

Cuyamaca Rancho State Park General Plan Initial Study

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

| | |
|--|--|
| Project Title: | Cuyamaca Rancho State Park General Plan |
| Lead agency name and address: | California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) |
| Contact person and phone number: | Luke Serna, Park and Recreation Specialist (619) 221-7060; enviro@parks.ca.gov |
| Project Location: | Cuyamaca Rancho State Park, San Diego County |
| Project sponsor's name and address: | Bob Patterson California State Parks 2797 Truxtun Rd. San Diego, CA 92106 |
| General plan description: | State Park |
| Zoning: | n/a |
| Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.) | The General Plan for Cuyamaca Rancho State Park (the Park) would plan for the long range management and use of the Park. This would be accomplished by delineating management zones for the Park and developing goals and guidelines for their current and future management. Certain zones may plan for the development of further facilities and recreational opportunities, while other zones may provide guidelines to protect natural and/or cultural resources. |
| Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings: | Private land owners, USFS lands, Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, Caltrans highway Right-of-Way, utility easements |
| Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements): | Permits may be needed if park facility development is proposed following General Plan approval. |

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Further explanation of how the project may affect the checked factors follows the environmental determination.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> | Agriculture and Forestry | <input type="checkbox"/> | Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> | Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Transportation/Traffic | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Utilities/Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I find 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 or shall be included as mitigation measures to be implemented in implementing the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. |

| | |
|---|----------------------------|
| Signature:  | Date: April 8, 2013 |
| Printed Name: Luke Serna | |

CEQA Environmental Checklist

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. Background studies performed in connection with the projects may further explain whether impacts may occur. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| I. AESTHETICS: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) Any additional facilities introduced to the Park would be designed to result in less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated on known scenic vistas. Public input would be solicited to ensure new facilities do not impact scenic vistas that park users may view as significant. Projects carried out based on guidance from the General Plan shall be designed to incorporate CDPR scenic and aesthetic values including but not limited to siting choice, building materials, aesthetic treatments and landscaping.
- b) Facility development would take place to complement views of SR-79. In the case that development is considered within view of the highway, appropriate measures such as those in question a) shall be included to avoid or minimize impact to scenic resources and result in less than significant impact with mitigation.
- c) Visual character within the Park shall be preserved by minimizing new development to sites that have been historically developed. Any new facilities would be designed to blend with their surroundings so as not to detract from the existing visual character of the site.
- d) New lighting may be necessary for public safety. Care shall be used in placing new light sources to avoid impacting campsites or areas where nighttime darkness is a valued condition.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:</p> <p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p> | | | | |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) No land within the Park is used for farmland or agricultural use.
- b) See a)
- c) This project will not conflict with zoning regarding forest land or timberland. The property is not zoned as Timberland Production. As stated within PRC §5019.53, State Parks shall "...provide for recreational activities including, but not limited to, camping, picnicking, sightseeing, nature study, hiking, and horseback riding, so long as those improvements involve no major modification of lands, forests, or waters.
- d) Small amounts of forest land may be changed to non-forest use in order to provide recreational or operational facilities within the Park. This land conversion would be minimized and facilities would be sited to minimize impact to sensitive plants or wildlife habitat.
- e) No farmland exists within the Park. Please see response d) regarding the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) The most recently completed air quality plan prepared by the local air quality management district, the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District is the 2011 Ambient Air Quality Network Plan. This Plan provides detailed measurements of major criterion pollutants including measurements from a station near the Park in the community of Alpine. Despite the Alpine measuring station measuring the County's highest levels of pollutants, the changes that would be under consideration at the Park would not affect the implementation of the Network Plan.
- b) The changes under consideration at the Park would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially towards an existing or projected air quality violation. Both the California and National standards for ambient air quality would not be substantially affected by the Park's General Plan. By continuing limited development within the Park as well as following appropriate measures to minimize large wildfire events, the Park should continue to help the County meet ambient air quality standards.
- c) The Parks's General Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the County of San Diego is in non-attainment under federal or state ambient air quality standards including emissions of ozone precursors. The County is currently

in non-attainment status for ozone. However, the wilderness and open space land uses within the Park have been shown to contain vegetation that can allow for the removal of ozone and ozone precursors (CARB, 2012).

