

1.4.8 Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors

In general, wildlife corridors and linkages are smaller constrained areas of habitat that connect larger areas of habitat which are otherwise separated by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or urban development. This allows for an exchange of gene pool between wildlife populations, which increases the genetic viability of otherwise isolated populations. Wildlife corridors are especially important for species with large habitat ranges or seasonal migrations. A corridor is a specific route that is used for the movement and migration of species, and may be different from a linkage in that it represents a smaller or narrower avenue for movement. A linkage is an area of land that supports or contributes to the long-term movement of wildlife and genetic exchange by providing live-in habitat that connects to other habitat areas. Many linkages occur as stepping-stone linkages that are comprised of fragmented archipelago arrangement of habitat over a linear distance. Corridors and linkages will be comprised of land features which accommodate the movement of all sizes of wildlife, including large animals on a regional scale. Their contributing areas will support adequate vegetation cover, providing visual continuity and long lines of sight, so as to encourage the use of the corridor by all types of wildlife. In San Diego County, important corridors/linkages have been identified on the local and regional scale.

The survey area does not support habitats that could facilitate wildlife movements for large mammals on a local or regional scale. In addition, the project site is surrounded by roads and urban land uses, and does not have direct connectivity to adjacent lands of higher quality habitats that extend offsite undisturbed over large distances. Due to these obstructions to wildlife movements around the site and the lack of surrounding blocks of natural areas, no core areas of habitat suitable for use by resident populations of wildlife, as either wildlife corridors or parts of a larger regional linkage, exist on or adjacent to the site. Further, the County MSCP Subarea Plan does not recognize or designate any locally or regionally important wildlife corridors or linkages on or in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Urban/Wildlands Interface and Adjacency Management Issues

An urban/wildlands interface is generally defined as land that presently contains, or will contain as a result of a proposed action, both elements of an urban setting and undeveloped or protected lands. This land is situated as such to present a sharply defined physical contrast between the two, potentially creating an adverse edge effect resulting from direct and indirect impacts derived from the urban elements.

As previously stated, the site is not within a Focused Conservation Area or PAMA of the County MSCP Subarea Plan (County of San Diego 1998). Furthermore, because the site is surrounded by roads and urban land uses, and does not have direct connectivity to adjacent lands of higher quality habitats that extend offsite undisturbed over large distances, it is not within an urban/wildlands interface.

1.5 Applicable Regulations

1.5.1 Federal

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act

Section 404 of the CWA requires that a permit be obtained from the USACE prior to the discharge of dredged or fill materials into any "waters of the U.S.," including wetlands. Such permits often require mitigation to offset losses of these habitat types. Waters of the U.S. are broadly defined in the USACE's

INTRODUCTION

regulations (33 CFR 328) to include navigable waterways and their tributaries. Waters of the U.S. encompass both wetland and non-wetland aquatic habitats, such as streams, creeks, rivers, lakes, ponds, bays, and oceans. Wetlands are defined as: "Those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that normally do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas." To fit this definition, an area suspected of being a wetland must have hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and hydrology. Wetlands that are not specifically exempt from Section 404 regulations (such as drainage channels excavated on dry land) are considered to be "jurisdictional wetlands." The USACE is required to consult with the federal and State Environmental Protection Agencies, USFWS, RWQCB, and CDFW in carrying out its discretionary authority under Section 404.

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act

Pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA, states can certify or deny federal permits or licenses that might result in a discharge to State waters, including wetlands (33 USC 1341). Section 404 permit applicants must obtain a "water quality certification" from the state water quality agency indicating that the proposed activity complies with all applicable state water quality standards, limitations, and restrictions. In California, the RWQCBs issue water quality certifications within their jurisdictions. The RWQCB reviews the project for consistency with Waste Discharge Requirements under the State land disposal regulations (Subchapter 15). In reviewing the project, the RWQCB will also consider impacts to waters of the U.S. and the filling of wetlands in accordance with the State wetland policy. Usually, mitigation is required (if not already a condition of the 404 permit) in the form of replacement or restoration of adversely impacted "waters of the U.S."

Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918

All migratory bird species that are native to the U.S. or its territories are protected under the federal MBTA, as amended under the Migratory Bird Treaty Reform Act of 2004 (FR Doc. 05-5127; USFWS 2004). The MBTA prohibits "take" (kill, harm, harass, capture, etc.) of any migratory bird listed in 50 CFR 10, including their nests, eggs, or products. Migratory birds include geese, ducks, shorebirds, raptors, songbirds, and many other species.

Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973

Administered by the USFWS, the federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) provides the legal framework for the listing and protection of species (and their habitats) that are identified as being endangered or threatened with extinction. Actions that jeopardize endangered or threatened species, or the habitats upon which they rely, are considered a "take" under the FESA. Section 9(a) of the FESA defines take as "to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to engage in any such conduct." "Harm" and "harass" are further defined in federal regulations and case law to include actions that adversely impair or disrupt a listed species' behavioral patterns.

Sections 4(d), 7, and 10(a) of the FESA regulate actions that could jeopardize endangered or threatened species. A special rule under Section 4(d) of the FESA authorizes incidental take of certain protected species within subregions that are actively preparing a Natural Communities Conservation Program (NCCP), or are covered by approved NCCPs, which are administered by the states. The term "incidental

take” refers to the “taking” of a listed species that is incidental to (and not the purpose of) an otherwise lawful activity.

Section 7 describes a process of federal interagency consultation for use when federal actions may adversely affect listed species. Federal actions by private, state, or local entities typically consist of activities that involve federal approvals/permits or federal funding. A Section 7 consultation (formal or informal) is required when there is a nexus between endangered species’ impacts and issuance of a CWA permit by the USACE for work in jurisdictional areas or other federal actions.

Section 10(a) allows issuance of permits for “incidental” take of endangered or threatened species with preparation of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). A HCP that demonstrates how the taking would be minimized and how steps would be taken to ensure the species’ survival must be submitted for issuance of Section 10(a) permits.

1.5.2 State

California Endangered Species Act

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) declares that deserving plant or animal species will be given protection by the State because they are of ecological, educational, historical, recreational, aesthetic, economic, and scientific value to the people of the State. CESA establishes a State policy to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance endangered species and their habitats. Under State law, plant and animal species may be formally designated as rare, threatened, or endangered through official listing by the California Fish and Game Commission. Listed species are given greater attention during the land use planning process by local governments, public agencies, and landowners than are species that have not been listed.

On private property, endangered plants may also be protected by the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) of 1977. Threatened plants are protected by CESA, and rare plants are protected by the NPPA. However, CESA authorizes that "Private entities may “take” plant species listed as endangered or threatened under the FESA and CESA through a federal incidental take permit issued pursuant to Section 10 of the FESA, if the CDFW certifies that the incidental take statement or incidental take permit is consistent with CESA." In addition, CEQA requires disclosure of any potential impacts on listed species, and alternatives or mitigation that would reduce those impacts.

Sections 1601 to 1603 of the California Fish and Game Code

Streambeds and other drainages are subject to regulation by the CDFW. The CDFW considers most drainages to be “streambeds” unless it can be demonstrated otherwise. A stream is defined as a body of water that flows at least periodically or intermittently through a bed or channel with banks and supports fish or other aquatic life. This includes watercourses having a surface or sub-surface flow that supports, or has supported, riparian vegetation. CDFW jurisdiction typically extends to the edge of the riparian canopy, and therefore, usually encompasses a larger area than USACE jurisdiction.

Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3800 of the California Fish and Game Code

These sections of the State Fish and Game Code prohibit the take or possession of birds, their nests, or eggs. Disturbance that causes nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort (killing or

INTRODUCTION

abandonment of eggs or young) is considered a "take." Such a take would also violate Federal law protecting migratory birds.

Incidental take permits are required from the CDFW for projects that may result in the incidental take of species listed by the State of California as endangered, threatened, or candidate species. The permits require that impacts to protected species be minimized to the extent possible and mitigated.

