County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

JOHN L. SNYDER
DIRECTOR

5555 OVERLAND AVE, SUITE 2188
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1295

(858) 694-2212 FAX: (858) 268-0461
Web Site: www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/

April 10, 2009

DRAFT

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

1. Title; Project Number:
   Sweetwater Phase III Trail; COFD-00251

2. Lead agency name and address:
   County of San Diego, Department of Public Works
   5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305
   San Diego, CA 92123

3. a. Contact: Lorrie Bradley, Environmental Planner
   b. Phone number: (858) 874-4055
   c. E-mail: Lorrie.Bradley@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

   The proposed project is located within the Sweetwater Regional Park (SRP) between the Western Staging Area (WSA) and just east of the Willow Street Bridge, in the unincorporated community of Bonita (refer to Figure 1). The eastern terminus of the proposed trail is located on the east side of Willow Street Bridge, with the trail extending west along the Sweetwater River corridor, and terminating at the Sweetwater Regional Park Western Staging Area.

   Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1310, Grid E 4, 5 F 3, 4

5. Project Applicant 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
   Community Plan: Sweetwater

Land Use Designation: (24) Impact Sensitive
Density: N/A

7. Zoning
Use Regulation: A70 (Limited Agriculture)
Minimum Lot Size: N/A
Special Area Regulation: F (Flood Plain)

8. Description of project:

The proposed project is a improvement to an existing multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length, and is part of the planned trail system that would extend east from Interstate 805 (I-805) to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The proposed project would establish a trail along an existing non-County designated path. The proposed trail will have overhead clearance of 12 feet, and will be improved and maintained in accordance with the County of San Diego Trail Design Guidelines.

The eastern portion of the proposed trail (approximately 2,235 linear feet) is located within the County's Sweetwater Off-site Mitigation Area (SWOMA). In this area the proposed trail would be located along an existing unimproved path, which ranges in width from two feet to eight feet. The proposed trail would have a tread width of five feet, would use native soil, and would follow the footprint of the existing path. Along this segment of the proposed trail, in order to allow for equestrian users to pass there are approximately 20 turnouts proposed that would be located approximately every 100 feet. The proposed turnouts would be ten feet in width, ten feet in length, and would be located directly adjacent to the trail. Impacts on biological resources within the SWOMA that would occur due to widening for the trail and turnouts would be mitigated by revegetation of those portions of the existing path that are narrowed to the five-foot design standard, and by closure and revegetation of other unimproved trails within the SWOMA. It should be noted that a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) was signed in July 1998 to establish a mitigation bank to enable the County to mitigate for impacts to jurisdictional resources incurred as part of County projects. The MOA allows for the establishment of trails within the boundaries of the mitigation bank (MOA, Section II.12.b). An existing footbridge, of undetermined age and origin, is located along this portion of the proposed trail. This bridge will be removed and replaced with a natural-bottom crossing at the same location. Areas that are currently impacted by the bridge on either side of Sweetwater River that would not be used for the proposed trail would be revegetated. In those areas where revegetation is proposed, plant species would be used consistent with the planting program specified for the SWOMA.

The western portion of the proposed trail (approximately 3,484 linear feet) is also located within the SRP, but is not located within the SWOMA. This portion of the proposed trail would have a tread width of eight feet, with a two-foot shoulder on either side, resulting in an overall crossection width of 12 feet. The tread along this segment of the proposed trail would also use native soil. The western portion of this segment of the

proposed trail extends through the Central Avenue Wetland Mitigation Site (CAWM), located approximately 0.13 mile east of the WSA. The existing trail (approximately 800 linear feet) that extends through the CAWM Mitigation Site was improved as part of the implementation of the wetland mitigation for the Central Avenue Flood Improvement Project (refer to Figure 2). No additional work on this portion of the trail is required or proposed. In this area the proposed trail would be located along an existing unimproved path, which ranges in width from two feet to 18 feet. The proposed trail would have a width of 12 feet, and would follow the footprint of the existing path. In areas where the path is less than 12 feet in width, widening would occur. In the areas where the path is greater than 12 feet in width, the path would be narrowed to 12 feet in width with revegetation proposed. Impacts on biological resources that may occur due to widening for the trail would be mitigated by revegetation of those portions of the existing path that are narrowed to the 12-foot design standard, and by closure and revegetation of other unimproved trails in the area.

