

## Environmental Checklist

1. **Project title:** Lake Hodges Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge
2. **Lead agency name and address:** San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority  
18372 Sycamore Creek Road  
Escondido, CA 92025
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Shawna C. Anderson, AICP – Principal Environmental Planner  
(858) 674-2275, ext. 13
4. **Project location:** The project is generally located west of I-15, south of Via Rancho Parkway and north and west of West Bernardo Drive in the City of San Diego's San Pasqual Valley Plan area.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Same as #2 above
6. **General plan designation:** Open Space
7. **Zoning:** AR-1-1 (Agriculture Residential)
8. **Description of project:**

The San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority (JPA) proposes to construct a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over Lake Hodges that would link two existing trails on both sides of the lake and provide a non-vehicular lake crossing as an alternative to Interstate 15 (I-15). The proposed bridge would extend between the North Shore Trail segment of the Coast to Crest Trail and the south shore of Lake Hodges across from the West Bernardo Drive onramp to I-15. Trail improvements would also be constructed at both ends of the bridge to provide access to the proposed structure. On the north side of the lake, trail improvements would involve a slight northerly realignment of a 400-linear foot section of North Shore Trail. To the south, a 1,750 linear foot trail connection/Class I bike path would be constructed southerly from the southern bridge abutment along the shoulder of West Bernardo Drive to the Bernardo Bay staging area, and extend from the staging area to the intersection of Rancho Bernardo Community Park. Approximately 690 feet of the bike path would consist of a concrete cantilevered structure placed over the southern lakeshore. The bridge and trail connections currently under consideration are proposed in both the JPA-adopted *San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan* (1994) and the City of San Diego adopted *San Pasqual Valley Plan* (1996). In addition, the bridge is listed as a Programmed Bikeway Project in the City's Bicycle Master Plan (2002).

See attached Initial Study for a more detailed project description.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:**

See attached Initial Study.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:**

Federal Highway Administration (NEPA concurrence); U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Section 404 wetland permit); California Department of Transportation (Encroachment Permit); Regional Water Quality Control Board (401 Certification); U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Section 7 consultation); California Department of Fish and Game (Streambed Alteration Agreement); California Department of Health Services; and City of San Diego (Site Development Permit, Grading Permit, Lease Agreement).

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.


NONE

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

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant 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 in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature

3/3/05  
Date

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

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

**I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:**

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

See the Initial Study for discussion.

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

See the Initial Study for discussion.

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

See the Initial Study for discussion.

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

No reflective materials would be used in the project design that might create reflective glare. The bridge itself would be lit at night with low-level recessed lights sufficient to light the bridge surface only (i.e., 1,200 lumen). The bridge lights would be attached to the lower portion of the railing posts covered by aluminum louvers and staggered along the bridge length (i.e., every 10 feet on opposite sides of the railing). Lighting analysis done for the project by the design engineers demonstrated that the lights would only illuminate the bridge surface itself and

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

would not shine into the lake or surrounding area. The trails leading to the bridge would not be lit. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts from light and glare. See the Initial Study.

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:**

Would the project:

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

The majority of the soils in the study area have no agricultural suitability. The proposed bridge abutments and trail improvements would traverse small areas containing soil deemed suitable for agriculture crops, such as avocados, citrus, truck crops, tomatoes and flowers (USDA 1973), but that have never been in production nor will ever be put into production due to their proximity to a potable water reservoir and location in the City's MHPA. The proposed project would not cause an impact on farmland because of the limited extent of the soil resources and lack of existing production.

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

The project area is zoned agricultural (AR-1-1) and the proposed project is an allowable use within that zoning and would not change the zoning. No Williamson Act contracts exist in the project area and no impact would occur.

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

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

The proposed project is a recreational trail and bridge connection situated within the City of San Diego Water Department ownership. No farmland is nearby nor would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project. No impact would occur.

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

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

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

The bridge and trail connections would be for non-motorized use for recreation and commuter purposes. The trail would not change any regional and local growth projections or land use plans which are the basis for the air quality plans. The project could reduce vehicle travel within San Dieguito River Park by providing a pedestrian and bicycle linkage within the park between two staging areas rather than requiring park users to drive between the north and south shore areas to access both sides of the lake. It would also offer an alternative form of non-motorized travel through the project area, which could reduce commute vehicular trips between Via Rancho Parkway and West Bernardo Drive along I-15. Therefore, only beneficial air quality effects to the air quality plan would occur.

