ANDREW POTTER, CCB
EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ROOM 402, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-2422
(619) 531-5600

RYAN SHARP
ASSISTANT CLERK

ANN MOORE
ASSISTANT CLERK

July 18, 2025

TO: Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer, Vice Chair
Supervisor Joel Anderson
Supervisor Monica Montgomery Steppe
Supervisor Jim Desmond

FROM: Andrew Potter
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

REFERRAL

Attached for your information, is correspondence from Araceli Moreno, Manager for The California Advisory Committee on Geographic Names (CACGN), seeking input from the San Diego Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of support or objection of the proposed names.

Respectfully,

ANDREW POTTER

Attachment

cc: Ebony N. Shelton, Chief Administrative Officer
Dahvia Lynch, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Land Use & Environment Group
Board of Supervisors Communications Received

AJP:sh

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
WADE CROWFOOT, Secretary for Natural Resources

July 18, 2025

REQUEST FOR COMMENT

To: San Diego Board of Supervisors
Re: **Name Proposals Received: Cush-pii, Kwettap Cush-pii, Cush-pii 'Estik, Kwettap 'Ekwii Emak**
Contact: cacgn@resources.ca.gov

RESPONSE REQUESTED BY: August 15, 2025

Dear San Diego Board of Supervisors:

The California Advisory Committee on Geographic Names (CACGN), a committee within the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), has received name proposals from the United States Board on Geographic Names (BGN) with the following names, Cush-pii (459-6453), Kwettap Cush-pii (459-6454), Cush-pii 'Estik (459-6455), and Kwettap 'Ekwii Emak (459-6456), within the geographic region specific to your jurisdiction.

Background
CACGN serves as an advisory committee to the U.S. Board of Geographic Names (BGN) regarding geographic names to be used on maps or any other publications published by federal agencies. The BGN is a federal body charged with maintaining uniform geographic name usage throughout the federal government. It considers proposals, suggestions and concerns associated with geographic names, and forwards those located in California to the CACGN for an initial review and recommendation.

Name Proposal
The summit Cush-pii, stream Kwettap Cush-pii, summit Cush-pii 'Estik, and stream Kwettap 'Ekwii Emak are located in San Diego County. The proposed names names Cush-pii, Kwettap Cush-pii, Cush-pii 'Estik, and Kwettap 'Ekwii Emak were submitted by Chairwoman of Kumeyaay Diegueno Land Conservancy (KDLC) to the BGN for their consideration of the features which are currently named Stonewall Peak, Stonewall Creek, Little Stonewall Peak, and Little Stonewall Creek. The CACGN seeks input from the San Diego Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of support or objection of the proposed names.

Given public agencies' unique relationships with members of their communities, CACGN looks to public agencies to lead engagement efforts with potentially affected community members and to provide recommendations that best reflect the values of their communities. While CACGN conducts

its own tribal consultations on naming proposals, we acknowledge public agencies' unique relationships with California Native American tribes and encourages public agencies to also conduct their own tribal consultation.

We respectfully request comments be received by August 15, 2025. CRNA staff anticipates bringing this case to CACGN on August 29, 2025. Once CACGN votes to recommend approval or disapproval of the name proposal, CACGN's recommendation will be sent to the BGN for a final decision.

We look forward to coordinating with the San Diego Board of Supervisors, local communities, and California Native American tribes in making a recommendation on this proposal.

Thank you for considering this notice, and please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Araceli Moreno

CACGN Manager

California Natural Resources Agency

- "owned slaves, and he advocated the gradual emancipation and colonization of the state's African Americans. He raised funds for the American Colonization Society."
- "gave Virginia's public school system a lasting foundation and as he defended the system from vigorous opposition and the shortfalls generated by the state's crippling debt"
- "spent his later years teaching geology, writing about the history of Washington and Lee University, and advocating the school system he helped create"
- "[between the time he was superintendent of Virginia's public school system and principal of the State Female Normal School] accepted a faculty position at Roanoke College, where he taught geology, mineralogy, and the science of teaching. Later in 1882, he and John L. Campbell completed a survey for the Georgia Pacific Railway Company and published *A Physical Survey Extending from Atlanta, Ga., ... to the Mississippi River* ... (1883), which played a key role in developing industry in northern Alabama"
- "surveyed land in Alabama for the Sloss Iron and Steel Company in 1888"

GNIS has a record for Ruffner, an unincorporated populated place, located east of Red Mountain near the southern end of the proposed Ruffner Mountain; it was first shown on the USGS 1959 1:24,000-scale Irondale quadrangle. GNIS does not record any other features in Alabama that contain the word "Ruffner."

Stakeholder Input

Local government	City of Birmingham	
	City of Irondale	
	Jefferson County	
State Names Authority	Alabama Geographic Names Authority	
Federal Agency	n/a	
Federally Recognized Tribes	All federally recognized Tribes contacted under Policy X	
Other	Ruffner Mountain Nature Preserve	

CALIFORNIA

Change Stonewall Peak to Cush-pii, Stonewall Creek to Kwettap Cush-pii, Little Stonewall Peak to Cush-pii 'Estik, and Little Stonewall Creek to Kwettap 'Ekwii Emak

Proposal Information

Proposed names	**Cush-pii, Kwettap Cush-pii, Cush-pii 'Estik, Kwettap 'Ekwii Emak**
Proposal type	change a name considered offensive

Current official name	Stonewall Peak, Stonewall Creek, Little Stonewall Peak, Little Stonewall Creek
GNIS ID	273917, 273614, 272128, 272127
Proponent	Emily Burgueno, Kumeyaay Diegueño Land Conservancy Chairwoman
Date proposed	1/10/25
BGN case number	6453, 6454, 6455, 6456
Quarterly Review List	459

The Kumeyaay Diegueño Land Conservancy proposed the following changes to four features in Cuyamaca Rancho State Park:

- Stonewall Peak to Cush-pii ("sharp point," the traditional Kumeyaay name for the summit)
- Stonewall Creek to Kwettap Cush-pii ("sharp point creek")
- Little Stonewall Peak to Cush-pii 'Estik ("little sharp point")
- and Little Stonewall Creek to Kwettap 'Ekwii Emak ("behind the clouds creek," a reference to nearby Kumeyaay village site)

The proposed names are names in Iipai Aa, the Kumeyaay language (also spelled 'Iipay Aa or Ipai). See below for details about each proposed name.

The proposal notes that the Kumeyaay Diegueño Land Conservancy (KDLC)

> was formed in 2005 to act in a unified, organized, and traditional relevant manner to identify, protect, and preserve sacred sites and ecosystems throughout the traditional Kumeyaay Homelands. The Kumeyaay Homelands stretch over 75 miles north and south of the Southern California International Border. . . .
>
> The KDLC Board of Directors is composed of delegates, appointed by resolution through their Tribal Councils, from the following ten (10) federally-recognized tribal governments: Campo Band of the Kumeyaay Nation, Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, Jamul Indian Village, Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation, La Posta Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation, Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians, Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel (INSY), San Pasqual Band of the Kumeyaay Nation, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians.
>
> In July 2021, Elizabeth Schalo, a professional engineer and former Kumeyaay Community College (KCC) student, informed KDLC of four geographic features within Kumeyaay Homelands using names based on the Confederate General Stonewall Jackson and three geographic features with the derogatory term sq___. In response, KDLC formed a Working Group with technical support from Ms. Schalo to identify ethnographic names and determine new names for these places with intention of submitting a name change request through the U.S. Board of Geographic Names (BGN). The KDLC []Working Group meetings

> occurred in-person at the Kumeyaay Community College Classroom on the Sycuan Reservation with the option of virtual participation. Participants included KDLC delegates whom all are respected Tribal Chairmen and Chairwomen, Tribal Councilmembers, elders, language speakers, historians/researchers, educators, community members, and more. In April 2022, KDLC submitted a comment letter to the Department of Interior Secretary's Order 3404 Derogatory Geographic Names Task Force with proposed names for the three sq___-named features. In September 2022, as a part of Order 3404, the BGN voted on the three names proposed by KDLC final replacement names. Today, KDLC submits this letter to you for proposed names for the four geographic features named for the Confederate General Stonewall Jackson.
>
> KDLC interviewed Elders, collaborated with fluent language speakers, reviewed multiple Kumeyaay dictionaries written and published by elders with support of linguists, and researched other historical documents and archives. . . .
>
> [The proposed names] would add to Kumeyaay place names within Ancestral Kumeyaay Homelands such as Aapaal'omar (Palomar), Powaii (Poway), Inaja, 'Ekwii 'Aamuc (Cuyamaca), Hamaachaa (Jamacha), Jamul, Otaay, Tijuana, etc. [The] proposed name change[s] within the boundaries of what is now Cuyamaca Rancho State Park would add to Kumeyaay place names throughout our Ancestral Homelands and support representation by uplifting traditional Kumeyaay language. We all know the words we use on a daily basis have power behind them, so let's put our voices together and speak the traditional Kumeyaay language on a daily basis by using the proposed names. . . .