Other ancillary elements of the proposed project include: trail markers; intermediate signage; and lodge pole fencing will be used to direct users to stay on the trails and to avoid intrusion into sensitive biological areas.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

   The proposed project is located within the SRP, a County operated open space park. Surrounding land uses include residential to the north, commercial and residential to the south, recreational uses (golf course) to the east, and Interstate 805 approximately 0.25 mile to the west. The topography of the site is flat as the project is located within the floodplain/floodway of the Sweetwater River.

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)
General Construction Storm Water Permit	RWQCB

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.

☐ Aesthetics
☑ Biological Resources
☐ Hazards & Haz. Materials
☐ Agricultural Resources
☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Hydrology & Water Quality
☐ Air Quality
☐ Geology & Soils
☐ Land Use & Planning

☐ Mineral Resources ☐ Noise ☐ Population & Housing
☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation ☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Utilities & Service Systems ☐ 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 Public Works 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 Public Works 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 Public Works finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature	April 10, 2009 Date
Lorrie Bradley Printed Name	Land Use/Environmental Planner 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. "Less Than Significant With 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ 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.

No Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. Based on a site visit completed by ESU staff, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. The project site is located within the SRP. The proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine cumulative effects. (Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a complete 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 project and other nearby 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

No Impact: Based on a site visit completed by ESU staff on June 10, 2008, the proposed project is not located near or visible from the composite viewshed of a State Scenic Highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State Scenic Highway. The proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length that will be a part of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The project site is located within the boundaries of the SRP and is not visible from a State Scenic Highway. 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ 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 surroundings can be characterized as developed/residential uses to the north and south, recreational uses to the east and Interstate 805 to the west. The project is compatible with the existing environment's visual character and quality. The construction of the trail will be part of a continuous non-motorized trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The viewshed contributes to the appeal of the trail system and will not be changed with the establishment of a trail at this site.

The project proposes to utilize existing dirt paths to the fullest extent practicable. Grading will be required for improvements to the trail, as well as installation of trail markers and lodge pole fencing at selected locations. No structures are proposed that

would interfere with the visual character of the site. Therefore, impacts on the existing visual quality and character of the project site will be less than significant.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not propose the use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the proposed 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. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain any agricultural resources, lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no impacts would occur since there would be no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance converted to non-agricultural uses.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Although a portion of the proposed project site is zoned A70 (Limited Agriculture). The entirety of the trail alignment is located within the existing SRP, an open space park which does not allow for agricultural uses. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there would be no impact since the project does not 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length that will be a part of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The project is located within the SRP which does not contain or allow for active agricultural operations. In addition, the proposed trail will not convert lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. There would be no project related impacts since there would be no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations converted to non-agricultural uses.

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)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Operation of the proposed project will not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air resources Board. The project is

the improvement of an existing multi-use trail. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict or obstruct 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ 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.

No Impact: The proposed project involves the improvement of an existing multi-use trail. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. The proposed project will not generate new vehicle trips in the area. 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)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ 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 (O_3). 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 (PM_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 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 PM_{10} 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: A minor amount of emissions from construction equipment at the project site would occur on a intermittent and temporary basis during project construction. The project proposes no permanent increase in pollutant emissions. Emissions from project construction would be minimal and localized. No increase in vehicular trips is anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Further there is no substantial grading associated with construction of the project. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 Average Daily Trips (ADT) are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook Sections 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs and PM_{10}. As such, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of PM_{10} or any O_3 precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ 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

No Impact: The proposed project involves the improvement of an existing multi-use trail. Based on a site visit conducted by ESU staff on June 10, 2008, no sensitive receptors have been identified within a 0.25-mile radius (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which dilution of pollutants is typically significant). Further, the proposed

project will not generate significant levels of air pollutants. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: According to the *Biological Technical Report for the Sweetwater River Phase III Trail Project*, prepared by RECON Environmental Inc., dated April 2009, four special status. Although the project site supports native biological habitat for these and other species, the incremental removal of this habitat will not result in substantial adverse effects with mitigation incorporated as specified in the Biological Technical Report.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Construction of the proposed trail will impact drainages under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