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

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

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

The project itself would not generate any pollutants. The proposed project would not generate a substantial number of new vehicular trips. It would serve existing park users by completing another trail linkage. Any users would likely park at the Sunset Drive and Bernardo Bay staging areas to access the trail and bridge. These recreational trips would likely occur regardless of the construction of this project (i.e., to access other recreational facilities instead). As noted above under checklist item III a), the proposed project has the potential to reduce vehicular travel within and through the park. The proposed project would not contribute to any violations of air quality standards.

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

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

A net decrease in criteria pollutants could occur from the proposed project due to the potential reduction in vehicular trips within and through the park, as noted above under checklist item III a). The proposed project would provide an alternative to park users on both sides of the lakeshore by providing a non-motorized connection across the lake. In addition, bicycle commuters along the I-15 corridor would be able to use this alternative connection that parallels I-15. Air quality impacts from implementation of the *San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan* were

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

addressed in Section IV.I of the Concept Plan EIR. While the Concept Plan EIR concluded that potential traffic generated as a result of implementation of the *San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan* was not anticipated to result in direct impacts to air quality, the Concept Plan EIR also concluded that because the San Diego region is unable to meet certain air quality standards, any increase in air contaminants represented a significant cumulative impact. The proposed project would provide a non-vehicular crossing over Lake Hodges as an alternative to I-15 facilitating an alternative that would reduce vehicular trips. Currently, the only way to cross Lake Hodges and the San Dieguito River Valley is to use an automobile. The project would provide a non-vehicular alternative for commuters, recreational users, and transportation in general.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

The proposed project would not emit any pollutants or cause substantial pollutant concentrations in the project vicinity. No sensitive receptors, such as schools or residential uses, occur near the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

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

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

The proposed project would not create any odors or be in a location subject to objectionable odors; no impacts would occur.

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

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES --**

Would the project:

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

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

See Initial Study for biological impact discussion.

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

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

See Initial Study for biological impact discussion.

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

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

See Initial Study for biological impact discussion.

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

See Initial Study for biological impact discussion.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

See Initial Study for discussion.

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

See Initial Study.

#### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

See Initial Study for cultural resources impact analysis.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

See Initial Study for cultural resources impact analysis.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------

A project-specific geological investigation was conducted which determined that the project site is underlain with alluvium and cretaceous-age granitic bedrock (Law Crandall 2002). Formations such as those have little to no potential for paleontological resources due to their young age (in the case of alluvium) and their molten origin (in the

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

base of granitic bedrock). Excavations for the abutment foundations would not directly or indirectly destroy unique paleontological resources. No impact would occur.

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

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

See attached Initial Study for cultural resources impact discussion.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:**

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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

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

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

iv) Landslides?

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

a) i) – iv) A project-specific geotechnical investigation was performed on the proposed project (Law Crandall 2002) and is summarized herein. The project site is not currently within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest active fault is Rose Canyon, located approximately 12 miles to the southwest. No faults were revealed at or near the project site during the investigation. The site would be subject

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

to strong ground motion in the event of an earthquake, but would be designed to withstand the effects of ground shaking and related effects, such as liquefaction, through compliance with current codes and engineering practices. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Localized layers of alluvial soils below the groundwater level would be subject to liquefaction and settlement in the event of a large magnitude earthquake; mitigation measures recommended in the geotechnical investigation would be incorporated into the final project design to avoid the potentially significant impacts from liquefaction.

There are no known landslides on or near the project site, although severe slope erosion was observed near the embankment fill of West Bernardo Drive due to wave action and runoff. Mitigation measures recommended in the geotechnical investigation would be incorporated into the final project design to avoid the potentially significant impacts from slope instability.

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

See Initial Study for soil erosion discussion.

**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?**

The geotechnical investigation noted talus and slope waste materials present on the natural slope above the northern abutment that are likely loose and would not be suitable for structural support. Refer to the discussion under checklist item VIa) on

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

seismic-induced instabilities, including liquefaction. Measures recommended in the geotechnical investigation have been incorporated into the final project design to avoid the potentially significant impacts from unstable soil conditions.

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

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

No expansive soils were encountered during field investigations conducted for the proposed project. No impacts from expansive soils would occur.