1.5.3 County of San Diego

Resource Protection Ordinance

Adopted in 1989 and amended in 1991 and 2007, Ordinance No. 9842 protects the County's Environmentally Sensitive Lands (i.e., wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, sensitive biological habitats, and prehistoric and historic sites) by requiring a Resource Protection Study for certain discretionary projects. Environmentally Sensitive Lands include wetlands/wetland buffers, floodplains, steep slopes, sensitive biological habitats, and significant prehistoric and historic sites as defined by RPO below:

Wetlands. Lands having one or more of the following attributes:

- a) At least periodically, the land supports a predominance of hydrophytes (plants whose habitat is water or very wet places);
- b) The substratum is predominantly undrained hydric soil; or
- c) An ephemeral or perennial stream is present, whose substratum is predominately non-soil and such lands contribute substantially to the biological functions or values of wetlands in the drainage system.

The San Diego County RPO states that lands which have wetland attributes solely due to man-made structures (e.g., culverts, ditches, road crossings, or agricultural ponds) shall not be considered RPO resources provided that the lands: (1) have negligible biological function or value as wetlands; (2) are small and geographically isolated from other wetland systems; (3) are not vernal pools; and, (4) do not have substantial or locally important populations of wetland dependent sensitive species. As described above, the onsite drainage swale is a riprap-lined earthen feature that was artificially channelized and designed to convey urban runoff and stormwater flows generated upstream. Although the upstream portion of this swale contains hydrophytic plant species, there is a predominance of non-native vegetation and no hydric soils. This swale provides negligible biological function or value as wetlands; is small and geographically isolated from other wetland systems; does not contain vernal pools; and does not have substantial or locally important populations of wetland-dependent sensitive species. Therefore, the project site does not contain wetlands as defined under the San Diego County RPO.

Wetland Buffers. Lands that provide a buffer area of an appropriate size to protect the environmental and functional habitat values of the wetland, or which are integrally important in supporting the full range of the wetland and adjacent upland biological community. Buffer widths shall be 50 to 200 feet from the edge of the wetland as appropriate based on the above factors.

RPO identifies certain permitted uses and development standards/criteria for the above categories. If the Resource Protection Study identifies the presence of Environmentally Sensitive Lands, one or more of the following actions may be required as a condition of approval for the discretionary permit:

- 1) Apply open space easements to portions of the project site that contain sensitive lands;

- 2) Rezone the entire project site through the application of a special area designator for sensitive lands; or
- 3) Other actions as determined by the decision-making body.

Because the site does not contain RPO wetlands, for the reasons described above, these wetland buffer requirements do not apply to the proposed project.

Floodplains. The relatively flat area of low lands adjoining and including the channel of a river, stream watercourse, bay, or other body of water which is subject to inundation by the flood waters of the 100-year frequency flood as shown on floodplain maps approved by the Board of Supervisors. For the reasons described under “Wetlands” above, the project site does not contain floodplains as defined under the San Diego County RPO.

Steep Slopes. All lands having a slope with natural gradient of 25% or greater and a minimum rise of 50 feet, unless said land has been substantially disturbed by previous legal grading. The minimum rise shall be measured vertically from the toe of slope to the top of slope within the project boundary. There are no RPO steep slopes on the property.

Sensitive Biological Habitats. Lands which support unique vegetation communities or the habitats of rare or endangered species or sub-species of animals or plants as defined by Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Admin. Code Section 15000 et seq.), including the area which is necessary to support a viable population of any of the above species in perpetuity, or which is critical to the proper functioning of a balanced natural ecosystem, or which serves as a functioning wildlife corridor. According to the County’s Biological Guidelines, sensitive biological habitats also include populations of sensitive species (e.g., County Group A plants, Group I wildlife species, State- and federally-listed species) and riparian habitat which is associated with the banks and other land adjacent to freshwater bodies, rivers, streams, creeks, estuaries, and other surface-emergent aquifers (such as springs, seeps, and oases). Although the upstream portion of the onsite drainage swale contains riparian plant species, there is a predominance of non-native vegetation and no hydric soils. This swale provides negligible biological function or value as riparian habitat; is small and geographically isolated from other riparian systems; and does not have substantial or locally important populations of riparian-dependent sensitive species. Therefore, there are no RPO sensitive biological habitats on the property.

Significant Prehistoric/Historic Sites. Sites that provide information regarding important scientific research questions about prehistoric or historic activities that have scientific, religious, or other ethnic value of local, regional, State, or federal importance. Such locations shall include, but not be limited to:

- (1) Any prehistoric or historic district, site, interrelated collection of features or artifacts, building, structure, or object either:
 - (aa) Formally determined eligible or listed in the National Register of Historic Places by the Keeper of the National Register; or
 - (bb) To which the Historic Resource (“H” Designator) Special Area Regulations have been applied; or
- (2) One-of-a-kind, locally unique, or regionally unique cultural resources which contain a significant volume and range of data and materials; and
- (3) Any location of past or current sacred religious or ceremonial observances which is either:

INTRODUCTION

- (aa) Protected under Public Law 95-341, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act or Public Resources Code Section 5097.9, such as burial(s), pictographs, petroglyphs, solstice observatory sites, sacred shrines, religious ground figures, or
- (bb) Other formally designated and recognized sites which are of ritual, ceremonial, or sacred value to any prehistoric or historic ethnic group.

There are no RPO prehistoric and historic sites on the property.

Multiple Species Conservation Program

The County MSCP Subarea Plan (County of San Diego 1998) was adopted October 22, 1997. The MSCP is a comprehensive, long-term habitat conservation plan which addresses the needs of multiple species and the preservation of natural vegetation communities in San Diego County. The MSCP addresses the potential impacts of urban growth, natural habitat loss and species endangerment and creates a plan to mitigate for the loss of Covered Species and their habitat due to future development of both public and private lands within the MSCP area. The total study area encompasses 12 jurisdictions and consists of 582,243 acres, of which 43% (252,132 acres) is in unincorporated areas under the jurisdiction of San Diego County. About 73% (approximately 184,000 acres) of the County Subarea provides habitat for native plants and wildlife. The remaining 27% (approximately 68,000) is disturbed, developed, or agricultural land that is considered to have little to no habitat value.

The MSCP is a subregional plan under the Natural Communities Conservation Program, which is implemented through local subarea plans. The County's Subarea Plan and its associated Implementing Agreement establish the conditions under which the County, for the benefit of itself and of public and private landowners and other land development project proponents within its Subarea boundaries, will receive certain long-term Take Authorizations from the USFWS and CDFW. As such, the Subarea Plan allows the taking of certain Covered Species incidental to land development and other lawful land uses which are authorized by the County, and satisfies conditions established in the Section 4(d) Special Rule for the coastal California gnatcatcher. The County Subarea Plan objectives are to:

- Acknowledge the no-net-loss-of-wetlands standard to satisfy State and federal wetland goals, policies, and standards;
- Include measures to maximize the habitat structural diversity of conserved habitat areas, including conservation of unique habitats and habitat features (e.g., soil types, rock outcrops, drainages, host plants);
- Provide for the conservation of spatially representative (e.g., coastal versus interior) examples of extensive patches of coastal sage scrub and other habitat types that were ranked as having high and very high biological value by the MSCP habitat evaluation model;
- Create significant blocks of habitat to reduce edge effects and maximize the ratio of surface area to the perimeter of conserved habitats;
- Provide incentives for development in the least sensitive habitat areas;
- Provide for the conservation of key regional populations of the covered species, and representation of sensitive habitats and their geographic subassociations in biologically functioning units; and

- Conserve large interconnected blocks of habitat that contribute to the preservation of wide-ranging species such as mule deer, golden eagle, and predators as appropriate. Special emphasis will be placed on conserving adequate foraging habitat near golden eagle nesting sites.

The project site occurs within the boundaries of the South Metro-Lakeside-Jamul Segment of the County's Subarea Plan, and specifically within areas designated as "Take Authorized Consistent with Metro/Lakeside/Jamul Segment Criteria". The Metro-Lakeside-Jamul Segment has a total area of 172,952 acres, of which 115,241 are in natural vegetation with habitat value. The area south of I-8 occupies 98,442 acres with 63,698 acres of habitat. Urban uses, other development, and agriculture occupy the remaining 34,744 acres. Population centers within this Segment include the unincorporated communities of Jamul, Jamacha, Rancho San Diego, Lakeside, Moreno, Eucalyptus Hills, Lakeview, Johnstown, Flinn Springs, Spring Valley, Mt. Helix, Crest, and Winter Gardens. Conservation of approximately 33,200 additional acres in an appropriate configuration are needed to achieve the biological goals for this Segment, of which approximately 15,500 acres are to be located south of I-8. As previously stated, the site is not located within a Focused Conservation Area or PAMA. Therefore, the preserve design goals and criteria for critical Biological Core Resource Areas and linkages/corridors do not apply to the project.