- d) Sensitive receptors within the Park include the Cuyamaca Outdoor School and the nearby Descanso Elementary School. No substantial pollutant concentrations are currently emitted within the Park. Future development would not emit emissions which could cause air quality impact to these sensitive receptor.
- e) Objectionable odors are present based on equestrian use as well as waste generation by visitors and staff within the Park. However, equestrian use has not been intensive enough of a recreational use to create an adverse condition affecting a substantial number of people. Waste generation by visitors and Park staff shall be minimized and handled appropriately according to local and state requirements. Some additional objectionable odors may occur from construction associated with development within the Park, however, they would be temporary in nature and shall be buffered from visitor use.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) Substantial adverse effects to candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS shall be less than significant from changes proposed within the General Plan. Any changes proposed within the General Plan shall be evaluated as an individual project at which point impacts may be evaluated further and measures implemented to minimize impacts. Changes proposed shall make efforts to use

currently developed or historically developed areas so as to minimize impact to wildlife and habitat and not introduce new areas of impact.

- b) Analysis of the habitat types that may be affected by changes proposed by the General Plan shall occur. Environmental impacts that may occur to habitat shall be assessed in the Environmental Analysis section of the GP.
- c) Changes proposed within the General Plan include the bridging of several watercourses including the Sweetwater River near SR-79. These would likely entail impact to navigable waters of the US. Coordination with USACE would be needed to ensure that impacts are minimized to the greatest extent possible.
- d) The movement of native fish or wildlife species by changes proposed within the Park's General Plan shall be avoided to the maximum extent practicable. Any changes that may affect the movement of species shall be analyzed further in a separate project environmental review.
- e) All CDPR operating procedures shall be adhered to in the changes that may be proposed by the Park's General Plan. This includes procedures that provide for the protection natural resources.
- f) The San Diego County East County Habitat Conservation Plan (ECHCP) is currently in preparation. Although this plan has not been approved, the Park will strive to meet the goals that have been created in the San Diego MSCP resulting in no impact to applicable natural resource conservation plans.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) Changes to the Park proposed within the General Plan shall be cognizant of its many unique historical resources. The General Plan shall document the Park’s historic resources and explain their value to the Park and to the region. Several sites of historical value shall be proposed for interpretive, operational, or recreational use within the plan. Care shall be taken to protect historical resources that may be affected by such use. Prior to any actions that have the potential to disturb historical resources, additional research and/or analysis will be carried out to determine if they are eligible for listing on the California or National Registers of Historic Places. Projects will be designed and implemented to avoid significant impacts to potentially eligible resources in compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Less than significant substantial adverse change in historical resources is anticipated.
- b) Changes to the Park proposed within the General Plan shall be cognizant of the many unique archaeological resources within the Park. The General Plan shall document these archaeological resources and explain their value to the Park and to the region. Several sites of archaeological importance shall be proposed for interpretive, operational or recreational use within the plan. Care shall be taken to protect archaeological resources that may be affected by such use. Prior to any actions that have the potential to disturb archaeological sites, additional research and/or testing will be carried out to determine if buried cultural deposits exist. Projects will be designed and implemented to avoid significant impacts to archaeological deposits to the extent possible. If impacts to archaeological resources are unavoidable, a mitigation plan will be developed and implemented. To ensure avoidance of significant impacts to unknown/buried archaeological resources, a CDPR Archaeological monitor and a Native American Monitor shall be present for all ground-disturbing work where archaeological sites are known or expected, or in the event that unknown cultural deposits are encountered during proposed work. Less than significant substantial adverse change in archaeological resources is anticipated.