In October and November 2021, a San Diego County resident submitted proposals to change the names based on an objection to the names referencing Confederate General Stonewall Jackson:

- Stonewall Peak to Cush-Pii ("sharp peak," a name the proponent discussed with the KDLC)
- Little Stonewall Peak to Ipuk Spiruk ("broken neck," a name the proponent reported learning from a Kumeyaay tribal member)
- Stonewall Creek to Cush-Pii Creek
- Little Stonewall Creek to Ipuk Spiruk Creek

The names proposed were Iipai Aa (Kumeyaay) names based on research by Elizabeth Schalo (also reference by KDLC; see above). The proponent stated that

> Once my Black family learned of the name of the peak and its association with Stonewall Jackson, we no longer feel welcome at this State Park or desire to hike the trail. Mountains maintain names like this as a method of intimidating Blacks in an effort to continue to oppress them post-slavery. Mountains whose names are maintained by the federal government should consider ALL people and allow

for ALL people to feel welcome visiting and hiking them. This proposed name change is long overdue.

After submitting the proposal, the proponent contacted several local groups to get their input about the proposed changes: the KDLC; the California State Parks Tribal Affairs Program; California Department of Parks and Recreation; California State Assembly members; and the San Diego County Supervisors.

Beginning in 2022, the California Department of Park and Recreation worked with a researcher and the KDLC to determine the most accurate Iipai Aa (Kumeyaay) names for the features. BGN staff did not receive or learn of any support submitted by these groups.

Historians report that the San Diego County gold rush started when a formerly enslaved person from Kentucky discovered placer gold in 1869 a few miles north of Stonewall Peak. Many Confederate sympathizers moved to the San Diego County area during the gold rush. Historians differ on the details of the origins of the Stonewall Mine, crediting the discovery of a gold vein there to either a Tennessee Confederate sympathizer named William Skidmore or to a miner from England named Charles Hensley. The two men staked a claim, naming it the Stonewall Jackson Mine. "Jackson" was likely dropped from the name due to anti-Confederate views of immigrating miners or because the mine was soon owned by pro-Union Republicans Almon Frary Sr., from Illinois, and Joseph Farley, from Ohio. The mine ceased operations in 1895.

Change Stonewall Peak to Cush-pii

Feature Details

Primary coordinates	32.9610022, -116.5719108
Secondary coordinates	n/a
Feature class	summit
Feature size	5,730 ft. elevation
Feature description	2.2 mi. NE of Cuyamaca Peak
Name history	the traditional Kumeyaay term meaning "Sharp Point," referring to both the topography and geology of the feature and cultural significance
USGS primary topo map	Cuyamaca Peak 1:24,000
State(s)	California
County(s)	San Diego County
Local jurisdiction(s)	n/a
PLSS	T14S R4E, San Bernardino Meridian
Land ownership	Cuyamaca Rancho State Park

BGN decisions

- None

Other Names

- Unpublished names: None found
- Published names:
  - Coosh-Pi: "Place Names in Ipai Language", americanindiansource.com, 2021; *The Indian Place Names of Rancho Cuyamaca*, 1950
  - Cush-Pi: Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians website, 2021; Kumeyaay.com, 2021
  - Cushi-Pi: Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association newsletter, March 2020; Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians website, 2021)
  - Sharp Peak: *San Diego County Place Names A to Z*, 2005
  - Stone Wall: Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association newsletter, March 2020)
  - Stonewall Peak: USGS 1903, 1942, 1960, 1979; AMS 1958; USFS 1997; "A dictionary of altitudes in the United States (fourth edition)", USGS, 1906; Cuyamaca Rancho State Park brochure and map, 2010; *Cuyamaca Rancho State Park Physical and Biological Resources Inventory*, 2014; *Anza-Borrego A to Z*, 2001; *San Diego County Place Names A to Z*, 2005)

Case Summary

The KDLC proposal reported

> *Cush-pii* is *Iipai Aa* for the traditional Kumeyaay term of what we now know as Stonewall Peak. *Cush-pii*, which means "Sharp Point," is referring to not just the geological attributes of the mountain but the cultural significance as well. This return to traditional knowledge would be a restoration of Kumeyaay place name and support active Kumeyaay language revitalization. The language was identified with the support from an elder language speaker of the Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel.

Change Stonewall Creek to Kwettap Cush-pii

Feature Details

Primary coordinates	32.9331277, -116.5535259
Secondary coordinates	32.9672672, -116.554234
Feature class	stream
Feature size	2.8 mi. long
Feature description	heads 3.4 mi. NE of Cuyamaca, flows generally S to enter the Sweetwater River 3 mi. ENE of Oakzanita Peak
Name history	a name in Iipai Aa (Kumeyaay language) meaning "Sharp Point Creek" in reference to the adjacent summit
USGS primary topo map	Cuyamaca Peak 1:24,000
State(s)	California
County(s)	San Diego County
Local jurisdiction(s)	n/a
PLSS	T14S R4E, San Bernardino Meridian

Land ownership	Cuyamaca Rancho State Park

BGN decisions

- None

Other Names

- Unpublished names: None found
- Published names:
  - Stonewall Canyon: "San Diego Integrated Regional Water Management Integrated Flood Management Planning," 2013; *Cuyamaca Rancho State Park Physical and Biological Resources Inventory*, 2014
  - Stonewall Creek: USGS 1960; USFS 1997; Cuyamaca Rancho State Park brochure and map, 2010; *San Diego Reader*, 2015

Case Summary

The KDLC proposal reported

> *Cush-pii Kwettap* is the proposed name for Stonewall Creek. *Kwettap* means "creek" in Kumeyaay. Together, *Cush-pii Kwettap* means "Sharp Point Creek." The word and spelling for *Kwettap* were determined with references from multiple Kumeyaay dictionaries including the *Barona Inter-Tribal Dictionary* and the *Mesa Grande Dictionary*. As well as input from KDLC Board Members and Kumeyaay historians/researchers.

BGN staff confirmed with the proponent the proper order of the name in Iipai Aa (Kumeyaay language) as Kwettap Cush-pii.

Change Little Stonewall Peak to Cush-pii 'Estik

Feature Details

Primary coordinates	32.9655443, -116.5647098
Secondary coordinates	n/a
Feature class	summit
Feature size	5,250 ft. elevation
Feature description	2.7 mi. NE of Cuyamaca Pea
Name history	a name in Iipai Aa (Kumeyaay language) meaning "Little Sharp Point" in reference to the adjacent summit
USGS primary topo map	Cuyamaca Peak 1:24,000
State(s)	California
County(s)	San Diego County
Local jurisdiction(s)	n/a
PLSS	T14S R4E, San Bernardino Meridian
Land ownership	Cuyamaca Rancho State Park

BGN decisions

- None

Other Names

- Unpublished names: None found
- Published names:
  - Little Stonewall Peak: USGS 1960; USFS 1997; Cuyamaca Rancho State Park brochure and map, 2010; *Cuyamaca Rancho State Park Physical and Biological Resources Inventory*, 2014

Case Summary

The KDLC proposal reported

> *Cush-pii 'Estik* is the proposed name for Little Stonewall Peak. *'Estik* means "little" in Kumeyaay. Together, *Cush-pii 'Estik* means "Little Sharp Point." The word and spelling for *'Estik* were determined with references from multiple Kumeyaay dictionaries including the *Barona Inter-Tribal Dictionary* and the *Mesa Grande Dictionary*. As well as input from KDLC Board Members and Kumeyaay historians/researchers.