(ACOE), CDFG, and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). As identified in the *Biological Technical Report for the Sweetwater River Phase III Trail Project*, prepared by RECON Environmental Inc., dated April 2009, mitigation for temporary and permanent impacts within the SWOMA will through closure of unimproved trails and restoration. Indirect impacts to jurisdictional resources adjacent to the proposed trail would be limited due to the project design features. Restoration and enhancement will consist of removal of non-native species and replanting with native riparian/wetland species.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Construction of the proposed trail segments will require drainage crossings, resulting in impacts to drainage features under the jurisdiction of the ACOE, CDFG, and the RWQCB. Mitigation for impacts to jurisdictional resources will be mitigated as described in question IV(b) above. The County will obtain all required permits to address temporary and permanent impacts to jurisdictional resources. Required permits include a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFG, a 404 Nationwide Permit from the ACOE, and a 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB. After implementation of required mitigation and approval of required permits, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

In addition, the proposed project is in conformance with the Memorandum of Agreement with the U.S. *Army Corps of Engineers regarding the Establishment, Operation and Use of the Sweetwater River Offsite Mitigation "Credit" Plan,* dated July 8, 1998.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the proposed project. The SRP, Sweetwater River and surrounding natural habitats provide habitat to many sensitive plant and animal species and provide connection to undeveloped portions of eastern San Diego County. The project does not, however, propose any structures or other barriers that may impede the use of the site as a wildlife corridor. In addition, the project proposes to utilize the existing disturbed areas to the maximum extent practicable to minimize removal of sensitive habitats. Furthermore, the proposed project will not interfere with or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, as the trail will be constructed along existing informal trails. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact with regard to interference with or impedance of 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.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is located within the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), a subarea plan under the Natural Communities Conservation Plan, in an area designated as "Take Authorized". The proposed project has been found to be in conformance with the MSCP as discussed in the MSCP Findings, dated April 10, 2009. In addition, the County will obtain all required permits prior to initiation of construction of the project. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources resulting in a finding of less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Carmen Zepeda-Herman on August 21, 2008, it has been determined that there are no project impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in an historical resources report titled, *Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report, Sweetwater River Phase III Trail Project*, prepared by RECON Environmental, dated September 15, 2008.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist**,** Carmen Zepeda-Herman, on August 21, 2008, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, *Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report, Sweetwater River Phase III Trail Project*, prepared by RECON Environmental, dated September 15, 2008. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ 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. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the proposed project site is located on Quaternary alluvium and has no potential for producing fossil remains. Additionally, based on a site visit by ESU staff on June 10, 2008, no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Carmen Zepeda-Herman, on August 21, 2008, 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 an archaeological survey report entitled, *Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report, Sweetwater River Phase III Trail Project*, prepared by RECON Environmental, dated September 15, 2008. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

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.

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length that will be a part of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The project does not propose the construction of any buildings or structures. Therefore, the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. However, no structures are proposed as part of the project. The potential to expose people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction, is therefore minimal and less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Based on a site visit by ESU staff its was determined that the geologic environment of the project area is not located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Riverwash (Rm), Tujunga Sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes (TuB), and Salinas clay, 0 to 2 percent slope (ScA). Riverwash has a soil erodibility rating of ”severe” 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.

Grading will be required for improvements to the trail, including drainage improvements. Grading activities within and adjacent to the existing drainages on site have the potential to cause soil erosion and sedimentation, which may result in increased rates of surface runoff, decreased water quality, and related environmental damage, if appropriate erosion and sedimentation control measures are not implemented. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil as the project will utilize existing trail treads to the maximum extent practicable, and the project will avoid the removal of mature vegetation and will only remove those stumps, boulders, and roots that interfere with safe passage. Natural drainage patterns will be maintained to the extent practicable during grading activities. An erosion control plan will be implemented with erosion control techniques, including the use of gravel bags, hay bales, and/or the installation of sediment traps, to control erosion. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will have a less than significant impact related to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

In addition, the proposed 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); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended

January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ 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. On a site visit conducted by ESU staff on June 10, 2008, no geological formations or features were noted that would produce unstable geological conditions as a result of the project. For further information, refer to Section VI Geology and Soils, Question a (i) through (iv) above. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on the project site are Riverwash (Rm), Tujunga Sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes (TuB), and Salinas clay, 0 to 2 percent slope (ScA). These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, the proposed project will not create a substantial risk to life or property. 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. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

