

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact", that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact does not apply to the project being evaluated (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on general or project-specific factors (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must consider the whole of the project-related effects, both direct and indirect, including off-site, cumulative, construction, and operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate when there is sufficient evidence that a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change may occur in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" (Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated) applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures, prior to declaration of project approval, has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation." 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 (including a General Plan) or Negative Declaration [CCR, Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, § 15063(c)(3)(D)]. References to an earlier analysis should:
  - a) Identify the earlier analysis and state where it is available for review.
  - b) Indicate which effects from the environmental checklist were adequately analyzed in the earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether these effects were adequately addressed by mitigation measures included in that analysis.
  - c) Describe the mitigation measures in this document that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and indicate to what extent they address site-specific conditions for this project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist or appendix (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, biological assessments). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include an indication of the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Explanation(s) of each issue should identify:
  - a) the criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate the significance of the impact addressed by each question and
  - b) the mitigation measures, if any, prescribed to reduce the impact below the level of significance.

# ENVIRONMENTAL (INITIAL STUDY) CHECKLIST

## I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

**Project Title:** Cuyamaca Rancho State Park Equestrian Facilities Project

**Project ID#** 13360

**PCA#** 10600

**Contact Person:** Christine Beck

**Telephone:** (619) 688-6140

**Location:** Cuyamaca Rancho State Park in San Diego County

**Checklist Date:** 11/15/2009

**Project Description:** The Cuyamaca Equestrian Facilities project includes the following components (1) conversion of the existing Green Valley Campground Loop A (sites 1-22) to an equestrian campground containing 10-15 sites and associated amenities; (2) construction and operation of a Day Use staging area and related amenities at the site currently known as Paso Picacho East, which will be referred to in the EIR as the Paso Picacho Day Use site; (3) construction and operation of an expanded Day Use staging area and related amenities within the site currently known as Merigan Ranch, which will be referred to in the EIR as the Descanso Area Development Interim Day Use site; and (4) future construction and operation of a new equestrian campground and associated facilities within the Descanso Area Development.

## II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
<b>1. AESTHETICS.</b>				
<u>ISSUES</u>				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

### COMMENTS

a-c) No change in the location of Loop A of the Green Valley Campground is proposed. Currently, Loop A is set-back from Highway 79 and buffered from the highway by mature oak and coniferous trees. Conversion of Loop A to an equestrian campground would be designed to avoid and/or minimize impacts to native mature trees, especially those closest to the highway, as Highway 79 has been classified as a first priority scenic route in the San Diego County General Plan.

For the Paso Picacho Day Use site, Highway 79 would need to be widened for a deceleration lane. This would require a permit from Caltrans. Widening of Highway 79 and construction of the parking lot would include the removal of a few mature native trees, possibly degrading the scenic view from the highway.

The Descanso Area Development campground would be located within the unincorporated town of Descanso. The site is currently an open field adjacent to Viejas Boulevard and is visible from businesses and residences in the area, as well as the neighboring elementary school. Converting the site to an equestrian campground with associated amenities would affect the viewshed, during and post-construction. Currently, many residences have equestrian facilities on their property, which are also visible from the road and school. Therefore, the views from Viejas Boulevard are already somewhat degraded by human uses. However, the open nature of the field and the views across it would be lost. The viewshed from the road would also change due to native landscaping around the campground. Viejas Boulevard has been classified as a third priority scenic route in the Scenic Highway Element of the San Diego County General Plan. The potential for significant impacts to scenic

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

vistas, the visual character, and nighttime views of the area as a result of implementing the project will be evaluated in the EIR.

d) It is expected that the amount of nighttime light at the Green Valley Campground would not increase as a result of the change in use. At the Descanso Area campground, security and other lighting will be put in near the restrooms, pathways, and self-pay station. Vehicles entering or departing the campground at night will also create a new source of light.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Mitigation will be developed in the EIR. However, for any mature trees removed at the project sites, replacement plantings would be at appropriate ratios. The Descanso Area campground would incorporate a visual buffer between Viejas Boulevard and the campground and may include native trees and shrubs, earthen berms, boulders, and rustic style ranch fencing.