BGN staff confirmed with the proponent the proper format of the name in Iipai Aa (Kumeyaay language) as glottal stop character as ' rather than '.

Change Little Stonewall Creek to Kwettap 'Ekwii Emak

Feature Details

Primary coordinates	32.9816186, -116.577462
Secondary coordinates	32.9822081, -116.5419388
Feature class	stream
Feature size	3.5 mi. long
Feature description	heads 3 mi. SE of North Peak, flows SSW into Lake Cuyamaca 2.9 mi. NE of Cuyamaca Peak
Name history	a name in Iipai Aa (Kumeyaay language) meaning "Behind the Clouds Creek" in reference to an adjacent Kumeyaay village site, Ah-ha Kwe-ah-mac'
USGS primary topo map	Cuyamaca Peak 1:24,000
State(s)	California
County(s)	San Diego County
Local jurisdiction(s)	n/a
PLSS	T14S R4E, San Bernardino Meridian
Land ownership	Cuyamaca Rancho State Park / Anza-Borrego Desert State Park

BGN decisions

- None

Other Names

- Unpublished names: None found
- Published names:
  - Little Stonewall Creek: USGS 1960; USFS 1997; California Department of Fish and Game report, 1994; Cuyamaca Rancho State Park brochure and map, 2010; *Cuyamaca Rancho State Park Physical and Biological Resources Inventory*, 2014

Case Summary

The KDLC proposal reported

> *Kwettap 'Ekwii Emak* is the proposed name for Little Stonewall Creek. *'Ekwii Emak* means "Behind the Clouds" in Kumeyaay. Together, *Kwettap 'Ekwii Emak* means "Behind the Clouds Creek." It is referring to the adjacent Kumeyaay village site, *Ah-ha Kwe-ah-mac'*. The words and spellings for *'Ekwii Emak* were determined with references from multiple Kumeyaay dictionaries including the *Barona Inter-Tribal Dictionary* and the *Mesa Grande Dictionary*. As well as input from KDLC Board Members and Kumeyaay historians/researchers.

BGN staff confirmed with the proponent the proper Iipai Aa (Kumeyaay language) glottal stop character as ' rather than '.

In 1982, the California Department of Park and Recreation established the Ah-Ha-Kwe-Ah-Mac/Stonewall Cultural Preserve (also known as the Ah-Ha-Kwe-Ah-Mac/Stonewall Mine Cultural Preserve). According to the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians website

> Cuyamaca Rancho State Park, forty miles east of San Diego, was the spring and summer home to bands of Kumeyaay Indians, who ranged throughout the Cuyamaca and Laguna Mountains in seasonal journeys from San Diego to the Salton Sea. The Kumeyaay called the beautiful oak and pine-covered mountains due east of San Diego, "Ah-ha Kwe-ah-mac," which translates roughly as "the place where it rains" or "the mist behind the clouds."

Stakeholder Input

Local government	San Diego County	
State Names Authority	California Advisory Committee on Geographic Names	
Federal Agency	n/a	
Federally Recognized Tribes	All federally recognized Tribes contacted under Policy X	
Other	Kumeyaay Diegueño Land Conservancy [proponent], representing:	Support

	• Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Campo Indian Reservation, California • Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, California • Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, California • Jamul Indian Village of California • La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the La Posta Indian Reservation, California • Manzanita Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Manzanita Reservation, California • Mesa Grande Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Mesa Grande Reservation, California • San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of California • Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation • Viejas (Baron Long) Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians of the Viejas Reservation, California	

New name Engagement Point

Proposal Information

Proposed name	**Engagement Point**
Proposal type	new name for unnamed feature
Current official name	N/A
GNIS ID	N/A
Proponent	Cameron Caldwell; Santa Rosa, CA
Date proposed	1/23/25
BGN case number	6467
Quarterly Review List	459

Feature Details

Primary coordinates	41.17572, -122.33507

ANDREW POTTER, CCB
EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ROOM 402, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-2422
(619) 531-5600

RYAN SHARP
ASSISTANT CLERK

ANN MOORE
ASSISTANT CLERK

July 30, 2025

TO: Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer, Chair
Supervisor Monica Montgomery Steppe, Vice Chair
Supervisor Paloma Aguirre
Supervisor Joel Anderson
Supervisor Jim Desmond

FROM: Andrew Potter
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

REFERRAL

Attached for your information, is correspondence from Bill Powers, Board Member of Protect Our Communities Foundation, regarding the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) State of Work (SOW), San Diego Regional Energy Study Phase 1, FIA-24-30263.

Respectfully,

ANDREW POTTER

Attachment

cc: Ebony N. Shelton, Chief Administrative Officer
Dahvia Lynch, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Land Use & Environment Group
Board of Supervisors Communications Received

AJP:sh

Powers Engineering

July 25, 2025

Ricky Williams, Land Use/Environmental Planner
San Diego County Office of Sustainability and Environmental Justice
5500 Overland Ave., Suite 270
San Diego, CA 92123

Subject: Comments on National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) Statement of Work (SOW), San Diego Regional Energy Study Phase 1, FIA-24-30263

Dear Ricky:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the May 1, 2025 NREL SOW for the San Diego Regional Energy Study Phase 1 Project. I am a board member of the Protect Our Communities Foundation (PCF) non-profit organization, the entity that raised concerns in 2022 during the Regional Decarbonization Framework (RDF) review process that ultimately led to the contract between San Diego County and NREL. I am also a consulting energy engineer and am writing this letter in that capacity.

The principal PCF concern was that the very low distributed energy resources (DER) estimate in the draft RDF would necessarily result in the County's decarbonization efforts being directed at remote, large-scale renewable resources. I applaud Supervisor Desmond for taking the lead in pursuing more detailed information on the DER potential in San Diego County. This letter is intended to provide NREL with PCF's "state of knowledge" of DER potential in San Diego County to inform NREL's efforts under FIA-24-30263. The recommendations are provided by relevant task in the SOW.

Task 3. Regional Energy Landscape, and Distributed Solar and Energy Storage Baseline

"*Analysis will summarize remaining rooftop, parking lot, and other infill capacity that could support future projects to maximize energy production in developed spaces.*"

Rooftop solar: I highly recommend that the Google Project Sunroof estimate for the solar potential of San Diego County residential and commercial rooftops serve as the point-of-departure for NREL's technical potential estimate for rooftop solar in San Diego County. Google Project Sunroof estimates the San Diego County rooftop solar potential at 41,200,000 megawatt-hours (MWh) per year, with a maximum installed capacity of 27,500 MW_{dc} of rooftop solar.[1]

[1] Google Project Sunroof, San Diego County rooftop solar potential, accessed July 24, 2025: https://sunroof.withgoogle.com/data-explorer/place/ChIJHWD_IzDr24ARKAeA6yv9DTU/.

Powers Engineering
4452 Park Blvd., Suite 209
San Diego, CA 92116

619-295-2072 (o)
619-917-2941 (c)
bpowers@powersengineering.com

Parking lot solar: A coarse estimate of parking lot solar potential in San Diego County is 4,400 to 8,000 MW_{dc}, equivalent to approximately 6,600,000 MWh to 12,000,000 MWh per year.[2]

Infill ground-mounted solar: NREL has previously estimated an in-fill groundmounted solar potential for California of 111 GW (111,000 MW_{dc}).[3] San Diego County is approximately 10 percent of California's population. This translates into an infill ground-mounted solar potential for San Diego County of approximately 11,000 MW_{dc}. This further converts to a solar energy generation potential of 16,500 MWh per year.[4]

Task 5. Quantify Costs and Co-impacts of Selected DERs

Task 5.2 Contractor will provide a qualitative summary outlining transmission and infrastructure needs to meet the San Diego region's energy demand. This summary will incorporate information from existing San Diego Gas & Electric's (SDG&E) transmission system plans and other regional and national transmission planning studies in comparison with DER baselines and projections identified in Task 3.