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

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

No septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems are proposed. No impact would occur.

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

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

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

The proposed project does not propose the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No impact would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

No accidental release of hazardous materials would reasonably occur as a result of the proposed bridge project. The bridge would only be accessible to pedestrians and bicycles which have no potential to cause a release of hazardous materials. No impact would occur.

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

The proposed project would not emit or involve the handling of any hazardous materials. No schools exist within ¼ mile of the project site. No impact would occur.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------

The bridge and trail connection would not be located near any site on these lists. No hazard to the public or environment would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

The proposed project is not within the vicinity of an airport. No safety hazard related to airports would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------

The proposed project is not located near a private airstrip. No safety hazards related to airstrip activity would occur.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------

The City has adopted procedures for any emergencies involving the Lake Hodges dam, which is approximately three miles due west of the proposed bridge (City of San Diego 2002). In addition, an emergency response plan for the lake is contained in a business plan on file with the City which outlines evacuation procedures in the event of a hazardous materials release (City of San Diego 1995). The proposed bridge would not interfere with the implementation of either of these plans. No impact would occur.

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

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

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

The proposed project is located in an area of high fire hazard potential because of the amount of native vegetation and steep slopes surrounding the site. The bridge and trail would not increase the potential for wildland fires since no motorized vehicles would use the facility. The JPA has the authority to close affected trail segments in the case of a wildland fire. No impact or increased risk would occur.

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

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

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

See Initial Study for water quality impact discussion under Hydrology/Water Quality.

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

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

See Initial Study.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</p> <p>See Initial Study for drainage discussion under Hydrology/Water Quality.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</p> <p>See Initial Study for drainage discussion under Hydrology/Water Quality.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>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?</p> <p>See Initial Study for drainage discussion under Hydrology/Water Quality.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</p> <p>See Initial Study for water quality discussion under Hydrology/Water Quality.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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?</p> <p>The proposal does not involve the construction of housing. No impact from flooding would occur.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<p>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</p> <p>See Initial Study for flooding discussion under Hydrology/Water Quality.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</p> <p>See Initial Study.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</p> <p>See Initial Study discussion under Hydrology and Water Quality.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -**

**Would the project:**

a) **Physically divide an established community?**

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

The proposed project would be located within an undeveloped area surrounding a water supply and recreation reservoir and would not physically divide a community. No impact would occur.

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

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

The bridge and trail connections are included in and consistent with the San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan and is identified as a future project in the San Pasqual Valley Plan and would not conflict with these plans. In addition, the bridge is identified in the City's Bicycle Master Plan (City of San Diego 2002). The project has minimized impacts to biological resources, in particular wetlands, in accordance with the City's Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) regulations as discussed in the attached Initial Study under Biological Resources. See the Initial Study for more discussion.

c) **Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

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

See attached Initial Study for a discussion of consistency with the MSCP under Biological Resources.

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

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:**

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

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

Both piers and a portion of the southern abutment and trail connection occur within the MRZ-2, mineral resource zone. This zone corresponds with the sand deposits found within the San Dieguito River floodplain. This resource is important because the sand quality satisfies the specifications for construction-quality portland cement. Development of the proposed project would preclude its extraction; however, full-scale mining of the sand would be inconsistent with the reservoir use and the Concept Plan goals of preserving the character and quality of the area.

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

See response to checklist item X a).

**XI. NOISE Would the project result in:**

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

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

The proposed bridge would be used by non-vehicular park users and would not generate any noise nor would it expose persons to long-term elevated noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of San

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

Diego Transportation Element of the General Plan. No impact from operational noise would occur.

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

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

Project construction would involve pile driving and rock drilling activities to install the abutments, piers and piles. No blasting would be required. Groundborne vibration would likely be generated in the short-term during construction. Vibration levels vary depending on the type of pile driving equipment (i.e., sonic versus impact) and is influenced by the soil conditions. Impact pile drivers typically cause more vibration than sonic. The closest residences are approximately 900 feet north of the northern abutment and 300 feet farther from the location where the bridge piers would be constructed and pile driving is proposed. There are no homes close to the bridge construction zone that would be adversely affected by ground-borne vibration or noise. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

See response to checklist item XI.a.

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

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

See noise discussion in Initial Study. The project would comply with the City's construction noise ordinance.

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

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

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

The proposed project is not located near an airport. No noise sensitive land uses are proposed. No aircraft noise impacts would occur.