**2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.**

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 Department of Conservation as an optional model for use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland. Would the project:

**ISSUES**

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**COMMENTS:**

a-c) Only the Descanso Area Development supports agricultural resources. Prior to Park ownership in 1977, the site was actively farmed. For the past 32 years the land has been fallow. The proposed campground and associated landscaping would directly impact this former agricultural site, making it unsuitable for future farming. Parks, however, did not purchase the property with the intent to farm it but with the intent to make it accessible to Park visitors. Therefore, conversion of the site from passive to active use would have little to no effect on existing agricultural production. However, the campground site is Farmland of Local Importance and would be removed from the agricultural land inventory available in San Diego County. Removing this Farmland of Local Importance is less than a significant effect because the farmland was effectively removed when it was purchased as Park land in 1977. Additionally, the improvements from the proposed campground use could be reversed if needed because of limited infrastructure and hardscape.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

N/A

**3. AIR QUALITY.**

**ISSUES**

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

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or regulation?                      | <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., children, the elderly, individuals with compromised respiratory or immune systems)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

**COMMENTS:**

a) The project will increase vehicle trips and barbecue/wood fires and their associated air pollution but the amount is insignificant when compared to the vehicle trips and daily combustible use within the San Diego Air Basin.

b-d) At all sites, dust may be raised during construction and operational activities. The Descanso Area campground site, in particular, is sandy and substantial dust (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) may be generated

e) Equestrian facilities have the potential to cause objectionable odors due to large numbers of horses being present and the smell of their waste. Both campgrounds will be self-contained but odors may drift from the two proposed campgrounds to neighboring sites.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

During project construction and operations, specific guidelines for dust control will be implemented to prevent or reduce the spread of contaminant dust both on and off all project sites. These measures will likely include water trucks or sprinklers to keep the dust down during construction and prior to daily equestrian activities at the campgrounds. Additional mitigation may be proposed prior to the approval of the project, subject to the planning and public review process. In an effort to reduce the spread of objectionable odors, horse waste would be removed on a regular basis from the facilities.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.**

**ISSUES**

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a sensitive, candidate, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the 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, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. 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 §404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**COMMENTS:**

Several sensitive species of flora and fauna are known to occur within Cuyamaca Rancho State Park and could potentially be impacted by the proposed project. Surveys have been completed to determine the potential direct and indirect impacts to sensitive species and vegetation communities (e.g. wetlands) as a result of the proposed project. Specific information will be provided in the EIR. California Department of Parks and Recreation intends to mitigate any adverse effects on these resources to the fullest extent feasible.

a) There are two species which are either state and/or federally listed within or adjacent to the project sites: the arroyo toad (*Bufo californicus*) and the least Bell's vireo (*Vireo belli pusillus*). The Sweetwater River, which is adjacent to the Green Valley Campground supports habitat for both of these species. Potential habitat for the arroyo toad is also located in the vicinity of the Descanso Area Development site. A detailed discussion of the sensitive biological resources within each project area will be provided in the EIR.

b) As stated above the Sweetwater River is adjacent to Loop A of the Green Valley Campground. It is also in the vicinity of the Descanso Area site, as is Descanso Creek. The Paso Picacho Day Use site is located near Cold Stream. Appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be utilized to avoid unnecessary damage or disturbance to these riparian systems.

c) Based on recent surveys, the likelihood of substantial adverse impacts to wetlands is low; however there may be stream crossings as part of the proposed projects. Additional information will be included in the EIR.

d) The project may interfere with the movement of native species. The Descanso Area campground site is potential habitat for arroyo toad dispersal; however the site does not support breeding habitat for this species. Further studies will be conducted to determine the presence of sensitive species in the vicinity of the proposed project. All avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures as well as potential impacts to dispersal habitat will be discussed in the EIR.

e-f) The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. San Diego County is in the process of preparing a Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Plan for the East County, which will include the areas of Descanso and Cuyamaca, however, the MSCP Plan has not been finalized or adopted. Although the County does not have authority over lands owned by the State of California, CDPR can participate in MSCP Planning on a voluntary basis.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Sensitive biological resources would be avoided wherever possible through design modifications and construction BMPs. Direct, indirect, and temporary impacts to these resources will be minimized and mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. Specific project design proposals, avoidance, and mitigation measures will be discussed fully in the EIR.

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

**ISSUES**

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
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) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**COMMENTS:**

Cuyamaca Rancho State Park is rich in historical and archaeological resources. Although some cultural resources have already been identified within the proposed project sites, additional surveys will be conducted in an effort to fully document these and other cultural features and their significance.

a) There are historic resources in the vicinity of the proposed project; however, these features would likely be avoided. Design avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures will be discussed in the EIR.

b-c) There are many known archaeological resources within the Park, including sacred sites. Some of these resources are known to be near the proposed project, however the knowledge of archeological resources within the Park is not exhaustive. Since all of the sites will be graded, there is a chance of uncovering unknown cultural resources. However, both the Green Valley Campground and the Descanso Area Development site have been previously disturbed, therefore uncovering buried resources may be somewhat reduced at these two sites.

d) Grading is expected to be minimal in recent sedimentary soils. Therefore, significant adverse effects to paleontological resources are not anticipated.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

CDPR will avoid all known cultural features. A Park's approved cultural monitor would be present during all soil disturbing activities to ensure protection of any newly discovered cultural resources. If an unknown underground resource is discovered, then work will shift from that area until the qualified cultural resource specialist can evaluate the discovery. Additional avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures will be discussed in the EIR.