Chapter 2 PROJECT EFFECTS

This Chapter provides a biological resources impact analysis in support of County review and processing of the GPA, Rezone, Condominium Map, and Site Plan application for the proposed project. The issues addressed in this Chapter are derived from the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Biological Resources (County of San Diego 2010), in addition to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements to eliminate or reduce project impacts to less than significant are provided in this Chapter.

2.1 Direct Biological Effects

2.1.1 Habitat Types/Vegetation Communities

The project's direct impacts to habitat types are depicted on Figure 6 and summarized below in Table 2.

2.1.2 Special-Status Species

Special-Status Plant Species

No special-status plant species were observed or are expected to occur onsite based on the results of the general biological survey and the lack of suitable habitats to support the potentially-occurring species listed in Appendix C.

Table 2 Habitats / Vegetation Communities Impacts and Mitigation

Habitat/Vegetation Community (Holland Code)	MSCP Tier	Existing On-Site (Acres)	On-Site Impacts (Acres)	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Required (Acres)
Disturbed Habitat (11000)	IV	19.69	19.69	N/A	0.00
Non-native Riparian <i>Ricinus communis</i> (65000)	I	0.24	0.24	1:1	0.24
Non-native Riparian <i>Washingtonia robusta</i> (65000)	I	0.38	0.38	1:1	0.38
Emergent Wetlands (52440)	I	0.02	0.02	3:1	0.06
TOTAL		20.33	20.33	N/A	0.68

Special-Status Wildlife Species and Raptor Foraging

No special-status wildlife species were observed onsite based on the results of the general biological survey; however, the following non-listed sensitive raptor species have a potential to nest or forage in portions of the survey area: Cooper's hawk, ferruginous hawk, turkey vulture, northern harrier, white-

tailed kite and prairie falcon. Cooper's hawk and prairie falcon have recently been removed from listing on the State species of special concern and are now on the State "Watch" List (CDFW 2011). All six raptor species are considered sensitive by the County, and are listed as Group 1 species. No nests, feathers, white wash, or other sign evident of these or any other raptors were observed onsite during the general biological survey. As previously stated, a red-tailed hawk was observed flying over the site during the general biological survey. The project would result in the permanent removal of approximately 20 acres of disturbed habitat and trees, or trimming of adjacent offsite trees and shrubs, that could support nesting and foraging sensitive raptor species. Such impacts could result in "take" of individuals and/or eggs in violation of the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code.

Nesting Birds

The project would result in the permanent removal of approximately 20 acres of disturbed habitat and trees that could provide suitable nesting habitat for several common bird species protected under the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code. Construction of the proposed project would involve the removal of onsite trees and possible trimming of adjacent offsite trees that could impact an active nest during the general bird nesting season (January 15-August 31), resulting in direct impacts to nesting birds in violation of the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code.

2.1.3 Sensitive Natural Communities

The project would result in the permanent removal of approximately 0.64 acre of disturbed wetlands which is considered a sensitive habitat by the federal and State regulatory agencies, and as identified in the County's regional plans, policies and regulations. Due to its disturbance, the biological function and value of the onsite disturbed wetlands is low and does not support special-status species based on the general biological survey.

2.2 Indirect Biological Effects

Indirect impacts to sensitive raptors or common bird species could occur as a result of construction noise and vibration during the general bird nesting season (January 15-August 31) in the immediate vicinity of an active nest, such that the disturbance results in nest abandonment and/or failure. Such indirect impacts could result in "take" of individuals and/or eggs in violation of the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code.

Chapter 3 SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES

3.1 Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The project would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on a candidate, sensitive, or special status species listed in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

3.2 Analysis of Project Effects

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts under the following guidelines for the following reasons:

County Threshold 4.1.A. No state or federally listed species would be impacted by the project.

County Threshold 4.1.C. No County List C or D plant species or County Group II animal species would be impacted by the project.

County Threshold 4.1.D. The site contains no habitat suitable for the arroyo toad.

County Threshold 4.1.E. No golden eagles are onsite or within 4,000 feet of the site.

County Threshold 4.1.G. No core wildlife area as defined in the County Guidelines occur onsite that supports a viable population of a sensitive wildlife species or that supports multiple wildlife species.

County Threshold 4.1.I. No western burrowing owl habitat exists onsite.

County Threshold 4.1.J. No coastal cactus wren habitat exists onsite.

County Threshold 4.1.K. No Hermes copper butterfly habitat exists onsite.

County Threshold 4.1.B. Direct Impacts to Special-Status Species

No special-status species were observed onsite based on the results of the general biological survey; however, the following non-listed, County Group 1 sensitive raptors have a potential to nest or forage in portions of the survey area: Cooper's hawk, ferruginous hawk, turkey vulture, northern harrier, white-tailed kite and prairie falcon. The project would result in the permanent removal of approximately 20 acres of disturbed habitat and trees, or trimming of adjacent offsite trees and shrubs, that could support nesting and foraging opportunities for sensitive raptors and common bird species. Based on the extent of preserved areas further east (San Diego National Wildlife Refuge) and south (Sweetwater Reservoir and surrounding watershed lands) of the project site, these areas would provide ample habitat for sensitive raptors to exist within stable populations in the region. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in

significant direct impacts to these potentially-occurring sensitive wildlife species, and mitigation would not be required.

County Threshold 4.1.F. Direct Impacts to Raptor Foraging Habitat and Nesting Birds

The project would result in the permanent removal of approximately 20 acres of disturbed habitat and trees, or trimming of adjacent offsite trees and shrubs, that could support nesting and foraging opportunities for sensitive raptors and common bird species protected under the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code. However, the project is not likely to have a substantial adverse effect on a high number of individuals or a substantial population of raptors or other avian species, and the loss of nesting and foraging habitat onsite is not anticipated to have a substantial adverse effect on the long-term survival of any raptor or avian species due to a prevalence of such habitat available in the region. Therefore, these potential direct project impacts would not be considered significant, and mitigation would not be required.

County Threshold 4.1.H. Indirect Impacts to Special-Status Species

Indirect impacts to sensitive raptors and nesting birds during the general bird nesting season (January 15-August 31) could occur as a result of construction noise, vibration and/or lighting disturbances within 500 feet of an active nest, such that the disturbance results in nest abandonment and/or failure, in violation of the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code. These impacts would be considered significant, and mitigation would be required (see Mitigation Measure Bio-1 below).

3.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The cumulative projects for this analysis are listed in Table 3. When considered together with the cumulative projects in Table 3, the proposed project could contribute to significant cumulative impacts to sensitive raptors and nesting birds as evaluated above.

Table 3 Cumulative Projects

Project Name	Project Type	Project Location
Jamul Indian Village	Casino	SW of SR-94/Campo Road and Melody Road
Cuyamaca College Facilities Master Plan Update	Master Plan Update	900 Rancho San Diego Parkway El Cajon, CA 92019
Simpson Farms	Commercial and Single Family Residential	NE corner of SR-94/Jefferson Rd intersection
Morgan Minor Subdivision (TPM 20550)	Single Family Residential	N of Procter Valley Rd/Poplar Meadow Ln intersection
Hendrix Subdivision (TM 5154)	Single Family Residential	E of Campo Rd on Las Palmas Rd
Mintz Subdivision (TM 5213 RPL2)	Single Family Residential	N of Skyline Truck Trail, E of Hidden Trail Dr
Jamul Highlands Subdivision	Single Family Residential	S of the Valley Rd/Jamul Highlands Rd

SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES

Project Name	Project Type	Project Location
(TM 5289 RPL2)	Residential	intersection
Residential Development (TPM 20626)	Single Family Residential	N of Proctor Valley Rd/Melody Rd intersection
Yacoo Minor Subdivision (TPM 20628 RPLI)	Single Family Residential	Schlee Canyon Rd north of Proctor Valley Rd
Residential Development	Single Family Residential	S of Olive Vista Dr
Blanco Parcel Map (TPM 20599 RPLI)	Single Family Residential	E side of SR-94, N of Melody Rd
Stein Barth Minor Subdivision (TPM 20868)	Single Family Residential	S of Olive Vista Dr
Pioneer Minor Subdivision (TPM 20594)	Single Family Residential	N of Melody Ln
Otay Ranch – Village 19	Single Family Residential	S of Melody Ln
Jamul Estates II	Single Family Residential	NE of Jamacha Blvd/Sweetwater Springs Blvd intersection
Peaceful Valley Ranch	Residential, equestrian, fire facility	E of SR-94/Melody Rd intersection

The cumulative projects identified herein would be required to implement mitigation measures that are similar to those identified for the proposed project to avoid, reduce and/or compensate for significant indirect and cumulative impacts with respect to sensitive raptors and nesting birds. As described in Mitigation Measure Bio-1, specific mitigation requirements would be implemented for any projects involving brushing, clearing, grubbing, grading, or construction activities near nesting habitats for special-status birds (e.g., Cooper’s hawk, ferruginous hawk, turkey vulture, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, prairie falcon), and other sensitive raptors and common nesting birds protected under the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code, during the typical bird breeding season (January 15-August 31). With implementation of these mitigation measures, the project’s potential cumulative impacts to sensitive raptors and nesting birds would be reduced to less than significant levels. No additional mitigation would be required.

3.4 Mitigation Measures and Design Considerations

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the project’s potential indirect and cumulative impacts to special-status birds (e.g., Cooper’s hawk, ferruginous hawk, turkey vulture, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, prairie falcon), and other sensitive raptors and common nesting birds protected under the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code to less than significant levels:

Bio-1 Avian Breeding Season Requirements. If project brushing, clearing, grubbing, grading, or construction activities (collectively, “Disturbance Activities”) are proposed within 500 feet of nesting raptor habitat and/or 300 feet of migratory bird nesting habitat during the typical bird

breeding season (January 15-August 31), then a qualified County approved biologist shall conduct a pre-disturbance survey for active nest(s) within the development area and within 500 feet thereof. If active nest(s) are detected, or considered likely, the following conditions shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the County PDS:

- A. No Disturbance Activities shall occur within an appropriate distance from active nest(s) until the young have fledged and are no longer returning to the nest(s). The appropriate buffers from active nest(s) shall be the distance the biologist determines is necessary to avoid the taking, capturing, or killing of any migratory bird, or any part of their nests or eggs. The point in time that the young have fledged from the nest(s) shall be determined by the biologist. Areas restricted from such activities shall be staked or fenced under the supervision of the biologist;
- B. No construction activities shall occur within any portion of the site where such activities would result in noise levels exceeding 60 dB(A) hourly average (or the ambient noise level, if it already exceeds this threshold) at the edge of the occupied habitat, unless an analysis is prepared by a qualified acoustician (possessing a current noise engineer license or registration and noise level monitoring experience for the avian species) at least two weeks prior to commencement of construction showing that such noise levels would not exceed these thresholds.
- C. At least two weeks prior to commencement of construction activities, under the direction of a qualified acoustician, noise attenuation measures (e.g., berms, temporary walls, etc.) shall be implemented to ensure that construction-related noise levels do not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average (or the ambient noise level, if it already exceeds this threshold) at the edge of the occupied habitat. Concurrent with the commencement of construction activities and installation of noise attenuation measures, noise monitoring¹ shall be conducted at the edge of the occupied habitat to ensure that noise levels do not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average (or the ambient noise level, if it already exceeds this threshold). If the noise attenuation techniques implemented are determined by the biologist to be inadequate to achieve the noise thresholds or otherwise prevent the taking, capturing or killing of any migratory bird, their nests or eggs, then the associated construction activities shall cease until such time that either:
 - i. enhanced attenuation techniques (e.g. higher walls, more walls, relocated walls, limitations on the placement of construction equipment, simultaneous use of loud equipment) are implemented that can achieve the noise threshold (or the no take, capture or kill standard); **OR**
 - ii. the young have fledged and are no longer returning to the nest(s). The point in time that the young have fledged from the nest(s) shall be determined by the biologist.

¹ Construction noise shall continue to be monitored at least twice weekly on varying days, or more frequently depending on the construction activity, to verify that noise levels at the edge of occupied habitat are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average (or the ambient noise level, if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average) and are avoiding the taking, capturing, or killing of any migratory bird, or any part of their nests or eggs.

SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES

The Director of PDS may waive this condition, through written concurrence from USFWS and CDFW, that no nesting migratory birds or raptors are present in the vicinity of the brushing, clearing or grading.

3.5 Conclusions

3.5.1 Special-Status Species

The proposed project would not result in significant direct impacts to special-status species or to potentially-occurring sensitive raptors because the extent of preserved areas in the project vicinity would provide ample habitat for sensitive raptors to exist within stable populations in the region, which would compensate for the project's permanent removal of approximately 20 acres of disturbed habitat and trees that could support nesting and foraging opportunities for sensitive raptors and common bird species. Furthermore, the project is not likely to have a substantial adverse effect on a high number of individuals or a substantial population of raptors or other avian species, and the loss of nesting and foraging habitat onsite is not anticipated to have a substantial adverse effect on the long-term survival of any raptor or avian species due to a prevalence of such habitat available in the region. Therefore, mitigation would not be required.

County Group 1-listed sensitive raptor species (e.g., Cooper's hawk, ferruginous hawk, turkey vulture, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, prairie falcon) and other sensitive raptors and common nesting birds protected under the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code have the potential to nest or forage in trees adjacent to the site during the typical bird breeding season (January 15-August 31). As described in Mitigation Measure Bio-1, specific mitigation requirements would be implemented for the proposed project and other cumulative projects (Table 4) involving brushing, clearing, grubbing, grading, or construction activities near nesting habitats that would reduce the project's potential indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive raptors and nesting birds to less than significant levels.

Chapter 4 RIPARIAN HABITAT OR SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITIES

4.1 Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The project would have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or another sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

4.2 Analysis of Project Effects

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts under the following guidelines for the following reasons:

County Threshold 4.2.A. Except for project impacts to disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats, no other sensitive vegetation communities occur onsite.

County Threshold 4.2.C. The project would not involve the use of groundwater which would draw down the water table to the detriment of groundwater-dependent habitat.

County Threshold 4.2.D. Because there are no sensitive natural communities adjacent to the project site, development of the project would not result in significant indirect impacts to these biological resources.

County Threshold 4.2.E. Because the project would result in the permanent removal of all disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats onsite, project design is not required to incorporate wetland buffers.

County Threshold 4.2.B Direct Impacts to Wetlands/Riparian Habitats

As described above in section 1.5.3, the San Diego County RPO states that lands which have wetland attributes solely due to man-made structures (e.g., culverts, ditches, road crossings, or agricultural ponds) shall not be considered RPO resources provided that the lands: (1) have negligible biological function or value as wetlands; (2) are small and geographically isolated from other wetland systems; (3) are not vernal pools; and, (4) do not have substantial or locally important populations of wetland dependent sensitive species. The onsite drainage swale is a riprap-lined earthen feature that was artificially channelized and designed to convey urban runoff and stormwater flows generated upstream. Although the upstream portion of this swale contains hydrophytic plant species, there is a predominance of non-native vegetation and no hydric soils. This swale provides negligible biological function or value as wetlands; is small and geographically isolated from other wetland systems; does not contain vernal pools; and does not have substantial or locally important populations of wetland-dependent sensitive species. Therefore,

the project site does not contain wetlands, or necessitate wetland buffers, as defined under the San Diego County RPO.

The proposed project would result in the permanent loss of approximately 0.64 acre of disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats. Impacts to these habitat types would be considered significant. Disturbed wetlands are considered a sensitive habitat according to the County's Guidelines; therefore, the permanent loss of this habitat is a significant direct impact of the project. This impact would be reduced to below a level of significance through purchase of 0.68 acre of wetland mitigation credits within the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank, or another County approved mitigation bank. The Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank is operated by Wildlands, Inc. and approved by the County and the regulatory agencies (see Mitigation Measure Bio-2 below). The proposed project site falls within the Bank's "tertiary" service area for which mitigation credits are available at \$350,000 per credit/acre, and credit amounts can be scaled in minimum increments of 0.01 acre.