- c) Changes to the Park proposed within the General Plan shall be planned to avoid unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features resulting in no impact.
- d) Changes proposed by the General Plan shall not impact any known human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. In the event that unknown human remains are discovered, work will cease in the area of the find and CDPR shall notify the County Coroner in accordance with §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, consultation will occur with the Native American Heritage Commission in accordance with §5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) Changes proposed as a result of the Park's General Plan would expose people or structures to potential risk due to the rupture of a known earthquake fault that is designated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map (September 2012). The nearest fault to the Park can be found on the Julian Quadrangle Map. Other hazards including seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction or landslides are unlikely to be of concern, but would be further assessed at the time that future facilities are planned for and designed. Much of the potential impact from these hazards can be avoided or minimized through the use of design methods that are mandated by the California Building Code and Uniform Building Code.
- b) Soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be minimized through a variety of project conditions that CDPR puts in place for all facility development. A listing of the most commonly used measures shall be included with the General Plan/EIR.
- c) By abiding by recommendations made within a geotechnical survey report, hazard from being located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable shall be avoided and/or minimized. Measures provided by the report would also avoid and/or minimize on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.
- d) A geotechnical report shall be prepared to assess the risk for expansive soil that could put any new building at risk of being impacted. The use of measures to strengthen the foundations for new structure development can greatly minimize this risk.
- e) Due to the need for the use of septic systems to handle waste water from Park facilities, assessment of the existing waste water capacity shall be evaluated and recommendations made to determine the need for further waste water handling systems. In the event that further septic systems or waste water disposal systems are needed, siting to ensure that soils are adequate to support their use shall be evaluated.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

a) Greenhouse gas emissions are currently generated as a result of providing services to both visitors and staff including electricity, space heating and cooling, water heating, and transportation. Changes proposed in the General Plan will increase greenhouse gas emissions in differing amounts based on the level of development and recreational opportunities that may be added to the Park. Several proposed changes in the Park including increasing the number of campgrounds, addition of visitor and operational buildings and increase in mileage of trails and roads for vehicles will increase greenhouse gas emissions. Although the increase in greenhouse gas emissions from development in the Park would not by itself result in a significant impact on the environment, the effect that emissions have on a global scale is significant when considered in conjunction with the increases that are happening from other emission increases occurring around the globe. Therefore, it is in the best interests of reducing this global impact for new development to include measures that will minimize emissions that will cumulatively result in less potential for impact from the release of greenhouse gases. CDPR will continue to identify new means of avoiding and/or minimizing emissions through a number of project measures. These measures should directly or indirectly reduce emissions and include:

- limiting the number of trips by contractors to job sites as well as the trips to haul materials
- using efficient methods of removing vegetation from job sites including composting or using vegetation for power generation
- minimizing the removal of trees, particularly those larger than 24 DBH due to their function in carbon sequestration
- maintaining good communication with Cal FIRE in order to prevent the spread of wildfire that may result in substantial greenhouse gas emissions

b) California has been a leader in taking steps to mitigate the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions. Steps have been taken through the establishment of policies, regulations and laws. Some of those include:

- **Executive Order S-3-05:** Established total GHG emission targets. Goals include reducing emissions to 2000 level by 2010, 1990 level by 2020 and 80% below 1990 level by 2050
- **Assembly Bill 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006:** Establishes regulatory, reporting and market mechanisms to achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions and a cap on statewide GHG emissions. Reductions will be accomplished through enforceable state wide cap on emissions that will be phased in starting in 2012
- **AB 32 Climate Change Scoping Plan:** Plan adopted by California Air Resources Board which contains strategies CA will implement to achieve reduction of approximately 118 million metric tons (MMT) of CO₂e or approximately 22% from the State's projected 2020 emission level of 545 MMT of CO₂e.