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 proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length that will be a part of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The project does not propose bathrooms or any use that would require septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

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 proposed 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. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have an impact 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit by ESU staff on June 10, 2008, and a regulatory database 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. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), within a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface, or within two miles of a public airport. Also, 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. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ 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. No project related impacts would occur.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ 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 framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop a specific operational area for San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

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 ten-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. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

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. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

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. Therefore, no project related impacts would occur.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

Less Than Significant Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan for the Sweetwater or Loveland Dams will not be interfered with because even though the project is located within a dam inundation zone, the project is not a unique institution that would be difficult to safely evacuate in the event of a dam failure. Unique institutions, as defined by the Office of Emergency Services, include hospitals, schools, skilled nursing facilities, retirement homes, mental health care facilities, care facilities for patients with disabilities, adult and childcare facilities, jails/detention facilities, stadiums, arenas, amphitheaters, or a similar use. The proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length that will be a part of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. Since the project does not propose a unique institution in a dam inundation zone, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan. Any potential project related impacts that may occur are considered to be less than significant.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is located in an urban area and there are no adjacent wildland areas. The proposed project would involve the improvement of an existing

multi-use trail. No structures are proposed for this project. Therefore, based on the location of the project in an urban area, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (three days) or more. The project does, however, involve or support uses that will produce animal waste, including equestrian trail uses, which would potentially expose people to significant risk related to vectors. In coordination with the County Department of Environmental Health, Vector Surveillance Program, County Department of Parks and Recreation will ensure that people are not exposed to vectors. Implementation of vector management measures are intended to ensure that the project will not expose people to risk of injury or death involving vectors or create cumulatively considerable impacts related to vectors. Any potential project related impacts that may occur are considered to be less than significant.

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

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge permits, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB). In addition, the project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff or land use activities that would require special site design considerations, source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) or treatment control BMPs, under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01).

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project lies within the Lower Sweetwater River (909.12) hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit. Portions of this watershed are impaired for Coliform bacteria and metals; however, the project does not propose any known sources of pollutants or land use activities that might contribute to these specific pollutants.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ 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 Lower Sweetwater River (909.12) hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit. The following are 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; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; and rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat. .The trail is designed to sheet flow runoff. Grading will be required for improvements to the trail and drainage improvements.

As part of the proposed project, during construction an erosion control plan will be implemented with erosion control techniques, including the use of gravel bags, and hay bales. In addition, Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented during construction activities to avoid water quality impacts, polluted runoff, erosion, and

sedimentation. BMPs to be used to minimize surface transport of sediments include, but are not limited to stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, fiber rolls and silt fencing. The construction contractor will be required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Implementation of BMPs as stated in contract documents and the SWPPP would reduce water quality impacts to below a level of significance. With the implementation of the BMPs described above, water quality impacts to the Sweetwater River would be reduced to below a level of significance. The proposed project would therefore not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Any potential project related impacts that may occur are considered to be less than significant.

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)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the use of groundwater for any purpose, including construction activities, irrigation, domestic or commercial water demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to, 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. 0.25 mile). Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Construction of the proposed trail will require crossing the Sweetwater River under the jurisdiction of the ACOE, CDFG, and/or the RWQCB. However, the project does not propose to substantially alter existing drainage patterns on the project site or in adjacent areas. Additionally, the course of existing streams or rivers would not