I would urge caution in assuming that SDG&E transmission system plans will be realized if the County were to pursue a renewable energy strategy built on maximizing DERs. The assumption that new DERs will include battery storage would largely eliminate the need for new transmission or distribution infrastructure to achieve 100 percent clean energy. This was the finding in a 2017 California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) consultant report that evaluated the grid impact of the requirement that all new California residential construction from 2020 onward include rooftop solar. The report determined that incremental grid system upgrades would be unnecessary if new residential solar installations included battery storage.[5]

Task 6. Coordination, Communication and Community Engagement

Task 6.1. Contractor will coordinate, facilitate, and create content for at least three (3) meetings with Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to inform and provide feedback on various project components, as directed by the Sponsor. The Contractor will identify relevant SMEs for these virtual meetings, as directed by the Sponsor. Relevant SMEs could include staff from other Sponsor' departments, investor-owned utilities, community choice aggregators, or regional and local agencies.

I recommend that public interest organizations involved in the RDF process also be included in the SME meetings. The public interest organizations should include at a minimum: PCF, the Utility Consumers' Action Network, Climate Action Campaign, and San Diego 350.

---

[2] Time, *The Overlooked Solar Power Potential of America's Parking Lots*, December 8, 2022: https://time.com/6239651/solar-parking-lots-france-us/. US range of parking lot solar potential, 442 GW to 800 GW. San Diego County is approximately 1 percent of US population (3.3 million versus 340 million). Assume San Diego County parking lot solar potential is 4.4 GW (4,400 MW_{dc}) to 8 GW (8,000 MW_{dc}). Assume 1,500 MWh of solar generation per MW_{dc}. San Diego County parking lot solar generation potential is 6,600 to 12,000 MWh per year.

[3] NREL, *U.S. Renewable Energy Technical Potentials: A GIS-Based Analysis*, July 2012, Table 2, p. 10: https://docs.nrel.gov/docs/fy12osti/51946.pdf.

[4] 11 GW x 1,000 MW/GW x 1,500 MWh/MW = 16,500,000 MWh.

[5] GNV GL, *Residential Zero Net Energy Building Integration Cost Analysis*, October 18, 2017, p. xv: https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/files/legacyfiles/1/6442455013-10007451-hou-r-02-d-zne-building-integration-costs-2017-10-18-final.pdf,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the NREL SOW for the San Diego Regional Energy Study Phase 1 Project.

Best regards,

Bill Powers, P.E.

Bill Powers, P.E.

Board member, Protect Our Communities Foundation

cc:

Supervisor Jim Desmond
Supervisor Monica Montgomery-Steppe
Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer
Supervisor Paloma Aguirre
Supervisor Joel Anderson
Eden Brukman, Chief Sustainability Officer

ANDREW POTTER, CCB
EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ROOM 402, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-2422
(619) 531-5600

RYAN SHARP
ASSISTANT CLERK

ANN MOORE
ASSISTANT CLERK

August 7, 2025

TO: Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer, Chair
Supervisor Monica Montgomery Steppe, Vice-Chair
Supervisor Paloma Aguirre
Supervisor Joel Anderson
Supervisor Jim Desmond

FROM: Andrew Potter
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

REFERRAL

Attached for your information, is correspondence from Carrie Gallagher, City Clerk for the City of Poway, regarding approval of Resolution 25-040 to call for a Special Municipal Election for November 4, 2025.

Respectfully,

ANDREW POTTER

Attachment

cc: Ebony N. Shelton, Chief Administrative Officer
Brian Albright, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Finance & General Government Group
Cynthia L. Paes, Registrar of Voters
Board of Supervisors Communications Received

AJP:sh

RESOLUTION NO. 25-040

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF POWAY, CALIFORNIA, CALLING, ORDERING, AND GIVING NOTICE OF THE HOLDING OF A SPECIAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN DISTRICT 2 OF THE CITY OF POWAY ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2025 FOR THE SUBMISSION OF THE QUESTION OF THE RECALL OF A CERTAIN OFFICER; AND REQUESTING THE CITY COUNCIL DIRECT THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS TO RENDER SERVICES TO THE CITY RELATING TO THE CONDUCT OF A SPECIAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the laws relating recalls of local elected officials in the State of California, a petition seeking the recall of District 2 Councilmember Anthony (Tony) Blain, was circulated and submitted to the Office of the City Clerk on July 16, 2025, in accordance with California Elections Code §§11220 and 11222, and prior to the deadline of July 16, 2025;

WHEREAS, the San Diego County Registrar of Voters provided certification as to the Verification of Signatures on Petition verifying that the recall petition contained not less than the required number of signatures to qualify the recall for the ballot (twenty-five percent (25%) of the voters of District 2 of the City of Poway);

WHEREAS, the Certificate as to the Verification of Signatures on Petition was presented to the City Council of the City of Poway at the August 5, 2025 Regular City Council meeting;

WHEREAS, California Elections Code §11240 requires the City Council to issue an order stating that an election shall be held to determine whether or not the officer named in the petition shall be recalled within fourteen (14) days after the meeting at which the certificate of sufficiency was received;

WHEREAS, California Elections Code §11242 requires the election be held not less than 88, nor more than 125 days after the issuance of the order.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Poway as follows:

SECTION 1: Submission of Question.

A. Pursuant to the California Elections Code, a Special Municipal Election is called and ordered to be held in District 2 (City Council District Map adopted by Ordinance No. 852 on February 15, 2022) in the City of Poway, California, on Tuesday, November 4, 2025, for the purpose of submitting the question of the recall of District 2 Councilmember Anthony (Tony) Blain.

B. The question to be submitted to the voters of District 2 of the City of Poway shall appear on the ballots in substantially the following form:

Shall Anthony (Tony) Blain be recalled (removed) from the Office of Councilmember of District 2 of the City of Poway?	YES
	NO

C. The vote requirement of the question to pass is a majority (50%+1) of the votes cast.

SECTION 2: Election Procedures.

A. The ballots to be used at the special municipal election shall be in the form and content as required by law.

B. Pursuant to California Elections Code §11327, the recalled office may file a statement of not more than two hundred words (200) words with the City Clerk, in accordance of California Elections Code §13307, to be sent to each voter, together with the voter information guide.

C. In accordance with Section 10002 of the California Elections Code, the City requests the County Election Department/Registrar of Voters render full election services to the City of Poway as may be requested by the City Clerk, with the County to be reimbursed in full for such services as are performed upon presentation of appropriate invoices.

D. The City Clerk is authorized to contract and coordinate with the San Diego County Registrar of Voters, in order to procure and furnish any and all official ballots, notices, printed matter and all supplies, equipment and paraphernalia that may be necessary in order to properly and lawfully conduct the special municipal election.

E. The vote center location and hours of operation, ballot drop box location and hours of operation, vote-by-mail procedures and timing, election officers and all other persons and procedures shall be those utilized by San Diego County Registrar of Voters in order to properly and lawfully conduct a special municipal election.

F. In all particulars not recited in this Resolution, the special municipal election shall be held and conducted as provided by law for holding municipal elections in the City.

G. Notice of the time and place of holding the special municipal election is given and the City Clerk is authorized, instructed and directed to give further or additional notice of such election, in time, form, and manner as required by law.

H. All ballots shall be tallied at a central counting place and not at the precincts. The central counting place shall be at a County center as designated by the San Diego County Registrar of Voters.

I. The San Diego County Registrar of Voters is hereby authorized to canvass the returns of the special municipal election.

J. The City Clerk of the City of Poway shall receive the canvass from the County as it pertains to the special municipal election, and shall timely certify the results to the City

Council, as required by law.