CDPR shall identify environmental impacts to resources from GHG emissions as well as take steps to reduce our carbon footprint. Emission reduction measures will mitigate the impacts of CDPR's GHG emissions resulting in a less than significant impact.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) Changes proposed by the General Plan would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The storage of fuels for heating and transportation would be present onsite. Any hazardous materials tested for in the demolition of facilities shall be handled and disposed of following appropriate state and federal regulations.
- b) Changes proposed would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. No reasonable upset and accident conditions beyond the possible release of minor amounts of vehicle fluids. In the case of release of hazardous material, clean-up plans shall be in place to ensure minimal environmental impact.
- c) The Cuyamaca Outdoor School and the Descanso Elementary School are the nearest school facilities sited near the Park. General Plan development is anticipated to include none to minimal amounts of hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste from park operations or park development. Emission or waste shall be properly contained of and disposed of in accordance with appropriate state and federal regulations.
- d) Review of the Department of Toxic Substance Control Envirostor database returned information showing A Formerly Used Defense Site that exists near Cuyamaca Lake within the Park. On July 29, 1999, a determination was made that no evidence exists of any hazard on the site. Therefore, it can be determined that this site would create no impact to the public or environment.
- e, f) The Park is not located within the vicinity of a public airport, public use airport or private airstrip. This would result in no safety hazard to people residing or working within the Park.
- g) Changes proposed to the Park from the General Plan will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with any emergency response plan or evacuation plan. An opportunity to review the Draft General Plan/EIR shall be provided to agencies involved in emergency planning including Cal FIRE so they may ensure that the General Plan's changes will not interfere with their existing emergency plans including wildfire preparedness.
- h) Changes proposed to the Park from the General Plan have the potential to expose visitors to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires due to these facilities being present within forest that has recent history of major wildfire. Planning of new facilities shall be undertaken to minimize the risk of impact from wildfire. Through coordination with Cal FIRE and other forest management agencies this risk can be minimized through the update and reexamination of existing fire management plans. Measures to minimize risk to new facilities shall be included within the General Plan.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) Changes proposed by the Park’s General Plan shall be conducted in accordance with all applicable local, State, and/or Federal water quality control standards and waste discharge requirements. Applicable Standard Project Requirements to minimize water quality impacts shall also be included in projects that result from the goals and guidelines within the General Plan. Those requirements shall be provided in the General Plan for reference in future Park projects.
- b) Development proposed by the Park’s General Plan could substantially deplete groundwater supplies. Groundwater supply is currently sufficient; however, supply has been insufficient during dry years when precipitation levels have not provided sufficient groundwater recharge to meet the needs of the Park. New water sources may be needed to provide sufficient supply to additional facilities. Changes to the Park proposed by the General Plan shall not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge resulting in deficit to aquifer volume or local groundwater level.
- c) Goals and guidelines provided by the General Plan may include recommendation of water crossings of trails. This work has the potential to alter the course of streams or rivers within the Park. Permits from appropriate resource agencies would be acquired at the time that individual projects are undertaken. These permits along with CDPR measures would avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate for potential erosion or siltation that could occur at a project’s location or downstream from it.
- d) Risk of flooding from projects such as river or stream crossings may occur. The use of bridges as opposed to culverts would be the preferred method of providing trail crossings over streams or rivers in order to reduce the potential for on- or off-site flooding. Proper hydraulic engineering in the design of water crossings shall additionally minimize the risk of flooding.
- e) Changes proposed within the Park’s General Plan may contribute additional runoff water from an increase in recreational and operation facilities. BMPs found within CDPR project measures shall avoid and/or minimize the potential for the generation of additional sources of polluted runoff.
- f) Facilities proposed by the Park’s General Plan have the potential to degrade water quality from the addition of several types of pollutants including visitors’ trash and automobile fluids. Park staff may advise visitors to minimize the introduction of these pollutants where possible. Other pollutant sources such as sediment from construction of facilities shall be minimized through the use of CDPR project measures resulting in a less than significant impact with mitigation.
- g) Any introduction of new housing such as that for Park staff shall be sited to avoid 100-year flood hazard areas resulting in less than significant impact.
- h) Development proposed within the Park’s General Plan shall make all efforts to avoid 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows.
- i) Changes proposed within the Park’s General Plan will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Lake Cuyamaca and Cuyamaca Dam are near the Park, however, flooding risk is relatively low. FEMA flood insurance rate maps shall be evaluated in the siting of

any new facilities proposed at the Park. Review of San Diego County's Flood Hazard Map shows a small portion of the Park is within the 100-year floodplain.