**6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.**

**ISSUES**

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
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 (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste 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"/>
f) 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"/>

**COMMENTS:**

a) The project is located in Southern California, an area known for seismic activity. However, it is not anticipated that construction of the proposed equestrian facilities would expose people or property to a higher risk of danger due to seismic activity than is currently present. The project will require some grading and landform changes but the risk of substantial adverse effects will be eliminated through proper engineering and site design. The sites to be graded are mostly flat, however during construction and until revegetated slopes mature, the project will have a greater risk of soil erosion and landslides during heavy rains.

b) In general, the Park has highly erodible surface soils. Soil surveys will be conducted before the development of the new facilities. High levels of visitor and equine use may increase loss of topsoil.

c-d) The soil at the Descanso Area Development campground site is sandy and will need to be compacted prior to construction.

e) Either a septic system that operates at Regional Water Quality Control Board standards and/or vault and composting toilet systems will be utilized at the various project sites.

f) It is not expected that there would be significant adverse effects to paleontological resources due to the soil horizon that would be disturbed by grading. An evaluation will be made as part of the EIR.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Appropriate BMPs will be installed in areas that are susceptible to soil erosion and/or landslides. These BMPs will be discussed in the EIR.

**7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.**

**ISSUES**

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
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 §65962.5, and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be 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? If so, 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) Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, 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 from wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**COMMENTS:**

a-b) The transport of hazardous materials is not anticipated for this project.

c) The proposed Descanso Area Development campground site is in close proximity to an elementary school. During construction, heavy equipment would generate emissions and dust. No hazardous materials would be used during construction or operation at any of the project sites.

d) The proposed project sites are not hazardous materials sites.

e-f) The proposed project sites are not located in the vicinity of airports or private airstrips.

g) During an emergency evacuation, there may be more traffic in the Descanso area due to Park visitors at the campground and/or the day-use area.

h) The Park is prone to wildfires and an increase in visitors could increase the risk of human-ignited fires.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

To minimize dust during construction, appropriate BMPs would be utilized including watering of the access roads and other denuded areas. When the Park is at high risk from wildfires, Park Rangers would limit campfire activities and if necessary, evacuate and close the Park. The Park's emergency response plan would also be updated to include the new proposed sites and uses.

**8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.**

**ISSUES**

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"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through 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 on- or off-site flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

There are rivers, streams, and wells in the vicinity of the project sites, as well as seasonally wet meadows. The project will not construct facilities in such a way as to cause substantial environmental damage.

a) A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required for this project to identify potential sources of pollution and to design the use and placement of BMPs.

b) Construction of the Descanso Area campground would result in increased use of water consumption due to use of hose bibs, restrooms, and dust control. However, the majority of the water would filter back to the on-site aquifer except for the water lost through evaporation. This potential impact will be addressed in the EIR and a subsequent project-specific EIR.

c-d) Grading will be minor and not substantially alter drainage patterns. If trails are constructed to incorporate creek or stream crossings, then minor impacts may occur. Additional information, design measures, and mitigation will be identified in the EIR.

e-f) There is a low potential for animal waste to enter one of the adjacent drainages. The proposed project may also result in an increase in runoff into adjacent streams and creeks due to an increase in impervious surfaces and compacted soils.

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

g-i) A portion of the Descanso Area Development site will be within the 100-year floodplain of the Sweetwater River. This potential impact will be addressed in the EIR and a subsequent project-specific EIR.

j) Due to its location, the project is not likely to result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

A hydrology and water quality study is being completed and the results will be included as part of the EIR. The project will require a SWPPP and conformance with accepted BMPs for water quality and stormwater runoff. BMP's will be incorporated into the design of the equestrian facilities. Manure will be cleaned up and removed regularly to appropriate disposal locations. The EIR will contain additional design and evaluation of potential water quality issues.