SECTION 3: Delivery of Resolution to County. The City Clerk shall attest to the adoption of this Resolution and enter it into the book of original resolutions. The City Council directs the City Clerk to deliver certified copies of this Resolution to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of San Diego County and to the San Diego County Registrar of Voters.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED at a Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of Poway, California on the 5th day of August, 2025 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:	MAEDA, PIKUS, DE HOFF, VAUS
NOES:	NONE
ABSTAINED:	BLAIN
ABSENT:	NONE
DISQUALIFIED:	NONE

Steve Vaus, Mayor

ATTEST:

Carrie Gallagher, CMC, City Clerk

ANDREW POTTER, CCB
EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ROOM 402, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-2422
(619) 531-5600

RYAN SHARP
ASSISTANT CLERK

ANN MOORE
ASSISTANT CLERK

August 7, 2025

TO: Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer, Chair
Supervisor Monica Montgomery Steppe, Vice-Chair
Supervisor Paloma Aguirre
Supervisor Joel Anderson
Supervisor Jim Desmond

FROM: Andrew Potter
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

REFERRAL

Attached for your information, is correspondence from Cindy Hailey, Staff Service Analyst of California Department of Fish and Wildlife, regarding the notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration for the Jamul Indian Village Land Disposal and Exchange Project.

Respectfully,

ANDREW POTTER

Attachment

cc: Ebony N. Shelton, Chief Administrative Officer
Dahvia Lynch, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Land Use & Environment Group
Board of Supervisors Communications Received

AJP:sh

State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 467-4201
wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director

California Environmental Quality Act

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE

LEAD AGENCY:	**California Department Fish and Wildlife**
CONTACT:	**Glen M. Lubcke, (858) 204-8774**
SUBJECT:	**Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration pursuant to Sections 21091 and 21092 of the Public Resources Code and CEQA Guidelines Section 15072**
PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD:	**August 04, 2025 to September 03, 2025**

Project Location: The Project site is comprised of two properties, the Disposal Property and Exchange Property, located in unincorporated San Diego County near to Jamul and Dulzura respectively. The Disposal Property is a 1.1-acre triangular portion of a larger parcel (APN 597-080-07) owned by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and part of the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER). The Exchange Property is 4.0 acres and consists of two parcels (APNs 600-101-04 and 600-101-05), owned by the Jamul Indian Village of California (Tribe). The parcels are approximately six miles from each other (Figure 1). The Project area is surrounded by undeveloped land and zoned as A72 General Agricultural Use (Figure 2).

Project Description: The Proposed Project is a land exchange between CDFW and the Tribe. CDFW proposes to dispose of a 1.1-acre portion of land (the Disposal Property), which is within the RJER, to the Tribe for future cemetery expansion. In exchange, the Tribe would provide a 4.0-acre parcel to CDFW to be added to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area for conservation. The Project does not propose any development activities, and future activities associated with the Disposal Property would be subject to applicable Federal, State, and local regulations.

Location of Negative Declaration Available for Public Review: The Draft IS/ND may be viewed online at https://wildlife.ca.gov/Notices/CEQA

Public Comment Period: By this notice, CDFW is announcing the opening of the 30-day comment period (August 4, 2025, to September 3, 2025). All written comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. on September 3, 2025 (end of the 30-day public review period).

Commenting on Negative Declaration: Written comments on the IS/ND must be addressed to:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife, South Coast Region (Region 5)
Attention: Glen M. Lubcke, Environmental Program Manager
Mailing Address: 3883 Ruffin Road, San Diego, CA 92123
OR **via email**: AskR5@wildlife.ca.gov (subject line: "JIV Land Exchange Project ND Comments")

The Project is not located on any list of places formally recorded as containing hazardous materials.




Figure 1 Regional Location





Figure 2 Site Vicinity Map



Environmental Assessment/Initial Study/Negative Declaration

Jamul Indian Village Land Disposal and Exchange

Prepared for:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

July 2025

Environmental Assessment/Initial Study/Negative Declaration

Jamul Indian Village
Land Disposal and Exchange

Prepared for:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
South Coast Region 5
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, CA 92123

Contact:

Glen M. Lubcke
Environmental Program Manager
858.204.8774
glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov

Prepared by:

Ascent
2550 Fifth Ave, Suite 640
San Diego, CA 92103

Contact:

Rid Hollands
Senior Environmental Planner
619.604.3788
rid.hollands@ascent.inc

July 2025

20230181.01

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 1-1
1.1 Overview 1-1
1.2 Purpose and Need for Action and Project Objectives 1-2

2 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SETTING 2-1
2.1 Project Title 2-1
2.2 Lead Agency Name and Address 2-1
2.3 Contact Person and Phone Number 1
2.4 Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses 2-1
2.5 Biological Comparison of the Exchange Properties 2-12
2.6 Project Sponsor's Name and Address 2-12
2.7 General Plan Designation 2-12
2.8 Zoning 2-12
2.9 Required Permits and Approvals 2-12
2.10 Tribal Consultation 2-17

3 ALTERNATIVES 3-1
3.1 No Action Alternative 3-1
3.2 Proposed Action Alternative 3-1

4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 4-1
4.1 Introduction 4-1
4.2 Analysis of Environmental consequences 4-2

5 LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS 5-1
5.1 Lead Agencies 5-1
5.2 Preparers 5-1

6 REFERENCES 6-1

Appendices

Appendix A Ecological Comparison of Two Properties for Land Swap: Slee Property on Honey Springs Road and R.J.E.R. Cemetery Property, Jamul, California

Appendix B Biological Memorandum

Appendix C Biological Resources Assessment for the Slee Property on Honey Springs Road, Jamul, California

Appendix D CEQA Checklist

Appendix E Cultural Resources Study and Technical Review

Appendix F Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

Figures

Figure 1 Regional Location 2-2
Figure 2 Site Vicinity Map 2-3
Figure 3 Relation to Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve and Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area 2-5
Figure 4 Disposal Property 2-8
Figure 5 Biological Resources of the Disposal Property 2-9
Figure 6 Exchange Property 2-13
Figure 7 Biological Resources of the Exchange Property 2-15
Figure 8 View of Disposal Property from Southbound SR 94 4-3
Figure 9 View of Exchange Property from Honey Springs Road 4-3

Tables

Table 1 Disposal and Exchange Property Habitat Acreage 2-12

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

amsl	above mean sea level
APCD	Air Pollution Control District
APN	Assessor Parcel Number
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DOI	Department of Interior
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
EA	Environmental Assessment
ECOS	Environmental Conservation Online System
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
GHG	greenhouse gas
HCWA	Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area
IS	Initial Study
JIV or Tribe	Jamul Indian Village of California
MSCP	Multiple Species Conservation Program
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
ND	Negative Declaration
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
O_3	ozone
PM_{10}	particulate matter 10 microns in size
$PM_{2.5}$	particulate matter 2.5 microns in size and smaller
RAQS	Regional Air Quality Strategy
RJER	Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve

SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
SCIC	South Coastal Information Center
SDAB	San Diego Air Basin
SDAPCD	San Diego County Air Pollution Control District
SIP	State Implementation Plan
THPO	Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WCB	Wildlife Conservation Board

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV or Tribe) is requesting to acquire a 1.1-acre portion of the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER) from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for their future cemetery expansion. To accommodate this request, CDFW is proposing to dispose of 1.1 acres of the RJER (Disposal Property) in exchange for the approximately 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) recently purchased by the Tribe, adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA).

CDFW's approval of the requested land disposal/exchange is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). While the RJER is owned and managed by CDFW, it was established, in part, with funding from a United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Section 6 grant under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended, along with a grant from the California Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB). Section 6 enables USFWS to provide Federal financial assistance through the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund to states and territories to support the development and implementation of conservation programs for the benefit of resident listed, candidate, and at-risk species on non-Federal lands. Because Federal Section 6 grant funding was used to purchase the 1.1-acre Disposal Property, which is a portion of the RJER acquisition, USFWS is required to review and approve land disposals/exchanges in the RJER. Thus, the land disposal/exchange is subject to approval from USFWS, and environmental review in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is required. To complete the Proposed Action, pursuant to USFWS, Federal Financial Assistance Manual Part 520, Chapter 7.37, (Real Property, After Close of Escrow), a Notice of Federal Participation must be recorded on title to the Exchange Property indicating that it has a Federal nexus due to its substitution for the Disposal Property.