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

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

The proposed project is not located near a private airport. No noise sensitive land uses are proposed. No aircraft noise impacts would occur.

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING --**  
**Would the project:**

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

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

The proposed project is a bridge and trail connection for recreational park users that would not change the population or indirectly induce growth. No impact would occur.

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

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

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

The proposed project is proposed within a reservoir and would not displace any housing. No impact would occur.

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

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

The proposed project would not displace any people. No impact would occur.

### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

The proposed project would implement the San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan, a major regional park facility in the area. No changes to existing public services in the area are anticipated, including fire protection, police protection and schools. A substantial increase in park users would not be expected as a result of this project.

Fire protection?

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Police protection?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Schools?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Parks?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**XIV. RECREATION --**

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

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

The bridge and trail connections would provide a new recreational facility for existing and new users of the San Dieguito River Park, a regional park. It is likely that the proposed project would serve both existing and new park users. However, the minor increase in park users is anticipated in the long-term plans for the park (i.e., Concept Plan) and would not cause its physical deterioration. The existing North Shore Trail is of sufficient width (at least 12 feet) to accommodate additional users. The JPA's existing ranger staff and volunteer patrol already monitor and patrol this area (North Shore and Piedras Pintadas trails) and would be able to accommodate patrolling the proposed bridge as well as maintaining the structure itself. No impacts would occur.

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

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

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

The proposed project is a new recreational facility. See Initial Study for biological and cultural resource impacts and the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the mitigation.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --  
Would the project:**

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

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

The proposed project has the potential to reduce vehicle commuter trips through the project area by providing a bicycle linkage between Via Rancho Parkway and West Bernardo Drive that is off the freeway. It also has the potential to reduce vehicle trips within the park by providing a north-south connection between the lakeshores that existing users would have to currently drive between to achieve. The only traffic potentially generated by the proposed project would be from new park users who would drive to a trailhead or staging area to access the bridge and trail connections. These trips would generally occur during non-peak hours. Any increase in trips associated with the project would be minimal since the bridge would service existing and future park users. Therefore, no impacts to the existing transportation system would occur.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

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

See response to checklist item XV a.).

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

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

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

The proposed project is a recreational use and would not affect air traffic. No airports exist nearby and no impacts would occur.

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

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

No vehicles would travel on the bridge or along the trail connections. Trail and bridge users would be physically separated from local roadways. The bike path along West Bernardo Drive is proposed adjacent to the road's shoulder and would be separated from the vehicles by the existing guard rail and proposed hand rail. The bike path is compatible with the existing roadway operations and would relocate some cyclists from the I-15 overpass over Lake Hodges and the bike lane along West Bernardo Drive to a separate trail dedicated for bike use. This relocation would reduce an existing hazard of bike traffic on the freeway and roadway shoulder. The project has been designed in accordance with all public safety requirements.

e) **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

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

The bridge and trail connections would be of sufficient width and surface that they could be accessed by smaller emergency vehicles. Emergency vehicles could use the trails to access an injured trail user, if needed, on either side of the lake. Emergency access would not be hampered by the proposed project.

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

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

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

Parking is available at the existing staging areas at Sunset Drive and Bernardo Bay. No new parking is proposed at these staging areas for this project. It is estimated that adequate parking is available at the staging areas to serve the new bridge and trail connections because park users could park at the existing staging areas and access both sides of the lake without having to re-park their cars. The bridge and trail connections would not attract a substantial amount of new users to the park. Therefore, adequate parking exists to serve the proposed project.

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

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

The bridge and trail connection would provide an alternative to using traditional transportation facilities. The project is listed as a priority project in the City's Bicycle Master Plan. It would implement City policies, which support alternative transportation. No impact would occur.

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

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

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

The proposed project is in a rural area and would not involve any changes to existing utilities and service systems nor create the need for new or altered wastewater treatment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p>The proposed project is in a rural area and would not involve any changes to existing utilities and service systems nor create the need for new or altered water or wastewater systems.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<p>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p>The proposed project is in a rural area and would not involve any changes to existing utilities and service systems nor create the need for new or altered stormwater systems.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<p>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</p> <p>See response to checklist item XVI b).</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<p>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?</p> <p>See response to checklist item XVI a).</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

The proposed project would not generate any new source of solid waste. No impacts to landfill capacity would occur.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------

See response to checklist item XVI f).