**9. LAND USE AND PLANNING.**

**ISSUES**

Would the project:

- |   |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**COMMENTS:**

a) The Descanso Area Development site is located within a portion of the Park that extends into the County of San Diego's unincorporated community of Descanso. It is also located adjacent to a school and across from several equestrian related businesses. Although many of the residents in this part of Descanso have horses or livestock on their property, some do not. The introduction of the campground and its users would increase the amount of noise, traffic, and lighting to this rural area. However, these new facilities may be considered a beneficial use for those members of the community that participate in equestrian activities. For those that do not, the new facilities may be considered a detriment to the area.

b) The proposed project is consistent with the Cuyamaca Rancho State Park General Plan and the Area of Potential Effect would be limited to Park lands. Viejas Boulevard and the neighboring properties are under the jurisdiction of the County of San Diego, while the school is governed by the Mountain Empire Unified School District. CDPR is not aware of any conflicts with local zoning and would coordinate with the County of San Diego during the implementation of this project. CDPR will also coordinate with school officials to reduce or eliminate potential traffic and noise impacts to the school from construction and operation of the campground.

c) CDPR will coordinate, during the course of this project, with all appropriate resource agencies and the County of San Diego to ensure that the project is in conformance with any applicable planning efforts.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

On June 12, 2007, CDPR held a public meeting in the community of Descanso to involve the public in the planning process for the campground and other equestrian facilities. Additionally, CDPR will coordinate with all appropriate resource agencies and the County of San Diego to ensure that the project is in conformance with any applicable planning efforts. Additional mitigation may be proposed or implemented during the planning and public review process prior to project approval.

**10. MINERAL RESOURCES.**

**ISSUES**

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
mineral resource that is or would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
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"/>

COMMENTS:

a-b) The proposed project sites contains sandy soil but no other known resources. The site is currently owned by CDPR and would not be open to mining activities.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

N/A

**11. NOISE.**

ISSUES

Would the project:				
a) Generate or expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project (above levels without the project)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, in excess of noise levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be 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? If so, 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) Be in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, 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"/>

COMMENTS:

a-b) Primarily during construction, use of heavy equipment and tools would increase noise levels above the current baseline in all project areas. Additionally, if large trucks are required to bring equipment to the site, there would be an increase in noise along the sites' access roads. There are sensitive noise receptors located adjacent or close to both campgrounds and day-use sites. Loop A is separated from the other campground loops within the Green Valley Campground but close to the Green Valley Day Use area. The Paso Picacho campground and Park employee facilities are located across SR-79 from the proposed Paso Picacho Equestrian Day Use site. The Descanso Area site is located adjacent to a school, a County park, homes, and close to businesses.

c-d) The proposed project will create both permanent and temporary increases in the ambient noise levels. These noises will include the ingress and egress of vehicles to the facilities, the loading and unloading of horses and other livestock, and

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

conversations between people at each location. Special events could increase noise levels on a temporary basis and are subject to CDPR approval.

e-f) There is no airstrip near the Park.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

It is anticipated that construction work near sensitive noise receptors would be limited to weekdays between 7 AM and 7 PM. Potential noise impacts to rural residences near the Descanso Area Development and appropriate mitigation will be addressed in the EIR and a subsequent project-specific EIR.

**12. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

**ISSUES**

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"/>

**COMMENTS:**

The entire proposed project is located within State Park property and does not involve the demolition or construction of any homes.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

N/A

**13. PUBLIC SERVICES.**

**ISSUES**

Would the project:

a) Result in significant environmental impacts from construction associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CDPR?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

COMMENTS:

This a government (State Park) project and would require a long-term financial commitment for maintenance and operations and possibly require additional staff support. The cost would be partially offset by camping fees and/or other user fees. Park rangers provide law enforcement protection and the California Department of Forestry (CDF) provides fire protection to the Park and its users. Additional assistance may be required from these agencies to protect the new use areas in the event of a wildland fire. There is some potential for the Descanso Area campground users to disrupt school activities, however there would be a visual and noise buffer between the campground and the school. A nominal amount of new public services such as trash, water, and electricity would be required for all of the project sites.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

The project design would incorporate a visual and noise buffer or berm between the proposed Descanso Area campground and the school. The Park's emergency response plan would be updated to include the new use areas.

**14. RECREATION.**

ISSUES

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional CDPR or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

a-b) Implementation of the proposed project would improve the equestrian recreational experience at Cuyamaca Rancho State Park and possibly alleviate crowded conditions at other equestrian facilities in the region. The project would affect existing recreational use patterns within the Park by creating new facilities and improving existing facilities that focus on only one user group. Non-equestrian users of the Park may voice concern regarding the limited focus of the proposed project. There is potential, however, for the community to use the facilities at the proposed Descanso Area site for non-equestrian activities. Proximity to Interstate 8 and the town of Descanso would allow for the day-use area to be easily accessed, and Park visitation by non-equestrian users may increase. The proposed project may also result in increased visitation to the adjacent County park, which may accelerate its deterioration.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

During times of heavy use or special events, increased staffing may be required.