- j) At this time, there is no means of assessing the potential impact from seiche at the Park. The nearest closed body of water is Lake Cuyamaca. Earthquake would pose the greatest potential to create inundation by seiche. Tsunami poses no threat to the Park due to the inland location of the Park. Landslide potential (mudflow) according to the San Diego County Rain Induced Landslide Map shows the majority of the Park is on steep slopes that could be prone to landslide. A smaller portion of the Park contains gabbroic soils with less landslide potential.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) No established communities exist within the Park.
- b) Changes proposed to the Park will strive to remain consistent with all planning documentation for surrounding open space including lands owned by USFS and BLM. The General Plan will also strive to achieve the goals for open space and recreation discussed within the San Diego County General Plan. Additional planning influences may be found within a dedicated section of the General Plan.
- c) The East County Multiple Species Conservation Plan is currently in preparation. This plan would encompass the boundaries of the Park. Despite the MSCP not being approved for this region of San Diego County, changes proposed by the General Plan will strive to abide by similar objectives the County of San Diego's MSCP. Many of the measures and/or mitigation required by the MSCP are similar to CDPR project requirements.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a, b) No mineral sources of value to the region, residents of the state or locally are currently viable within the Park. There was history of gold mining from 1870-1892. PRC § 5001.65 does not permit resource extraction within CDPR units.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XII. NOISE: Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) No thresholds for noise levels have been identified for CDPR. However, CDPR has identified several project measures to minimize noise generation that could affect visitors within CDPR units. These measures include the use of noise barriers, noise mufflers on construction equipment, staging to avoid sensitive noise receptors and construction scheduling to avoid higher use visitation times. If new overnight facilities are proposed the current quiet hours established in the park will apply to these facilities as well. This includes a prohibition of use of generators during the night.
- b) Visitors may be exposed to groundborne vibration or noise levels, however, this impact can be minimized through the use of measures indicated in question a).
- c) Visitors to the Park are acutely aware of small increases in ambient noise levels. Changes to the Park proposed in the General Plan may result in less than significant changes in ambient noise levels based on additional facilities being proposed. The changes proposed will ensure

that a low noise environment is maintained. If need be, additional regulations within the Park may be considered to maintain a low noise environment.

- d) No substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels shall occur above levels currently existing at the Park. Proposed Park development may result in temporary noise level increase. This increase would be temporary and planned around heavier use times within the Park resulting in a less than significant impact.
- e) The Park is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f) Project development proposed within the General Plan would not expose visitors to excessive noise levels resulting from a private airstrip in the vicinity.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) The Park's General Plan development would not induce substantial population growth because it does not include major development such as new homes, businesses, roads or any other population inducing infrastructure. Development would include modest increases in overnight facilities such as additional campsites or rustic cabins, operations buildings, and/or staff housing.
- b) The Park's General Plan development would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing. Any change in the use of a structure as housing for Park staff would be replaced with equal or better housing.
- c) The General Plan's development would not displace substantial numbers of people.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XIV. 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 objectives for any of the public services: | | | | |
| Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) General Plan changes to the Park would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the construction of new or altered park facilities. New or restored facilities would be sited to minimize the impact to natural or cultural resources and would also utilize the site of existing structures wherever possible. Fire protection would remain at an acceptable service level and response time. Public safety and police protection would continue to be acceptable and meet the performance objectives for public safety within a CDPR unit. The Cuyamaca Outdoor School would continue to serve students and provide the Park's resources for their education. The Park would make further resources available to the public while increasing protection to sensitive natural and cultural resources.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| XV. RECREATION: | | | | |
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) Changes proposed within the General Plan would allow for modest increases in recreational opportunity within the Park. No decrease is anticipated in recreational resources that would result in the need to expand nearby park facilities. Continued use of the Park would require regular maintenance that shall ensure that no substantial deterioration of facilities occurs.
- b) Changes proposed within the General Plan will include facilities to expand recreational opportunity within the Park. Potential impacts that may occur to the environment shall be discussed within the EIR. Measures shall be included in the General Plan to avoid and/or minimize impacts due to future Park changes. Additional CEQA impact analysis will take place for specific project planning guided by the General Plan.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) Proposed changes would not conflict with any transportation plan such as a Caltrans Transportation Concept Summary for State Route 79 through the Park. Any improvements near SR-79 shall be made in order to facilitate multiple modes of transportation.
- b) The applicable congestion management program would be served by the Transportation Concept Summary as discussed in question a). This summary shows that all segments of SR-79 through the Park currently provide a Level of Service (LOS) B. The County of San Diego's