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --**

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

Mitigation measures listed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration would reduce impacts to biological and cultural resources to less than significant.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? “Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

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

The impacts to biological and cultural resources would be mitigated by the San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan design standards and the mitigation measures listed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project would not cause any cumulatively considerable impacts that were not already identified in the Program EIR for the Concept Plan.

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

○	○	○	●
---	---	---	---

No substantial adverse impacts to human beings would occur from the project.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:

### BHA, Inc.

- 1991 San Dieguito River Park East Lake Hodges Bike Path Feasibility Study and Environmental Constraints Analysis. April 25.

### BRW, Inc.

- 1993 Lake Hodges Bikeway Access, Area Analysis Concept Design. July 6.

### California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

- 2004 First Supplemental Historic Property Survey Report. June.
- 2003 Interstate 15 Managed Lanes Project Final Initial Study/Environmental Assessment and Mitigated Negative Declaration. March.
- 2003 Historic Property Survey Report – Negative Findings
- 2002 Storm Water Quality Handbooks, Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs) Manual. November.
- 2001 Field Guide to Construction Site Dewatering. CTSW-RT-01-010, October.
- 2000 Storm Water Quality Handbooks, Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs) Manual. November.

### City of San Diego.

- 2002 Bicycle Master Plan, May.
- 2002 Lake Hodges Dam Emergency Procedures, April 2.
- 2001 San Diego Municipal Code, Land Development Manual-Storm Water Standards. October 23 (Adopted December 2).
- 1999 Planning and Development Review Department Environmental Analysis Section Significance Determination Guidelines Under the California Environmental Quality Act, May.
- 1997 MSCP Subarea Plan, March.
- 1995 San Pasqual Valley Plan.
- 1995 San Pasqual Valley Plan EIR (SCH No. 94071063).
- 1995 Revised Business Plan for Hodges Reservoir, April 5.
- 1978 Rancho Bernardo Community Plan.

### Conservation Biology Institute.

- 2003 Administrative Draft Habitat Management Plan Lake Hodges/San Pasqual Valley Open Space. February 24.

### Gallegos & Associates.

- 2001 Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Lake Hodges Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge. November.

### HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX).

- 2004 Lake Hodges Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge/Trail Biological Technical Report. July.
- 2003 Lake Hodges Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge/Trail Jurisdictional Delineation Report. July 16.

### Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

- 2001 Lake Hodges Bridge Alternatives Analysis, October 9.

Law Crandall.

- 2002 Proposed Lake Hodges Bike/Pedestrian Bridge Draft Bridge Foundation Report. September 23.

MACTEC.

- 2004 Results of Slope Stability Analyses, Proposed Lake Hodges Bikeway/Pedestrian Bridge South Embankment Slopes, March 1.
- 2002 Draft Bridge Foundation Report, Proposed Lake Hodges Bike/Pedestrian Bridge, September 23.

Pierson, Fred.

- 2000 Historic Resource Evaluation Report for the San Dieguito River Park Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge Across Lake Hodges. July 27.

Safdie Rabines Architects.

- 2003 Computer visual simulations of the proposed project. January.

San Diego County Water Authority.

- 1995 Final Environmental Impact Report/Statement for the San Diego Water Authority Emergency Water Storage Project No. 312451800.

San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority (JPA).

- 2002 San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan. Adopted 1994. Updated February 15, 2002.
- 1994 Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan. February 18.

Spurlock Poirier.

- 2003 Landscape Concept Plan, Lake Hodges Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge.

T.Y.LIN International.

- 2003 Letter to San Dieguito River Park re: Lake Hodges Bike and Pedestrian Bridge Hydraulic Design. July 25.
- 2003 60% Plans for Construction of Lake Hodges Bikeway Access. Updated August 8.
- 2002 Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge Advance Planning Studies. June.

URS Corporation.

- 2003 Letter to Ms. Karen Henry re: Storm Water Data Report. July 23.
- 2003 Draft Storm Water Data Report Lake Hodges Bikeway Access. July 23.
- 2003 Memo re: Lake Hodges/Santa Ysabel Creek 100-year elevation at the proposed pedestrian bridge. July 23.

United States Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service.

- 1997 Biological Opinion on the San Diego County Water Authority Emergency Water Storage Project, San Diego County, California (1-6-97-F-13). April 9.