The Proposed Action is the disposal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property, which is a portion of Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 597-080-07 held in fee title by CDFW and subject to a Federal nexus created when the property was acquired using Federal funding for the original acquisition of the RJER. This 1.1-acre area is proposed to be disposed and conveyed to JIV for future expansion of the existing cemetery. The future cemetery expansion is not part of the Proposed Action and would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed disposal/exchange would meet financial and ecological qualifying criteria required by CDFW. The Disposal Property and Exchange Property have been appraised, and per CDFW's land conversion evaluation of the disposal/exchange properties, CDFW determined that the financial aspect of the disposal/exchange will result in CDFW receiving at least a financial equivalent amount of land for the Disposal Property. The second aspect of the disposal/exchange determination is whether the natural resources (i.e., habitats) being disposed would be replaced with resources of equal or greater value and function to keep the purpose of the original acquisition "intact." The original purpose of the acquisition of the four subject properties is stated in the funding documents (Cooperative Agreement #11430-2-G001 and Section 6 grant E-8-HL-1). The objective of the grant(s) was to acquire lands in the Otay Lakes/Proctor Valley area that support important habitats (i.e., coastal sage scrub, chamise chaparral, and grassland) to support federally threatened and endangered species, including the coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*), Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*), and other sensitive animals and plants. The Proposed Action would result in the net increase of approximately 2.9 acres of chamise chaparral and coastal sage scrub habitat adjacent to the HCWA in southern San Diego County.

1.1.1 Property Selection

The following factors were used in determining the property selections for the land exchange:

- location of both properties in relation to ecological reserves and wildlife areas,
- location of the Disposal Property in relation to the Tribe's current property boundaries and existing cemetery,

- proximity of each property to the other, and
- presence of similar habitat types and environmental resources.

1.1.2 Regulatory Context

This environmental assessment (EA) and associated initial study/negative declaration (IS/ND), hereafter referenced as EA/IS/ND, was prepared to satisfy the requirements of NEPA and CEQA, respectively. The NEPA lead agency is USFWS, and the CEQA lead agency is CDFW. This EA/IS/ND describes the environmental resources in the Proposed Action area and analyzes the effects of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative on the environment.

CEQA

This IS/ND was prepared in accordance with CEQA Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. and CEQA Guidelines, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 et seq. The purpose of the IS/ND is to determine whether project implementation would result in potentially significant or significant effects on the environment. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15073, the public review period shall not be less than 30 days. Upon adoption of this report, the document will be used to make written findings, consider project approval, and file a notice of determination. An environmental checklist that covers the issue areas identified in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines is included in Appendix D.

NEPA

This EA has been prepared to analyze and document the environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative. USFWS will use this EA to determine (1) if the Proposed Action would result in significant impacts on the environment and (2) whether a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) or an environmental impact statement should be prepared. Should USFWS determine that a FONSI is applicable, a notice of the EA will be made available for a 30-day review period. The EA will be posted on the Federal Environmental Conservation Online System (ECOS) website with a link to http://regulations.gov and may be published in the local newspaper, if requested. The FONSI will be posted online after it is signed.

1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Per Department of Interior (DOI) NEPA Interim Final Rulemaking 7-2025 (DOI 2025a), DOI now maintains the majority of its NEPA procedures in a handbook separate from the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The NEPA Implementing Procedures handbook (DOI 2025b) requires that an EA briefly discusses the purpose and need for the Proposed Action, whereas CEQA Guidelines require a clearly written statement of the objectives sought by a proposed project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15124 [b]). The information in this section addresses both requirements by providing information as to why USFWS and CDFW are considering the Proposed Action and the proposed objectives.

1.2.1 Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to accommodate the Tribe's request for acquisition of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to enable their need to expand their existing cemetery due to capacity limitations. The Tribe has made this request to ensure that families and Tribal members can continue to be buried together on their ancestral lands. This requires the Disposal Property to be removed or "disposed" from the boundaries of RJER. At that time, the Federal interest in the Disposal Property would be vacated. To ensure that the original purpose of the acquisition of the RJER is maintained, the JIV, in coordination with CDFW, proposes to replace the Disposal Property with the Exchange Property. CDFW must ensure that the Proposed Action does not interfere with the original grant's objectives and that those objectives continue to be met in perpetuity. USFWS, as the Federal grantor, must provide authorization to CDFW to move forward with the Proposed Action. To maintain the original purpose of the acquisition, the Exchange

Property must be at least biologically equivalent to the Disposal Property, which is being disposed of/removed from the RJER, and CDFW must receive lands of equal or greater biological value (see Appendix A). Similarly, the Exchange Property must be at least equivalent to, or of greater monetary value, to the Disposal Property.

1.2.2 Project Objectives

The objective of the Proposed Action is to accommodate the Tribe's request for acquisition of a 1.1-acre portion of the RJER (Disposal Property) to provide space for the expansion of their existing cemetery. In exchange for the Disposal Property, the Tribe would convey the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW, which would result in an increase of the total acreage of conserved lands in the nearby HCWA. To ensure this objective is met, CDFW prepared a justification for the proposed land disposal consistent with Public Resources Code Section 5096.516, Fish and Game Code Section 1348, and WCB's Land Conversion Evaluation guidelines. These codes and guidelines require that land acquired by CDFW in a property exchange support the same or equivalent objectives; be undertaken for land of greater biological value, as assessed by CDFW based on a habitat value assessment; and result in an equivalent or higher appraised value.

This page is intentionally left blank.

2 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SETTING

2.1 PROJECT TITLE

Jamul Indian Village Land Disposal and Exchange

2.2 LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS

CEQA Lead Agency
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
3833 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

NEPA Lead Agency
United States Fish and Wildlife Service
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

2.3 CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER


California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Glen M. Lubcke
Environmental Program Manager
South Coast Region 5
858-204-8774

United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Mary Beth Woulfe
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
Section 6 Coordinator Palm Springs/Carlsbad
760-431-9440, ext. 294

2.4 PROJECT LOCATION AND SURROUNDING LAND USES


Figures 1, 2, and 3 illustrate the regional location and project vicinity for both the Disposal Property and Exchange Property (referred to collectively as the "disposal/exchange properties"). The disposal/exchange properties are located in unincorporated San Diego County and are approximately 6 miles from each other. Regional access to both properties is provided by State Route (SR) 94. A description of each of the disposal/exchange properties is provided below.

RJER and the disposal/exchange properties fall within the Metro-Lakeside-Jamul segment of the County of San Diego's (County) Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan (SAP). The protected open space lands of the RJER and adjacent HCWA are important components of the core biological resource area (Jamul Mountain) and several regional linkages (Otay Mountain/Jamul Mountains to Sycuan Peak) described in the County's MSCP Subregional Plan (Subregional MSCP). The RJER was primarily acquired to create an area of grassland in the MSCP preserve system to be managed specifically for burrowing owls, a covered species under the MSCP SAP. The RJER contains a 60+ acre burrowing owl habitat management area, which supports burrowing owl breeding, foraging, and wintering habitat while maintaining genetic connectivity with the existing population at Otay Mesa.




Source: Adapted by Ascent in 2025.

Figure 1 Regional Location



Source: Adapted by Ascent in 2025.

Figure 2 Site Vicinity Map



Source: Adapted by Ascent in 2024.

Figure 3 Relation to Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve and Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area

2.4.1 Disposal Property

The Disposal Property is an approximately 1.1-acre triangular-shaped property on the northern boundary of the RJER in unincorporated San Diego County. It is a small piece of a larger parcel (APN 597-080-07) owned by CDFW (Figure 4). The property is in Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute US Geological Survey (USGS) Quadrangle. The Disposal Property is undeveloped and is bordered by private undeveloped land to the north; the Tribe's Saint Francis Xavier Cemetery to the east, with the Jamul Casino and construction of the 16-story hotel beyond; and conservation lands in the RJER to the south and west. The JIV Reservation, including the existing Jamul Casino and its associated hotel, is located less than 100 feet east of the property. Single-family residential development is located approximately 0.2 miles north and west of the property. Overall, the visual character of the area is rural, with undisturbed natural features to the north, south, and west.