4.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The cumulative projects for this analysis are listed in Table 3. The proposed project would result in significant impacts to disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats. When considered together with the cumulative projects in Table 4, it is assumed that the proposed and cumulative projects would involve similar temporary and permanent impacts which would contribute to significant cumulative impacts to these sensitive natural communities within the region.

The cumulative projects identified herein would be required to implement mitigation measures that are similar to those identified for the proposed project to avoid, reduce and/or compensate for significant direct, indirect and cumulative impacts with respect to this issue. As described in Mitigation Measure Bio-2, the purchase of wetland mitigation credits within the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank, or another County approved mitigation bank, would reduce the project's cumulative impacts to disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats to less than significant levels. No additional mitigation would be required.

4.4 Mitigation Measures and Design Considerations

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the project's direct and cumulative impacts to disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats to less than significant levels:

Bio-2 Habitat-Based Compensatory Mitigation. Prior to project brushing, clearing and/or grading, the applicant shall purchase 0.68 acre of wetland mitigation credits within the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank, or another County approved mitigation bank, to compensate for project impacts to 0.64 acre of disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats, in accordance with the habitat compensation ratios in Table 2. The Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank is operated by Wildlands, Inc. and approved by the County and the regulatory agencies. The proposed project site falls within the Bank's "tertiary" service area for which mitigation credits are available at \$350,000 per credit/acre, and credit amounts can be scaled in minimum increments of 0.01 acre.

4.5 Conclusions

The proposed project would result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats. As described in Mitigation Measure Bio-2, prior to project brushing, clearing and/or grading, the applicant shall purchase 0.68 acre of wetland mitigation credits within the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank, or another County approved mitigation bank, to reduce the project's direct and cumulative impacts to 0.64 acre of disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats to less than significant levels.

Chapter 5 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS AND WETLANDS

5.1 Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The project would 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.

5.2 Analysis of Project Effects, Mitigation Measures and Design Considerations

As evaluated in the RBF/Baker Jurisdictional Delineation Report (Appendix D), the proposed project would result in the permanent loss of approximately 0.23 acre (954 linear feet) of waters of the U.S. under USACE and RWQCB jurisdiction; 0.39 acre (954 linear feet) of CDFW streambed (waters of the State); and 0.03 acre of CDFW associated riparian vegetation. However, these onsite habitats do not qualify as RPO wetlands as described in Section 1.5.2 above. The permanent loss of federal and State jurisdictional resources is a significant direct impact of the project. This impact would be reduced to below a level of significance through purchase of wetland mitigation credits within the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank, or another County approved mitigation bank (see Mitigation Measure Bio-2 above).

Furthermore, the project applicant must obtain the following regulatory approvals for these jurisdictional impacts: CWA Section 404 Nationwide Permit 29 (Residential Developments) from USACE; CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification from RWQCB; and Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW. The use of NWP 29 may be authorized because the project would result in the permanent loss of less than ½-acre of USACE jurisdictional waters of the U.S. (non-wetland), and it is expected the USACE District Engineer may waive the 300 linear foot limit by issuing a written determination concluding that the discharge would result in minimal adverse effects.

5.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The cumulative projects for this analysis are listed in Table 3. The proposed project would result in significant impacts to federal and State jurisdictional resources as described above. When considered together with the cumulative projects in Table 4, it is assumed that the proposed and cumulative projects would involve similar temporary and permanent impacts which would contribute to significant cumulative impacts to these sensitive natural communities within the region.

The cumulative projects identified herein would be required to implement mitigation measures that are similar to those identified for the proposed project to avoid, reduce and/or compensate for significant direct, indirect and cumulative impacts with respect to this issue. As described in Mitigation Measure Bio-2, the purchase of wetland mitigation credits within the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank, or another County approved mitigation bank, would reduce the project's cumulative impacts to federal and State jurisdictional resources to less than significant levels. No additional mitigation would be required.

5.4 Mitigation Measures and Design Considerations

Implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-2 would reduce the project's direct and cumulative impacts to federal and State jurisdictional resources to less than significant levels.

5.5 Conclusions

The proposed project would result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to federal and State jurisdictional resources. As described in Mitigation Measure Bio-2, prior to project brushing, clearing and/or grading, the applicant shall purchase wetland mitigation credits within the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank, or another County approved mitigation bank, to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

Chapter 6 WILDLIFE MOVEMENT AND NURSERY SITES

6.1 Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The project would not 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.

6.2 Analysis of Project Effects, Mitigation Measures and Design Considerations

The proposed project would not result in significant direct, indirect, and/or cumulative impacts under the following guidelines for the following reasons:

County Threshold 4.4.A. The proposed project would not impede wildlife access to foraging habitat, and there is no evidence that breeding habitat occurs onsite or other adjacent areas.

County Threshold 4.4.B. No known identified wildlife corridors or linkages occur within the site or in the immediate vicinity. The site does not support habitats that could facilitate wildlife movements for large mammals on a local or regional scale; is surrounded by roads and urban land uses; and does not have direct connectivity to adjacent lands of higher quality habitats that extend offsite undisturbed over large distances. Due to these obstructions to wildlife movements around the site and the lack of surrounding blocks of natural areas, no core areas of habitat suitable for use by resident populations of wildlife, as either wildlife corridors or parts of a larger regional linkage, exist on or adjacent to the site. Further, the County MSCP Subarea Plan does not recognize or designate any locally or regionally important wildlife corridors or linkages on or in the immediate vicinity of the site. Therefore, the project would not block or substantially interfere with a regional wildlife corridor or linkage.

County Threshold 4.4.C. Due to the disturbed conditions onsite, the project would not create artificial wildlife corridors that do not follow natural movement patterns. In addition, based on the extent of preserved habitats further east and south of the site, it is assumed these areas would provide ample habitat for species to exist within stable populations in the region.

County Threshold 4.4.D. As noted above, there is no evidence of breeding habitat adjacent to the site or any wildlife corridors or linkages onsite or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the project would not increase noise and/or nighttime lighting within a wildlife corridor or linkage at levels that could affect animal behavior or wildlife movement.

County Threshold 4.4.E. As noted above, there is no evidence that any wildlife corridors or linkages are identified onsite or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the project would not affect the widths of existing wildlife corridors or linkages nor constrain an already narrow corridor that may occur in the region.

County Threshold 4.4.F. As noted above, there is no evidence that any wildlife corridors or linkages are identified onsite or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the project would not affect the visual continuity of existing wildlife corridors or linkages that may occur in the region.

Further, the site is not located between a potential nursery site and important foraging resource. Therefore, the project would not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Chapter 7 LOCAL POLICIES, ORDINANCES, AND ADOPTED PLANS

7.1 Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The project could conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, and/or conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

7.2 Analysis of Project Effects, Mitigation Measures and Design Considerations

The proposed project would not result in significant direct, indirect, and/or cumulative impacts under the following guidelines for the following reasons:

County Thresholds 4.5.A and 4.5.D. The project would not impact coastal sage scrub vegetation in excess of the County's 5% habitat loss threshold.

County Thresholds 4.5.B, 4.5.E, and 4.5.F. The project would not result in any impacts to resources of regional importance; it would not impact a Biological Resource Core Area as defined in the County's BMO; and it would not prevent the County MSCP Subarea Plan from meeting its conservation goals and objectives. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or State HCP. In addition, there is no Habitat Management Plan, Special Area Management Plan, Watershed Plan, or similar regional planning effort to which the project must conform.

County Thresholds 4.5.G. and 4.5.H. As noted above, there is no evidence of breeding habitat adjacent to the site or any wildlife corridors or linkages onsite or in the immediate vicinity. In addition, based on the extent of preserved habitats further east and south of the site, it is assumed these areas would provide ample habitat for species to exist within stable populations in the region.

County Thresholds 4.5.I and 4.5.J. The project would not impact MSCP narrow endemic species or core populations of narrow endemics, nor would it reduce the likelihood of survival and recovery of listed species.