Mobility Element shows an increased level of mass transit to rural areas including SR-79 as well as widening of the roadway to accommodate other modes of transportation such as bicycling.

- c) Changes proposed by the Park's General Plan will not result in change in air traffic patterns.
- d) As increased demand for recreation facilities continues at the Park, there may be interest in adding additional parking facilities. The location of proposed parking facilities will need to be considered carefully to ensure that dangerous conditions aren't created due to poor lines of sight from automobiles entering or exiting SR-79 from a new parking facility. With appropriate coordination with Caltrans, no substantial increase in hazard would be anticipated. Additionally, crossing for equestrians may be considered but shall be done in coordination with Caltrans.
- e) Emergency access will continue to remain sufficient for the future development proposed for the Park. Coordination with emergency management agencies shall occur to incorporate their input.
- f) Proposed facilities would not conflict with policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities or decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Any new facilities near SR-79 would be designed to ensure that several transportation options remain feasible for accessing the Park.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) No wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board shall be exceeded. Any proposed facilities that require additional onsite wastewater treatment systems will acquire an OWTS permit from the County of San Diego. The determination of the need for additional wastewater capacity for CDPR facilities shall be determined upon selection of a preferred alternative for the General Plan that will outline the extent of new facilities to be constructed. Further analysis of wastewater treatment needs and siting shall occur during individual project planning.

- b) No new water treatment facilities shall be constructed as a result of changes proposed within the General Plan. New OWTS facilities may be recommended, however, their siting and construction shall result in less than significant impact to the environment.
- c) New storm water drainage facilities may be required as requirements of new facility development proposed within the General Plan. Their construction and siting shall include appropriate water quality protection measures to result in less than significant impact to the environment.
- d) In the case that expanded visitor or staff facilities are proposed, the sufficiency of existing water supply shall be evaluated. Any new water supply facilities including water tanks shall be sited and constructed so as to result in less than significant impact to the environment.
- e) No wastewater treatment provider is needed at the Park. All treatment takes place onsite.
- f) No development proposed by the General Plan would result in a significant increase in solid waste. Any increase in solid waste due to proposed facility development would be sufficiently accommodated by the local landfill.
- g) Any changes in solid waste generation would comply with appropriate federal, state and local statutes and regulations. The change in generation would result in a less than significant impact.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | | | | |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Potential Impacts and Mitigation:

- a) Alternatives proposed for analysis within the General Plan will be designed so that they do not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. Even alternatives that result in the largest amount of facility development shall be designed so as not to result in substantial reduction in habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Nor shall alternative proposed eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. CDPR Historians and Archaeologists shall be consulted with as goals and guidelines for the Park are developed and new or modified facilities are planned for. With their expertise there will be less than significant impacts to historic and archaeological resources.
- b) The preparation of the Park's General Plan shall guide future changes to the Park and allow for more effective analysis of how cumulative impacts from several individual projects shall affect the entirety of the Park. Potential cumulative impacts shall be discussed within the GP. Through the use of appropriate avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures, impacts shall be less than significant. Potential cumulative impacts that may result include cumulative sedimentation from trail construction and/or maintenance and cumulative impacts to archaeological, historical, and natural resources due to resource proximity to recreational facilities.

- c) The project will not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Increased recreation opportunity at the Park will provide a benefit to the physical and mental well-being of visitors to the Park.