**15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

ISSUES

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial increase in traffic, in relation to existing traffic and the capacity of the street system (i.e., a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exceed, individually or cumulatively, the level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
c) Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Contain a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) that would substantially increase hazards?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**COMMENTS:**

a-e) The proposed project will nominally increase vehicle miles traveled within the Park when compared to the regional volume of traffic on the nearby roadways. However, large vehicles towing horse trailers in the immediate areas of the campgrounds and day-use areas would increase as a result of the proposed project. These vehicles are slow moving and can cause increased traffic queues, especially on weekends and holidays or during special events. However, the Park's existing campgrounds are often occupied by campers with recreational vehicles. The number of slow-moving recreational vehicles on any given weekend would not change appreciably on SR-79 as there will be fewer campsites available at Green Valley and there would only be about 20 new campsites at the Descanso campground. However, there would be potential for increased traffic queues at intersections for turning vehicles.

f) The existing equestrian day-use parking is inadequate in both the northern and southern portions of the Park. The proposed project would improve parking for both equestrian and non-equestrian users in the southern portion of the Park. Also, a new driveway will provide better access into the southern day-use area. The northern day-use area will be constructed to Caltrans' requirements to allow safe ingress and egress onto State Highway 79.

g) The project does not provide for alternative transportation such as bicycle racks or bus turnouts since it is an equestrian facility, however, trail connections to the local community would allow for walking or equestrian access to the southern campground facility.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

During construction and special events, traffic control may be required.

**16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.**

**ISSUES**

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment restrictions or standards of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination, by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to service the project's anticipated demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**COMMENTS:**

To facilitate the project, permanent infrastructure will be installed. A septic system, vault or composting toilets would be installed at the two day-use areas and the Descanso Area campground. New utility connections would also have to be installed at the Descanso Area campground. If septic systems are installed they would comply with the standards appropriate for the area. At the Descanso Area campground, a waste station dump site and electrical hook-ups may be provided for RVs. A watering system would also need to be installed to reduce dust impacts. Stormwater or drainage facilities would be constructed as part of all of the proposed projects and trash and manure would be collected frequently. Manure may be composted to avoid impacts to the local landfill. Additional information, design measures, and mitigation will be further identified in the EIR.

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Avoidance or relocation of any existing utility easements may be required. Additional information, design measures, and mitigation will be further identified in the EIR.

**III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

Would the project:

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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have the potential to 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"/>
c) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probably future projects?)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**COMMENTS:**

a-b) The proposed project sites are in areas that have sensitive cultural and natural resources. CDPR will survey these areas and avoid areas known to have significant or sensitive resources. The full extent and significance of impacts to cultural

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

resources, sensitive species, habitat, and wetlands will be detailed in the EIR. CDPR intends to mitigate any adverse effects to sensitive resources, as a result of the proposed project, to the fullest extent feasible.

c) The proposed project would have cumulative impacts on Cuyamaca Rancho State Park as well as on the community of Descanso and other nearby residents. Construction of the Descanso Area Development and the Paso Picacho Day-Use parking lot would result in an increase in visitor use and a rise in traffic, which would include larger equestrian vehicles such as trucks, trailers, and recreational vehicles. Finally, project implementation may result in an increase in use of Park-wide trail connections. An increase in facilities and trails would intensify visitation at locations throughout the Park as well as surrounding towns and businesses. In addition to the proposed Equestrian Facilities projects, other projects being proposed and/or developed within and surrounding the Park include Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) projects, Americans with Disabilities Act improvements and upgrades, trail connections, and development projects in the communities of Descanso and Lake Cuyamaca. FEMA projects are a result of the 2003 Cedar Fire and include vegetation management activities, erosion control, and construction activities to replace structures lost during the fire.

d) The proposed Equestrian Facilities projects may result in some adverse impacts to nearby residents in the neighboring town of Descanso. The proposed Descanso Area Development site is in the vicinity of a school, businesses, and residences. There would be high levels of visitation and recreational use at this site, which would result in more noise, an increase in water and utility usage, and aesthetic impacts. Impacts to air and water quality and to sensitive biological resources would be avoided to the maximum extent possible.

#### IV. PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION

On the basis of the Initial Study,

- I find that the proposed project could not have an adverse effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect because the mitigation measures described in the attached Mitigation appendix will be required. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

PREPARER: Christine Beck

TITLE: Associate Park and Recreation Specialist DATE: 11/12/2009