the (20) Land Use Designation which are preserved for agricultural or general open space uses. In addition, the General Plan commits to continue to provide and expand the variety of trail experiences, including staging areas, and provide connections to other public trail systems pursuant to Countywide Trail Policies 1.1 and 1.3.

The project is also subject to the policies of the Ramona Community Plan and falls within the designated Oak Country Estates Specific Planning Area. The Ramona Community Plan includes goals, policies and recommendations to preserve natural resources and open space for outdoor recreational uses. Additionally, while the project site is no longer being proposed for rural development, this project will adhere to the specific planning area conditions by preserving existing large rock outcroppings and vernal pools, maintaining riparian vegetation along the Santa Maria Creek, minimizing grading, and providing a riding and hiking trail on site. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Ramona Community Plan.

The property is zoned S88 Specific Plan which is intended to accommodate Specific Plan areas shown on the San Diego County Plan (refer to above paragraph), and A70

Limited Agriculture which is typically applied to areas throughout the County to protect moderate to high quality agricultural land pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance Section 2700. As previously indicated in Section II. Agricultural Resources, the project will not displace existing nor preclude future agricultural uses and construction and use of the trails and staging area will not adversely affect existing or future agricultural uses; therefore, the proposed project is consistent with plan and zone. Additionally, the project adheres to the Ramona Trails and Pathway Plan and community-specific trail design guidelines contained within the County Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP).

The project falls within the Ramona Airport Influence Area and thus is subject to the Ramona Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) (adopted 2006). The proposed project is consistent with the Ramona ALUCP Compatibility Policies pertaining to (1) noise, (2) safety, (3) airspace protection, and (4) overflight compatibility because:

1. The project is located outside of the CNEL 55 dB(A) contour for the airport and thus is outside of the noise impact area. All land uses located outside this noise contour are consistent with the noise compatibility policies. For additional information, please refer to section XI.e Noise.
2. A small portion of the project site along the eastern boundary is located within Safety Zone 6 of the Ramona Airport. While the safety compatibility criteria do not specifically consider a multi-use trail and staging area, the project may be evaluated with respect to the similar Non-Group Recreation use, which is considered a compatible use within Zone 6. For additional information, please refer to section VII.d Hazards and Hazardous Materials.
3. The project is for a multi-use trail and staging area and does not propose structures of any kind that may constitute an airspace obstruction. It also does not propose any use that will cause visual, electronic, or wildlife hazards to aircraft in flight or taking off or landing at the airport. For additional information, please refer to section XV.c Transportation/Traffic.
4. The project is located within an overflight easement dedication zone; however, overflight easements are not required for nonresidential development projects. The project is for a multi-use trail and staging area, therefore, this policy does not apply to the proposed project.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997)

as an area of "Potential Mineral Resource Significance" (MRZ-3). However, the project does not entail any paving, construction, or other features that would result in future preclusion of mineral extraction. Therefore, there is no impact.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). The site has not been delineated as a locally important resource recovery site nor will the construction of a trail and staging area result in a loss of availability of locally important resources. Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project is for construction of a trail and staging area and does not support any noise-generating equipment. Additionally, temporary noise as a result of trail and staging area construction will be achieved with machinery that does not generate noise levels in excess of County noise standards. Therefore, the project will not expose people to or generate any noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan or Noise Ordinances, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for construction of a trail and staging area and does not support any noise-generating equipment. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for construction of a trail and staging area and will not support any noise-generating equipment. Also, any temporary increase over existing ambient levels when equipment is used to construct the trail is not expected to exceed

the noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). Equipment operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, the project will not operate equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project is located within the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for the Ramona Airport. However, project implementation is not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours). The location of the project is outside of the CNEL 60 dB(A) contours for the airport.

In addition, based on the list of past, present and future projects there are no new or expanded public airports projects in the vicinity that may extend the boundaries of the CNEL 60 dB noise contour or CLUP. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace any existing housing since the site is currently vacant.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XIV. RECREATION

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity. The project itself is an expansion of recreational uses.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant: The proposed staging area will accommodate up to four horse trailers and ten cars with additional overflow car parking available if needed. While San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) trip generation tables are typically used to estimate trip generation for land development projects, the SANDAG "Brief Guide for Vehicular Generation Rates" does not include a rate/category that would apply to the proposed staging area and trail. Therefore, it was assumed that day users of the equestrian staging area would stay for at least two to four hours to utilize the proposed trail. Conservatively assuming the staging area would, on average, fill to capacity twice daily, eight trailers and 20 cars would be serviced daily. Assuming two trips per vehicle (one inbound trip and one outbound trip); the staging area would generate 56 vehicular trips. Recreational trips will peak during weekends and holidays and reduced usage will occur on the typical weekday. Very few trips will occur during the weekday peak periods.

Access to the proposed trail and staging area along Highland Valley Road is provided via State Route 67 (SR 67) and Archie Moore Road. A Traffic Impact Analysis, dated December 16, 2004, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers was completed for the residential Oak Country Estates project previously proposed for the project site

and was included in the Final Oak Country Estates Environmental Impact Report (Certified May 2006). Estimating the previous Oak Country Estates project would generate 684 ADT, the Traffic Impact Analysis concluded that the addition of project traffic would not substantially increase traffic in the area and that street system operations would remain unchanged and continue to operate at existing levels of service. No significant project impacts were calculated at signalized or unsignalized intersections or street segments based on County criteria.