County Thresholds 4.5.K and 4.5.L. The proposed project could result in the removal or disturbance of nesting habitat during the general bird nesting season (January 15-August 31), and therefore, could result in impacts to nesting birds (including sensitive raptors), in violation of the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code. Implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-1 would reduce project impacts to nesting birds and sensitive raptors (including eagles protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act) to less

than significant levels. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the requirements of the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code.

County Threshold 4.5.C Direct Impacts to Wetlands/Riparian Habitats

The proposed project would result in the permanent loss of 0.64 acre of disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats that may be considered County RPO wetlands. Due to its disturbance and isolation from any connecting natural waterbodies, however, the onsite drainage swale is not considered a unique vegetation community; does not support a viable population of special-status species; is not critical to the proper functioning of a balanced natural ecosystem; and does not serve as a functioning wildlife corridor. Furthermore, the onsite drainage swale is a riprap-lined earthen feature that enters the project site through a 60-inch concrete culvert along the northern project boundary and exits the site through a 60-inch concrete culvert along the southwest project boundary. It was artificially channelized and designed to convey urban runoff and stormwater flows generated upstream. Although the upstream portion of this swale contains hydrophytic plant species, there is a predominance of non-native vegetation and no hydric soils. This swale provides negligible biological function or value as wetlands; is small and geographically isolated from other wetland systems; does not contain vernal pools; and does not have substantial or locally important populations of wetland-dependent sensitive species. Therefore, the project site does not contain RPO wetlands or floodplains, and the project would not conflict with the County's RPO.

Chapter 8 SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

8.1 Special-Status Species

County Group 1-listed sensitive raptor species (e.g., Cooper's hawk, ferruginous hawk, turkey vulture, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, prairie falcon) and other sensitive raptors and common nesting birds protected under the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code have the potential to nest or forage in trees adjacent to the site during the typical bird breeding season (January 15-August 31). Specific mitigation requirements would be implemented for the proposed project and other cumulative projects involving brushing, clearing, grubbing, grading, or construction activities near nesting habitats that would reduce the project's potential indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive raptors and nesting birds to less than significant levels.

8.2 Sensitive Natural Communities

The proposed project would result in permanent loss of 0.64 acre of disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats including approximately 0.23 acre (954 linear feet) of waters of the U.S.; 0.39 acre (954 linear feet) of waters of the State; and 0.03 acre of associated riparian vegetation. However, these onsite habitats do not qualify as RPO wetlands. The permanent loss of disturbed wetlands and federal and State jurisdictional resources is a significant direct and cumulative impact of the project. Prior to project brushing, clearing and/or grading, the applicant shall purchase 0.68 acre of wetland mitigation credits within the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank, or another County approved mitigation bank, to reduce these direct and cumulative project impacts to less than significant levels.

Table 4 provides a summary of the proposed project mitigation measures and the level of significance after mitigation.

Table 4 Summary of Mitigation Measures

Proposed Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	County Guideline	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Pre-disturbance survey for active nest(s) within the development area and within 500 feet thereof by a qualified County-approved biologist, if Disturbance Activities are proposed within 500 feet of nesting raptor habitat and/or 300 feet of migratory bird nesting habitat during the typical bird breeding season (January 15-August 31). If active nest(s) are detected, or considered likely, the following conditions shall be	Bio-1	4.1.H	Less than Significant

Proposed Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	County Guideline	Level of Significance after Mitigation
implemented to the satisfaction of the County PDS: (1) No Disturbance buffers within an appropriate distance from active nest(s) until the young have fledged and are no longer returning to the nest(s); (2) staked or fenced areas restricted from such activities under the supervision of the biologist; (3) no construction activities within any portion of the site where such activities would result in noise levels exceeding 60 dB(A) hourly average (or the ambient noise level, if it already exceeds this threshold) at the edge of the occupied habitat, unless an analysis is prepared by a qualified acoustician at least 2 weeks prior to commencement of construction showing that such noise levels would not exceed these thresholds; (4) at least 2 weeks prior to commencement of construction activities, under the direction of a qualified acoustician, implement noise attenuation measures to ensure that construction-related noise levels do not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average (or the ambient noise level, if it already exceeds this threshold) at the edge of the occupied habitat; (5) concurrent with the commencement of construction activities and installation of noise attenuation measures, conduct noise monitoring at the edge of the occupied habitat to ensure that noise levels do not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly average (or the ambient noise level, if it already exceeds this threshold); (6) if the noise attenuation techniques implemented are determined by the biologist to be inadequate to achieve the noise thresholds, then the associated construction activities shall cease until such time that either enhanced attenuation techniques are implemented that can achieve the noise threshold or the young have fledged and are no longer returning to the nest(s).			
Prior to project brushing, clearing and/or grading, purchase 0.68 acre of wetland mitigation credits within the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank, or another County approved mitigation bank, to compensate for project impacts to 0.64 acre of disturbed wetlands/non-native riparian habitats. The Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank is operated by Wildlands, Inc. and approved by the County and the regulatory agencies. The proposed project site falls within the Bank's "tertiary" service area for which mitigation credits are available at \$350,000 per credit/acre, and credit amounts can be scaled in minimum increments of 0.01 acre.	Bio-2	4.2.B 5.1	Less than Significant

Chapter 9 REFERENCES

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2008. Complete List of Amphibian, Reptile, Bird and Mammal Species in California. September.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2011. Special Animals. California Department of Fish and Game, Natural Diversity Database. Sacramento, California. January.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2014. Biogeographic Data Branch, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), RareFind Version 5. Accessed April 17, 2014.
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2014. The Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (8th Edition). Accessed May 14-15, 2014. Available online at <http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/>
- County of San Diego. 2010. Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Biological Resources. Fourth Revision. September 15, 2010. Land Use and Environmental Group. Department of Planning and Land Use. Department of Public Works. Available online at http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dplu/docs/Biological_Guidelines.pdf
- Google Earth. 2014. Google Earth 5.0. Accessed April 16, 2014. Available online at <http://earth.google.com/>
- Jepson On-Line Interchange for California Floristics. 2014. Information provided by the participants of the University and Jepson Herbaria, U.C. Berkeley. Accessed May 14, 2014. Available online at <http://ucjeps.berkeley.edu/interchange.html>
- Lightner, J. 2011. San Diego County Native Plants. San Diego, California: San Diego Flora.
- Oberbauer, T., M.Kelly, and J.Buegge. 2008. Draft Vegetation Communities of San Diego County. Based on "Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California" prepared by Robert F. Holland, Ph.D. for State of California, The Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game (October 1986). March 2008. Available online at http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dplu/docs/Veg_Comm_SDCountry_2008.pdf
- Peterson, Roger Tory. 2010. Peterson Field Guide to Birds of Western North America. Fourth Edition. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. Boston-New York.

- San Diego Natural History Museum (SDNHM). 2014. San Diego County Plant Atlas Project. Accessed May 28, 2014. Available online at [http://www.sdplantatlas.org/\(S\(gn2sqn45kw1fmc45trphjz55\)\)/index.aspx](http://www.sdplantatlas.org/(S(gn2sqn45kw1fmc45trphjz55))/index.aspx)
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2014. Soil Survey, Web Soil Survey. Accessed April 21, 2014. Available online at <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/HomePage.htm>
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2014a. Species Reports. Accessed May 30, 2014. Available online at http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2014b. Critical Habitat Portal. Accessed May 21, 2014. Available online at <http://criticalhabitat.fws.gov>
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 1997. Spring Valley, California 7.5 Minute Series (Topographic) Map.

Chapter 10 PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED/LIST OF PREPARERS

10.1 Persons Contacted

Michael Crews Development

Michael Crews
Wes Peltzer

President
LAW OFFICES OF WESLEY W. PELTZER

Vincent N. Scheidt

Vince Scheidt

Certified Biological Consultant

Wildlands, Inc.