be modified in any manner that would resulting in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Construction of the proposed trail will require crossing the Sweetwater River under the jurisdiction of the ACOE, CDFG, and/or the RWQCB. However, the project does not propose to substantially alter existing drainage patterns on the project site or in adjacent areas. Additionally, the course of existing streams or rivers would not be modified in any manner that would resulting in flooding on- or off-site. No project related impacts would occur.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length that will be a part of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The project does not propose to add any impervious surfaces. Existing dirt paths will be used and the trail tread will consist of native soil material. Therefore, the project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Grading will be required for improvements to the existing multi-use trail. The proposed project includes site design measures, source control and treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants in runoff during construction operations. These measures are summarized in VIII (a) above and described below. Trail inspection and necessary maintenance will be performed by County personnel or volunteers on an as-needed basis to pick up trash and debris, smooth the trail, repair fences, and trim vegetation. The trail will be designed to ensure sheet runoff to prevent rills and erosion. Any potential project related impacts that may occur are considered to be less than significant.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Drainage swales, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site. The project is not proposing to place housing or structures with a potential for human occupation within these areas, however. In addition, the project will not place access roads or other improvements in locations that will limit access during flood events or affect downstream properties. No project related impacts would occur.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site contains drainage swales, which are identified as being within 100-year flood hazard areas. However, the project is not proposing to place structures, access roads or other improvements which will impede or redirect flood flows in these areas. No project related impacts would occur.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies within a special flood hazard area (Zone A) as identified on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). However, the project is not proposing to place structures with a potential for human occupation within these flood hazard areas. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, therefore no impact would occur.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The majority of the trail is located downstream of the Sweetwater Reservoir; however, a small portion of the project does lie within a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County, as identified on an inundation map prepared by the dam owner. After review of the inundation map for the Sweetwater Reservoir, it has been determined that the proposed project will not result in the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss injury, or death involving flooding as a result of failure of the Sweetwater Dam. Adequate emergency response time exists to warn people before the water would reach the site. In addition, the San Diego County of Disaster Preparedness has an established emergency evacuation plan for the area, which will not be impeded or impaired by the project. Any potential project related impacts that may occur are considered to be less than significant.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☑ 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. No project related impacts would occur.

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. No project related impacts would occur.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The project site is not located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. The project footprint and surrounding areas are flat and do not contain slopes that would be at risk for failure. Refer to Section VI.a.iv above for additional information. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow. Any potential project related impacts that may occur are considered to be less than significant.

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

a) Physically divide an established community?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length that will be a part of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not physically disrupt or divide an established community. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan/Zoning Map, as well as the goals and policies identified in the General Plan and applicable community

plans. The project was developed and designed in correspondence with the County's Community Trail Master Plan. The Master Plan sets forth implementation strategies and design guidelines adopted for the purpose of avoiding and mitigating environmental effects. Furthermore, to procure necessary permits/approvals, the County has coordinated with the appropriate jurisdictions and agencies, including California Department of Fish and Game, US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project, therefore, would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project area. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant 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). The project site is surrounded by intermixed land uses including residential, recreational, and commercial, which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties including, but not limited to, noise, air quality, and traffic. Implementation of the proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value as the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible surrounding land uses. Any potential project related impacts that may occur are considered to be less than significant.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned A70, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82). The project site does not have an Impact Sensitive Land Use

Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit completed by ESU staff on June 10, 2008, the surrounding area supports single-family residential land uses to the north and south, recreational uses to the east and Interstate 805 approximately 0.25 mile to the west. Primary users of the trail system would be hikers, bike riders and equestrians. The proposed project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards as described below.

i. County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). The project will not, therefore, expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

ii. Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Non-transportation noise generated by the proposed project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards because operation of the project does not involve any noise generating equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

ii. Noise Ordinance – Section 36.410

The project will not generate construction noise that exceeds the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an eight hours during a 24-hour period. The construction of the trail is not expected to require extensive construction equipment, as the trail will utilize existing disturbed tread to the maximum extent practicable. The project's compliance with the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404 and 36.410) will ensure that the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive land uses and the applicable noise level limits at the property line or during construction. The project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length and 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. No project related impacts would occur.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Increased noise levels may result from the proposed project due to increased users on the trail system; however, the low noise-producing activities (i.e. hiking, equestrian riding, and habitat watching) would not significantly impact the current noise environmental. The project would therefore not result in a substantial permanent increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Any potential project related impacts that may occur are considered to be less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would result in short-term noise impacts due to the use of mechanized and handheld equipment for construction and maintenance of the project, as well as construction vehicles entering and exiting the project site. Temporary increases in existing ambient noise levels for general construction noise are expected to be in compliance with the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410), which are derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an eight hours during a 24-hour period. Although construction activities may result in noise impacts to the surrounding environment, these impacts will be temporary and will cease upon completion of construction and installation of the project. The short-term impact, in combination with existing regulations on hours of operation, will reduce the impacts to below a level of significance.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation ☑ No Impact

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ 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. No project related impacts would occur.