Because of intervening hills, the Disposal Property is not visible from Melody Road, from residential areas to the north or west, or to motorists traveling northbound on SR 94. The existing cemetery and the Disposal Property are briefly visible to motorists traveling southbound on SR 94.

JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE LAND TRANSFER ACT

The Jamul Indian Village Land Transfer Act (Public Law 118-119), signed into law on December 23, 2024, identified the Disposal Property as the "Proposed 1.1. acres" in the following excerpt:

> *"(c) ADDITIONAL TRUST ACQUISITION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall accept title in and to, and place into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Jamul Indian Village of California, the land depicted as ''Proposed 1.1. acres'' on the map of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife entitled ''Amended Acres Proposal'' and dated May 2023 if that land is conveyed or otherwise transferred to the United States by, or on behalf of, the Jamul Indian Village of California.*
>
> *(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Land taken into trust under subsections (a) and (c) shall be—*
>
> *(1) part of the reservation of the Jamul Indian Village of California; and*
>
> *(2) administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to property held in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian Tribe."*


Consequently, upon approval of the Proposed Action, the Disposal Property would be subject to the Jamul Indian Village Land Transfer Act and any such requirements therein.

HABITAT TYPES

The Disposal Property is fully occupied by disturbed coastal sage scrub habitat dominated primarily by California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*) and laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*) that was previously affected by grazing activities and is now interspersed with nonnative grassland species between individual shrubs (Figure 5). This vegetation cover provides suitable habitat for a variety of special-status animal species, including the federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher, Hermes copper butterfly (*Lycaena hermes*), and federally endangered Quino checkerspot butterfly. There are no aquatic resources on the Disposal Property. Near the southwestern boundary is an ephemeral drainage tributary to Willow Creek.


DRAINAGE

The Disposal Property contains rolling slopes with a few flat areas and an elevation ranging from approximately 930 to 980 feet above mean sea level (amsl). Drainage of the property runs southeast into Willow Creek and then south to Jamul Creek, which flows to the Lower Otay Reservoir.



Source: Adapted by Ascent in 2025.

Figure 4 Disposal Property



Source: Data downloaded from SANDAG in 2024; adapted by Ascent in 2025.

Figure 5 Biological Resources of the Disposal Property

CRITICAL HABITAT

There is no designated critical habitat in the Disposal Property. There is designated critical habitat for the Hermes copper butterfly approximately 30 feet southwest of the Disposal Property. The species' host plant, spiny redberry, was not detected on the Disposal Property, but was found outside the property boundary to the south, according to the biological memorandum prepared by Montrose Environmental in November 2021 (see Appendix B) and confirmed by Ascent biologists during a site visit in November 2024.

2.4.2 Exchange Property

The Exchange Property is owned by the Tribe and consists of two contiguous parcels (APNs 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) on Honey Springs Road, which total 4.0 acres (Figure 6). The property is located in Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle. The Exchange Property is undeveloped and is bordered by rural residential to the north and west; privately owned, undeveloped land to the south; and the CDFW-owned HCWA to the east.

The Exchange Property is primarily covered with shrubs and rock outcrops, which is similar to adjacent undeveloped land. Overall, the visual character of the area is rural, with undisturbed natural features to the east and south.

HABITAT TYPES

The Exchange Property is dominated primarily by coastal sage scrub habitat with some contiguous stands of chamise chaparral habitat along with several rock outcrops (Figure 7). These vegetation communities and land cover provide suitable habitat for a variety of special-status animal species.

The coastal sage scrub habitat is dominated by California sagebrush, California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*), and laurel sumac with sparse stands of San Diego County viguiera (*Bahiopsis laciniata*). The coastal sage scrub contains game trails and is moderately dense.

The chamise chaparral habitat is dominated by chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*) with some laurel sumac present. Both the coastal sage scrub and the chamise chaparral habitats have native and nonnative grasses and herbs in the understory. The percentage of nonnative grass cover is substantially lower on the Exchange Property than the percentage present on the Disposal Property. The chamise chaparral is heavily dense, mature, and undisturbed, with occasional game trails.

The gaps in the coastal sage scrub and the chaparral canopies provide potentially suitable habitat for a variety of special-status plant species. There are no aquatic resources on the property. There is a channel located off-site and 500 feet west of the northwestern corner of the Exchange Property.

DRAINAGE

The topography of the Exchange Property is a northwest-facing slope of boulder-strewn hills, with elevation ranging from 1,305–1,470 feet amsl. Drainage runs north and west into an unnamed watercourse to Dulzura Creek and eventually flows into Jamul Creek and Lower Otay Reservoir.

CRITICAL HABITAT

There is no critical habitat for any federally listed species on the Exchange Property. Critical habitat for the Quino checkerspot butterfly and Hermes copper butterfly is found approximately 0.25 miles northwest of the Exchange Property, as confirmed by Natural Investigations Co. biologists in November 2022 (see Appendix C) and confirmed by Ascent biologists during a site visit in January 2025.

2.5 BIOLOGICAL COMPARISON OF THE EXCHANGE PROPERTIES

The Disposal Property and Exchange Property contain similar vegetation communities and wildlife habitats, but neither property contains aquatic resources. Both properties are adjacent to existing CDFW reserves (RJER and HCWA, respectively). The biological features and open space on each property enhance the adjacent CDFW reserves by expanding existing active wildlife corridors. Similarly, both properties contain suitable habitat for coastal California gnatcatcher. The Exchange Property offers high habitat quality and contains a mosaic of good quality chamise chaparral and coastal sage scrub. Upon project approval, the Proposed Action would result in a total gain of 2.9 acres of chamise chaparral and coastal sage scrub habitat. After site visits in November 2024 (Disposal Property) and January 2025 (Exchange Property), Ascent biologists updated the 2022 ecological comparison of habitat types (presented in Table 1 of Appendix A), as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Disposal and Exchange Property Habitat Acreage

Habitat Type	Exchange Property (acres)	Disposal Property (acres)
Chamise chaparral	0.99	—
Coastal sage scrub	3.01	0.78
Disturbed coastal sage scrub	—	0.32
Total	4.0	1.1

Source: Compiled by Ascent in 2024.

2.6 PROJECT SPONSOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS

Jamul Indian Village of California
14191 Highway 94
Jamul, CA 91935

2.7 GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION

The disposal/exchange properties are designated in the County of San Diego General Plan, Jamul Subregional Planning Area (County of San Diego 2017) as follows:


- Disposal Property: (OS-C) Open Space-Conservation
- Exchange Property: (SR 10) Semi-Rural Residential

2.8 ZONING

The disposal/exchange properties are zoned A72 General Agricultural Use (County of San Diego 2021a).

2.9 REQUIRED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

CDFW and USFWS have jurisdiction over the review and approval of the Proposed Action. Therefore, this EA/IS/ND is required to be prepared for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Pursuant to USFWS, Federal Financial Assistance Manual Part 520, Chapter 7.37, (Real Property, After Close of Escrow), a Notice of Federal Participation must be recorded on title to the Exchange Property indicating that it has a Federal nexus due to its substitution for the Disposal Property.




Source: ESRI World Imagery; SanGIS

20230181.01 GRX 003

Source: Adapted by Ascent in 2025.

Figure 6 Exchange Property



Source: Data downloaded from SANDAG in 2024; adapted by Ascent in 2025.

Figure 7 Biological Resources of the Exchange Property

2.10 TRIBAL CONSULTATION

In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (Gatto), the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and NHPA's implementing regulations, Section 106 (36 CFR 800), on July 16, 2025, CDFW and USFWS sent joint notification letters to 19 contacts at 12 Native American tribes on the list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which were indicated as having traditional and cultural affiliation with the project site. The 30-day period for Native American tribes to request consultation via the AB 52 process ends on August 20, 2025; however, consultation under Section 106 and AB 52 at the time of writing this EA/IS/ND is ongoing.

A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search was also conducted by NAHC for the Disposal Property on December 3, 2021. The results were positive and recommended contacting the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the JIV, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. SLF searches were also undertaken for the Exchange Property on June 20, 2022, and December 23, 2022, both of which were also positive. The first search identified the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, and the latter search identified the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the JIV, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians.