Given the previous determination that there would be no project-level traffic impacts for an increase in 684 ADT, it can be reasonably assumed that the current proposed Oak Country II Trails project, which will generate substantially less traffic (56 ADT) outside of peak hours, will also not result in significant traffic impacts. Furthermore, the small number of additional trips does not surpass County traffic impact thresholds and does not require mitigation. Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project impact on traffic volume, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant: A Traffic Impact Analysis, dated December 16, 2004, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers was completed for the residential Oak Country Estates project previously proposed for the project site and was included in the Final Oak Country Estates Environmental Impact Report (Certified May 2006). The Traffic Impact Analysis concluded that all roads in the vicinity of the project site, except for SR 67, are projected to operate at LOS D or better in the future. SR 67 will continue to operate at LOS F between Poway Road and Ramona Street, while the segment between Ramona Street to SR 78 will change from LOS D to LOS F.

As indicated above, it is conservatively assumed that the proposed project will generate 56 ADT. The proposed project will add less than 100 trips to Circulation Element roads projected to operate at LOS F and less than 200 trips to Circulation Element Roads projected to operate at LOS E. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause the traffic impact threshold guidelines established by the County of San Diego to be exceeded. The proposed project will not prevent the planned Circulation Element road system from operating at its planned level of service at buildout. Implementation of the proposed project will not result in a significant traffic impact to the planned road network.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The main compatibility concerns for the protection of airport airspace are related to airspace obstructions (e.g., building height, antennas, etc.) and hazards to flight (e.g., wildlife attractants, distracting lighting or glare, etc.). The proposed project is located within the Ramona Airport Influence Area. The project is for a multi-use trail (hiking, biking, and equestrian use) and equestrian staging area, and is located within the designated low risk level Traffic Pattern Zone for the Ramona Airport. The proposed land uses are consistent with the allowable land uses identified for the Traffic Pattern Zone within the CLUP for Ramona airport, therefore the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns because the allowable land uses within airport safety zones are created for the purpose of ensuring ongoing airport safety, including maintenance of air traffic patterns. Furthermore, the project would not exceed the FAA Part 77 criteria related to airspace obstructions. Refer also to section VII.e Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a significant impact on air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impede adequate sight distance on a road.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project is for a multi-use trail and staging area and does not require emergency access.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The staging area will provide parking for up to four horse trailers and ten cars with additional overflow car parking. The parking capacity will meet current and anticipated future trail use requirements based on low volume staging area requirements as discussed in the Community Trails Master Plan (2005) and experience with other staging areas within County Parks.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is for the development of a multi-use trail and equestrian staging area. Project implementation will not result in any construction or new road design features; therefore, will not conflict with policies regarding alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve any uses that will discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the project will not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded storm water drainage facilities.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve or require water services from a water district. The project is for a multi-use trail and equestrian staging area that does not rely on water service for any purpose.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project for the development of a trail and equestrian staging area will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers' service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: It is unlikely that implementation of the project will generate solid waste. However, all solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, in the event removal of trash and/or debris is required to implement the project, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project may generate solid waste associated with the removal of trash and debris from the proposed trail and equestrian staging area. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440 et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and, therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly biological and cultural resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes avoidance of the arroyo toad and bird breeding seasons, biological surveys and monitoring, erosion control BMPs, off-site conservation of compensatory habitat, presence of an archaeological monitor and Native American monitor during land disturbance activities, installation of fencing and signs, and management of the Preserve in accordance with a Resource Management Plan being prepared by the County. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT NUMBER	PERMIT STATUS
Ramona Airport Improvement	SP 00-010	Approved
Montecito Ranch	SP 01-001/TM 5250 RP2	In Progress
Cummings Ranch	TM 5344	In Progress
Fenton Ranch	TM 4979 RP4/TPM 20299	Approved
MBA Ltd. TPM	TPM 20370	Approved
RCDK Realty II TPM	TPM 20401	Approved
Lee TPM	TPM 20402	Approved
Roberts TM	TM 5267	Approved

No Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections: I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII. Hydrology and

Water Quality, XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

VIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

Biological Assessment for the Oak Country II Trails Project, EDAW, Inc., October 2008

Biological Resources Report for the Proposed Oak Country II Trails Project, Community of Ramona, San Diego County, EDAW, Inc., March 2009.

Community Trails Master Plan (January 12, 2005)
(http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us/reusable_components/images/parks/doc/tocev.pdf)

Oak Country II Trails Project Jurisdictional Delineation Report for Waters of the U.S. and State of California, EDAW, Inc., October 2008.

Oak Country Estates Final Environmental Impact Report, RBF Consulting, May 2006.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000
(<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.
(www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.
(www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
(www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
(www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
(www.gp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.
(www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987.
(<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002.
(migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities

Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov>, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL

- ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.
- California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>)
- County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)
- County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.
- Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.
- National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)
- National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)
- San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- LAND USE & PLANNING**
- California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)
- California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.
- Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.
- Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)
- MINERAL RESOURCES**
- National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)
- U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.
- U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.
- NOISE**
- California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)
- Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)
- Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)
- International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attach.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.