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)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ 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. No project related impacts would occur.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length within an existing open space park. The project will not displace any existing housing since the site is currently vacant. No project related impacts would occur.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle) approximately 1.43 miles in length that will be a part of a planned trail system extending

east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. 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. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would improve and formalize a portion of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The proposed project is not expected to result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that substantial deterioration of existing facilities would occur or be accelerated. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project involves the improvement of an existing multi-use trail. However, as outlined in the Environmental Analysis Form Section I-XVII, the project will not result in adverse physical affects on the environment with incorporation of mitigation measures previously identified in Section IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

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)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The proposed project would result in a short-term increase in traffic during construction activities due to construction vehicles entering and exiting the project site. Increased daily trips during project construction is anticipated to result in less than significant impacts to existing traffic on adjacent roadways. In addition, implementation of the project may result in increased traffic to and from the project site due to increased use of the trail system. The limited number of increased vehicle trips anticipated is not expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in relation to existing traffic loads, vehicle trips or volume to capacity ratio on roads. The short-term, periodic traffic resulting from construction activities and any increased traffic from use of the trail system is not expected to exceed the level of service (LOS) standards established by the County of San Diego for the Circulation Element's roads in the surrounding area. Impacts are considered less than significant. The proposed project would improve and formalize approximately 1.43 miles of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. Any potential project related impacts that may occur are considered to be less than significant.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is to improve and formalize approximately 1.43 miles of a existing trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The project does not propose any additional average daily trips (ADTs); therefore, the proposed project will have no direct or cumulative impact on the level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No project related impacts would occur.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would involve the improvement of an existing multi-use trail and will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, or place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. No project related impacts would occur.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would involve the improvement of an existing multi-use trail and will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County; therefore, the project has adequate emergency access. No project related impacts would occur.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The western terminus of the proposed project is located at the SRP western staging area, which has ample parking. In addition, the proposed project is part of a larger planned trail system; which will allow for trail access on foot via trails east and west of this portion of the trail. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in inadequate parking capacity. No project related impacts would occur.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would improve and formalize approximately 1.43 miles of trail that is part of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir for hikers, bikers, and equestrian users. No feature of the proposed project would result in a conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. No project related impacts would occur.

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

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ 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. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation
- ☑ No Impact

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed trail project does not include or require the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not result in significant environmental effects with respect to construction or expansion of water and/or wastewater facilities. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not include new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. Moreover, the project does not involve any landform modification or require any source, treatment of structural BMPs for storm water. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects. No project related impacts would occur.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would improve and formalize approximately 1.43 miles of trail that is part of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir for hikers, bikers, and equestrian users and does not involve or require water services from a water district. No project related impacts would occur.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation
- ☑ No Impact

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would improve and formalize approximately 1.43 miles of trail that is part of a planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir for hikers, bikers, and equestrian users and will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers service capacity. No project related impacts would occur.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would involve the improvement of an existing multi-use trail and will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would involve the improvement of an existing multi-use trail and will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County. Therefore, compliance with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulation related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☑ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Based on the environmental evaluation and discussion contained in this Environmental Initial Study, the proposed project would potentially degrade the quality of the environment and result in significant impacts to the following area without mitigation incorporated: biological resources. In addition to project specific impacts, this environmental evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project to reduce impacts in these areas to below a level 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/MAP NUMBER
3870 Grandview Place TPM	TPM 20162
Martinez Family Daycare	AD 07-045
Souza Accessory Structure	AD 04-062
Glen Abbey Memorial Park Expansion	MUP 52-008w3
San Diego Filipino-American Church	MUP 69-15w3
State Farm Office Plaza TPM	TPM 20413

Less than Significant 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:

No 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 the project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. 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.

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 (NLPIP),

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/legsregs/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.qp.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.

RECON Environmental, Inc. Draft Jurisdictional Delineation Report for the Sweetwater River Phase III Trail Project, San Diego County, California, November 20, 2008

RECON Environmental, Inc. Jurisdictional Delineation Report for the Sweetwater River Phase III Trail Project, San Diego County, California, September 30, 2008

RECON Environmental, Inc. Sweetwater River Trail Phase III Mapping Assessment, February 12, 2009

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.

RECON Environmental, Inc. Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report Sweetwater River Phase III Trail Project, San Diego County, California, September 15, 2008

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.sdcounty.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.sdcounty.ca.gov)

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

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

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcounty.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/attacha.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.