Julie Maddox

Marketing Coordinator

10.2 List of Preparers

County of San Diego Reviewers

Monica Bilodeau
Ashley Gungle

Contract Biologist
Land Use/ Environmental Planner

Biotechnical Report Authors

RBF Consulting/Michael Baker International
Michael Gonzales

Biologist/Project Manager

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached figures present data and information required for this biological evaluation, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed: 

Date: _____

Thomas J. McGill Ph.D., Principal Biologist
RBF Consulting/Michael Baker International
County Approved CEQA Consultant

APPENDIX A

PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES OBSERVED

APPENDICES

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Scientific Name Common Name	Status				Habitat Description	Considered in Impact Analysis	Rationale
	Federal	State	CNPS	County List			
PLANTS							
<i>Acanthomintha ilicifolia</i> San Diego thorn-mint	~	~	1B.1	A	Vernal pools or clay soil openings in chaparral, coastal sage scrub, valley and foothill grassland, 10-935 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support vernal pools
<i>Achnatherium diegoensis</i> San Diego needlegrass	~	~	~	D	Clay soils in rocky (often mesic) areas in native grassland, chaparral and coastal sage scrub ,	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these soils and habitats
<i>Adolphia californica</i> California adolphia	~	~	~	2.1	Coastal sage scrub, chaparral, valley and foothill grassland, 45-300 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Ambrosia pumila</i> San Diego ambrosia	FE	~	1B.1	A	Sandy loams or clay soils (sometimes alkaline soils) in chaparral, coastal sage scrub, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools, 20-415 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these soils and habitats
<i>Arctostaphylos otayensis</i> Otay manzanita	~	~	1B.2	A	Metavolcanic soils in chaparral and cismontane woodland habitats, 275-1,700 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these soils and habitats
<i>Astragalus deanei</i> Dean’s milkvetch	~	~	1B.1	A	Open, brushy, south-facing slopes in chaparral, coastal sage scrub, riparian forest, 75-670 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Bloomeria clevelandii</i> San Diego goldenstar	~	~	1B.1	A	Clay soils in chaparral, coastal sage scrub, valley and foothill grassland, mesa grasslands, scrub edges; and fine sandy loam on mounds between vernal pools, 50-1090 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Brodiaea orcuttii</i> Orcutt’s brodiaea	~	~	1B.1	A	Clay soils in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, meadows and seeps, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools, 30-1,692 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these soils and habitats
<i>Calochortus dunnii</i> <i>Dunn’s mariposa lily</i>	~	CR	1B.2	A	Rocky, gabbroic or metavolcanic soils in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, and valley and foothill grassland habitats, 185-1,830 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these soils and habitats
<i>Clinopodium chandleri</i> San Miguel savory	~	~	1B.2	A	Rocky, gabbroic or metavolcanic.soils in chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal sage scrub, riparian woodland, and valley and foothill grassland habitats, 120-1,075 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these soils and habitats
<i>Deinandra conjugens</i> Otay tarplant	FT	SE	1B.1	A (NE)	Clay soils in coastal sage scrub and valley and foothill grassland, 25-300 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these soils and habitats
<i>Dudleya variegata</i> variegated dudleya	~	CR	1B.2	A	Clay soils in chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal sage scrub, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools, 3-550 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Ericameria palmeri</i> var. <i>palmeri</i> Palmer’s goldenbush	~	~	1B.1	B	Granitic soils, steep hillsides in chaparral, coastal sage scrub, 30-600 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Ferocactus viridescens</i> coast barrel cactus	~	~	2B.1	B	Exposed level areas or rocky slopes in coastal sage scrub, chaparral, valley and foothill grassland, 3-485 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Holocarpha virgata</i> ssp. <i>elongata</i> graceful tarplant	~	~	4.2	D	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal sage scrub, valley and foothill grassland, coastal mesas, 60-1,100 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support habitats

Scientific Name Common Name	Status				Habitat Description	Considered in Impact Analysis	Rationale
	Federal	State	CNPS	County List			
<i>Isocoma menziesii</i> var. <i>decumbens</i> decumbent goldenbush	~	~	1B.2	A	Sandy soils in coastal sage scrub, disturbed areas, 10-910 m	No	Low potential to occur as the site does support disturbed areas; nearest recorded occurrence is 1,500' to the south (Figure 7)
<i>Iva hayesiana</i> San Diego marsh-elder	~	~	~	2.2	Marshes and swamps, 10-500 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Lepidium virginicum</i> ssp. <i>robinsonii</i> Robinson pepper grass	~	~	4.3	A	Chaparral, coastal sage scrub, grassland, 1-885 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Muilla clevelandii</i> San Diego goldenstar	~	~	1B.1	A	Clay soils in chaparral, coastal sage scrub, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools in coastal mesas, 50-465 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these soils and habitats
<i>Salvia munzii</i> Munz sage	~	~	2B.2	B	Chaparral, coastal sage scrub, 120-1,065 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
ANIMALS							
<i>Accipiter cooperi</i> Cooper's hawk	~	~	N/A	1	Open areas in woodlands and residential areas; breeds in extensive forests	Yes	High potential to occur as the site supports these areas and trees to nest in; nearest recorded occurrence is 1.1 miles to the west (Figure 7); refer to Mitigation Measure Bio-1
<i>Agelaius tricolor</i> tri-colored blackbird	~	SSC	N/A	1	Seasonal wetlands, freshwater marshes, alkali flats, native grasslands, riparian forests, and oak savannas	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Aimophila ruficeps</i> Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow	~	~	N/A	1	Coastal sage scrub, sparse mixed chaparral	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Ammodramus savannarum</i> grasshopper sparrow	~	SSC	N/A	1	Dense native grasslands with a mix of grasses, forbs and scattered shrubs on rolling hills, lowland plains, valleys, lower hillsides	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, topographic features
<i>Amphispiza belli</i> Bell's sparrow	~	SSC	N/A	1	Dry chaparral, coastal sage scrub, chamise chaparral	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Anniella pulchra pulchra</i> silvery legless lizard	~	SSC	N/A	1	Sandy, loose, loamy soils with high moisture content under sparse vegetation	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support moist soil conditions
<i>Antrozous pallidus</i> pallid bat	~	SSC	N/A	1	Arid regions with rocky outcroppings and open, sparsely vegetated grasslands near water; day roosts in attics, shutters or crevices; night roosts in the open, but with foliage nearby; hibernation roosts in buildings, caves, or cracks in rocks	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, structures
<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i> golden eagle	~	FPS	N/A	1	Open areas in mountains, foothills, plains, deserts	Yes	High potential to occur as the site supports open areas and trees to nest in; refer to Mitigation Measure Bio-1

Scientific Name Common Name	Status				Habitat Description	Considered in Impact Analysis	Rationale
	Federal	State	CNPS	County List			
<i>Ardea herodias</i> great blue heron	~	~	N/A	2	Marshes, swamps, shores, tidal flats, moist fields	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Athene cunicularia hypugea</i> burrowing owl	~	SSC	N/A	1	Open grasslands, unplowed prairies, farmlands, airfields; nests in burrows in ground or pipes	No	Low potential to occur as the site supports ground squirrel and gopher burrows
<i>Bufo californicus</i> arroyo toad	FE	SSC	N/A	1 (NE)	Washes, arroyos, sandy riverbanks, riparian areas with willows, sycamores, oaks, cottonwoods; extremely specialized habitat needs, including exposed sandy streambanks with stable terraces for burrowing with scattered vegetation for shelter, and areas of quiet water or pools free of predatory fishes with sandy or gravel bottoms without silt for breeding	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Buteo regalis</i> ferruginous hawk	~	~	N/A	1 (NE)	Open grasslands, plains, farmlands	Yes	High potential to occur as the site supports open areas and trees to nest in; refer to Mitigation Measure Bio-1
<i>Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus</i> coastal cactus wren	~	SSC	N/A	1	Tall <i>Opuntia</i> cactus in coastal sage scrub for nesting and roosting	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Cathartes aura</i> turkey vulture	~	~	N/A	1	Wide variety of habitats	Yes	Observed in flight overhead; refer to Mitigation Measure Bio-1
<i>Chaetodipus californicus femoralis</i> Dulzura California pocket mouse	~	SSC	N/A	2	Grass/chaparral edges in chaparral, coastal sage scrub, grasslands	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, topographic features
<i>Chaetodipus fallax fallax</i> northwestern San Diego pocket mouse	~	SSC	N/A	2	Sandy, herbaceous areas with rocks or coarse gravel in chaparral, coastal sage scrub, grasslands	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, topographic features
<i>Charina trivirgata roseofusca</i> rosy boa	~	~	N/A	2	Concealed beneath rocks and in crevices to escape the elements and natural predators; granite outcroppings are the most common geologic association	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, topographic features
<i>Circus cyaneus hudsonius</i> northern harrier	~	SSC	N/A	1	Marshes, fields, farms, prairies	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Cnemidophorus hyperythrus</i> orange-throated whiptail	~	SSC	N/A	2	Chaparral, coastal sage scrub, 0-1,040 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Coleonyx variegatus abbottii</i> San Diego banded gecko	~	~	N/A	1	Rocky areas in coastal sage scrub, chaparral in coastal foothills, 150-900 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, topographic features
<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i> Townsend's big-eared bat	FE	SSC	N/A	2	Montane forests mainly in the humid coastal area of the Pacific Northwest; roosting sites most commonly in caves, cliffs, and rock ledges but have been found in abandoned mines and other man-made structures; abandoned buildings are usually used only during summer, while caves and abandoned mines are preferred in winter; 457-2,743 m	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, structures

Scientific Name Common Name	Status				Habitat Description	Considered in Impact Analysis	Rationale
	Federal	State	CNPS	County List			
<i>Crotalus ruber ruber</i> red diamond rattlesnake	~	SSC	N/A	2	Rocks, rodent burrows and dense vegetation in chaparral, woodlands, grasslands, desert areas	No	Low potential to occur as the site does support rodent burrows; nearest recorded occurrence is 1.2 miles to the south (Figure 7)
<i>Danaus plexippus</i> monarch butterfly	~	~	N/A	2	Many open habitats including fields, meadows, weedy areas, marshes, and roadsides	No	High potential to occur as the site supports open, weedy areas
<i>Dendroica petechia</i> yellow warbler	~	SSC	N/A	2	Edges of marshes and swamps, willow-lined streams, leafy bogs; thickets, orchards, farmlands, forest edges, and suburban yards and gardens; areas of scattered trees, dense shrubbery, and any other moist, shady areas	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Elanus leucurus</i> white-tailed kite	~	FPS	N/A	1	Open groves, river valleys, marshes, grasslands, roadsides	Yes	High potential to occur as the site supports open areas and trees to nest in; refer to Mitigation Measure Bio-1
<i>Empidonax traillii extimus</i> southwestern willow flycatcher	FE	SE	N/A	1 (NE)	Willows in riparian habitats, wet and dry thickets, brushy pastures, abandoned orchards	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Eremophila alpestris interparietalis</i> coast horned lark	~	~	N/A	2	Open areas dominated by sparse low herbaceous vegetation or widely scattered low shrubs. Nests in hollow on ground often next to grass tuft or clod of earth or manure	Yes	Moderate potential to occur as the site supports these habitats; nearest recorded occurrence is 1.1 miles to the south (Figure 7); refer to Mitigation Measure Bio-1
<i>Eumeces skiltonianus abbottii</i> Coronado Island skink	~	SSC	N/A	2	Grassland, woodlands, pine forests, chaparral, especially in open sunny areas such as brush clearings and the edges of creeks and rivers, prefers rocky areas near streams with lots of vegetation	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, topographic features
<i>Eumops perotis californicus</i> greater western mastiff bat	~	SSC	N/A	2	Variety of habitats, including desert scrub, chaparral, oak woodland, ponderosa pine belt and high elevation meadows of mixed conifer forests, significant rock features offering suitable roosting habitat	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, rock features
<i>Euphydryas editha quino</i> Quino checkerspot butterfly	FE	~	N/A	1 (NE)	Adults usually fly from late-February to mid-April, during which time they mate and lay eggs; eggs hatch about a week and a half later and the larvae begin feeding on dwarf plantain (<i>Plantago erecta</i>) or Indian paintbrush (<i>Castilleja exserta</i> spp. <i>exserta</i>), common in meadows and upland sage scrub/chaparral habitat; important in maximizing egg production, adult females nectar primarily on annuals including goldfields (<i>Lasthenia</i> sp.), cryptantha (<i>Cryptantha</i> sp.), gilia (<i>Gilia</i> sp.), linanthus (<i>Linanthus</i> sp.), and trefoil (<i>Lotus</i> sp.)	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these host plants and nectar sources
Hermes copper butterfly	~	~	N/A	1	Southern mixed chaparral, coastal sage scrub, with <i>Rhamnus crocea</i> host plant	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, host plant
<i>Falco mexicanus</i> prairie falcon	~	~	N/A	1	Prefer open grassland habitats in spring and fall migrations, and open desert and grassland habitats in winter. Breed in open, arid grasslands with cliffs and bluffs for nesting	Yes	Low potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, topographic features; refer to Mitigation Measure Bio-1
<i>Icteria virens</i> yellow-breasted chat	~	~	N/A	1	Summer resident in dense riparian thickets near watercourses	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support this habitat

Scientific Name Common Name	Status				Habitat Description	Considered in Impact Analysis	Rationale
	Federal	State	CNPS	County List			
<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i> loggerhead shrike	~	SSC	N/A	1	Open fields and scrubby habitats with scattered trees	Yes	Moderate potential to occur as the site supports these habitats and trees to nest in; refer to Mitigation Measure Bio-1
<i>Larus californicus</i> California gull (non-breeding)	~	~	N/A	2	Ocean, lakes	No	No potential to occur
<i>Lasiurus blossevillii</i> western red bat	~	~	N/A	2	Prefer riparian areas dominated by walnuts, oaks, willows, cottonwoods, and sycamores where they roost in these broad-leafed trees	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i> hoary bat	~	~	N/A	~	Prefer trees at the edge of clearings, but have been found in trees in heavy forests, open wooded glades, and shade trees along urban streets and in city parks	No	Low potential to occur as the site does support trees; nearest recorded occurrence is 1.1 mile to the east (Figure 7)
<i>Lepus californicus bennettii</i> San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit	~	SSC	N/A	2	Open shrub	No	High potential to occur; nearest recorded occurrence is 1.2 miles to the west (Figure 7)
<i>Myotis ciliolabrum</i> western small-footed myotis	~	~	N/A	2	Roosts alone or in small groups in rock crevices, mines, caves, or buildings, and even occasionally uses in an abandoned swallow's nest as a roosting site	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these features
<i>Myotis evotis</i> long-eared myotis	~	~	N/A	2	Wide range of habitats, but is most commonly found in mixed coniferous forests, from humid coastal areas to montane forests; other places which function as day roosts are abandoned buildings, cracks in the ground, caves, mines, and loose bark on living and dead trees	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, structures
<i>Myotis yumanensis</i> Yuma myotis	~	~	N/A	2	Variety of habitats, ranging from juniper and riparian woodlands to desert regions near rivers, streams, ponds, lakes, when not near water over which to forage, they roost in caves, attics, buildings, mines, underneath bridges, and similar structures	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, structures
<i>Nyctinomops macrotis</i> big free-tailed bat	~	SSC	N/A	2	Arid regions with rocky outcroppings and open, sparsely vegetated grasslands near water; day roosts in attics, shutters or crevices; night roosts in the open, but with foliage nearby; hibernation roosts in buildings, caves, or cracks in rocks	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, structures
<i>Nyctinomops femorosaccus</i> pocketed free-tailed bat	~	SSC	N/A	2	Semi-arid deserts; roosts in caves, tunnels, mines, rock crevices, under the roof tiles of buildings; usually found in large colonies	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats, structures
<i>Odocoileus hemionus</i> southern mule deer	~	~	N/A	2	Wide variety of habitats	No	No potential to occur as the site is surrounded by urban development and roadways precluding site access by deer
<i>Onychomys torridus ramona</i> southern grasshopper mouse	~	SSC	N/A	2	Variety of low, open and semi-open scrub habitats including coastal sage scrub, mixed chaparral, low sagebrush, riparian scrub, and annual grassland with scattered shrubs in mesas and valleys in the coastal region	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support these habitats
<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i> double-crested cormorant	~	WL	N/A	2	Variety of marine and inland aquatic habitats; require water for feeding and nearby perches, such as rocks, sandbars, pilings, shipwrecks, wires, trees or docks for resting on and drying out during the day	No	No potential to occur as the site does not support this habitat