The joint AB 52/Section 106 notification letters and the SLF searches are provided within Appendix E.

This page is intentionally left blank.

3 ALTERNATIVES

There are two alternatives considered in this document, the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Alternative, which are discussed in more detail below.

3.1 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed land disposal/exchange would not take place. The 1.1-acre Disposal Property would remain in conservation as part of the RJER under CDFW ownership, and there would be no need to dispose of the property. The Exchange Property would not be transferred to CDFW, and there would be no increase in acreage of CDFW's HCWA. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed with rural-residential housing or agricultural uses consistent with the underlying County of San Diego General Plan and zoning designation, there are no foreseeable near-term plans for development of that property. Thus, it is assumed that no changes or development of either of the disposal/exchange properties would occur under the No Action Alternative.

3.2 PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The Proposed Action consists of the disposal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from CDFW's ownership and transfer to the JIV. The JIV proposes to transfer the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW. The Disposal Property would be removed from the RJER. The Exchange Property would be added to the HCWA and managed for perpetual conservation. See Figure 3 for an aerial map of the properties in relation to nearby reserves. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

This page is intentionally left blank.

4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The environmental consequences associated with each of the following environmental areas are discussed in more detail below:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

4.1.1 Impact and Mitigation Terminology

This document uses the following terms to describe the significance of the environmental impacts on environmental areas listed above:

- No impact: When the Proposed Action would not have any direct or indirect impacts on the environment or there would be no changes from the existing conditions.
- Less-than-significant impact: When the change resulting from the Proposed Action would not exceed the applicable significance criteria. There would be no substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the physical conditions in the area affected by the Proposed Action.
- Less-than-significant impact with mitigation: When the change resulting from the Proposed Action may have the potential to generate impacts having a significant impact on the environment, but the impacts may be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the implementation of mitigation measures.
- Potentially significant impact: When there is substantial evidence that an effect may exceed the applicable significance criteria.
- Mitigation measure: Used to avoid, minimize, reduce, or compensate for significant and potentially significant impacts of the Proposed Action.

4.1.2 Cumulative Impacts

CEQA defines cumulative impacts as when two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. CEQA requires that cumulative impacts be discussed when the Proposed Action's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. Per the DOI Handbook, to the extent it assists in reasoned decision-making, USFWS may, but is not required to by NEPA, analyze environmental effects from other projects separate in time, or separate in place, or that fall outside of USFWS's regulatory authority, or that would have to be initiated by a third party. If USFWS determines that such analysis would assist it in reasoned decision-making regarding the proposed action, it will document this determination in the environmental assessment

and explain where it drew a reasonable and manageable line relating to the consideration of such effects from such separate projects. Reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts are discussed when appropriate in the relevant issue areas discussed below. Growth associated with the buildout projections in the County of San Diego General Plan, along with the construction of the Jamul Casino Hotel and the future expansion of the Disposal Property were considered in determining whether the impacts of the Proposed Action would be cumulatively considerable.

4.2 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Alternative would have less-than-significant impacts or no impacts on all of the resource areas addressed in this analysis: Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire. No impacts would require mitigation to achieve less than significance, and no potentially significant impacts would occur. A brief discussion of each resource area is included below.

4.2.1 Aesthetics

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future consistent with the underlying land use designation of rural residential, there are no current plans for development, and thus, there would be no visual changes in the foreseeable future. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review. There would be no impacts on a scenic vista or to scenic resources, no change to the visual characteristics of the properties, and no new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views. Therefore, there would be no impacts associated with aesthetics.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The area surrounding the Disposal Property is visually dominated by the adjacent Jamul Casino Hotel, a 16-story boutique hotel with 200 rooms (the glass building in the center of Figure 8), accompanied by a six-story parking structure with 350 parking spaces. The hotel is currently under construction and will be accepting reservations starting August 11, 2025. Because the Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, there would be no impacts on a scenic vista or to scenic resources, no change to the visual characteristics of the properties, and no new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views. Therefore, there would be no aesthetic impacts. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. Under the Proposed Action, the Exchange Property would remain in its current vacant status but instead of being under JIV ownership, would remain as an undeveloped, state-owned property. It would be preserved and managed as part of CDFW's HCWA. No development or alterations to the visual character of the Exchange Property would occur. There would be no impacts on a scenic vista or to scenic resources, no change to the visual characteristics of the properties, and no new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views. Thus, there would be no aesthetic impacts.



Source: Photograph taken by Ascent staff in 2024.

Figure 8 View of Disposal Property from Southbound SR 94



Source: Photograph taken by Ascent staff in 2024.

Figure 9 View of Exchange Property from Honey Springs Road

4.2.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under their current land ownership. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership. It would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER.

Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future consistent with the underlying land use designation of rural residential, there are no current plans for development. There would be no reasonably foreseeable conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance; no conflict with a Williamson Act contract; no conflict with zoning as forest land or timberland; no loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; and no conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. In addition, if any future development of either property was proposed, it would require independent environmental review. Therefore, there would be no impact on agriculture and forestry resources.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The Disposal Property is classified as "grazing land" by the California Department of Conservation (DOC 2022). The Disposal Property does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, there would be no impact related to conversion of such farmland. The Disposal Property is not under a Williamson Act contract but is zoned as A72 General Agricultural Use under the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (County of San Diego 2021a). Although the land is zoned for agricultural use, it is not currently used for agricultural activities even though it has been used for cattle grazing previously (see Appendix A). The Disposal Property does not contain land designated as forest land or timberland. Because the Proposed Action is a legal transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, there would be no impact on agricultural or forestry resources. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. The Exchange Property is classified as "other land" by the California Department of Conservation (DOC 2022). The Exchange Property does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, there would be no impact related to conversion of such farmland. The Exchange Property is not under a Williamson Act contract but is zoned as A72 General Agricultural Use under the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (County of San Diego 2021a). Although the land is zoned for agricultural use, it is not currently utilized for agricultural activities even though land in the HCWA area was historically used as a cattle ranch (CDFW 2008). The Exchange Property does not contain land designated as forest land or timberland. Under the Proposed Action, the Exchange Property would remain in its current vacant status, and would be an undeveloped, state-owned property that would be preserved and managed as part of CDFW's HCWA. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have no impact on agricultural or forestry resources.

4.2.3 Air Quality

The disposal/exchange properties are located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) and in the jurisdictional boundaries of the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD), which regulates air quality through its permit authority over most types of stationary emissions sources and through its planning and review activities. SDAPCD and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the SDAB. The SDAB has been

designated as being in nonattainment under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for ozone (O_3) and the CAAQS for particulate matter 10 and 2.5 microns in size and smaller (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, respectively). The SDAB either meets the NAAQS and CAAQS or is unclassifiable for all other criteria air pollutants (SDAPCD 2021).

SDAPCD also developed the air basin's input to the California's State Implementation Plan (SIP), which consists of the state's overall air quality attainment plans to meet the NAAQS and the individual air quality attainment plans of each air quality management district and air pollution control district (APCD). SDAPCD published the 2020 San Diego Ozone State Implementation Plan (the most recent version) for attaining the Federal 8-hour 75 parts per billion (ppb) and 70 ppb O_3 standards by 2026 and 2032, respectively (CARB 2020). The plan was submitted to the US Environmental Protection Agency on January 8, 2021, for consideration as a revision to the SIP. Additionally, the San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991 and is updated on a triennial basis. The RAQS was updated in 1995, 1998, 2001, 2004, 2009, 2016, and 2022 (the most recent version, hereafter referenced as 2022 RAQS). The RAQS outlines SDAPCD's plans and control measures designed to attain the state air quality standards for O_3. The 2022 RAQS contains strategies to continue directly reducing emissions of ozone precursors in San Diego County and assist in reducing PM and greenhouse gases (GHGs) as an additional benefit (SDAPCD 2022).

Schools, hospitals, and convalescent homes are relatively sensitive to poor air quality because children, older people, and people with compromised health are more susceptible to respiratory distress and other air-quality-related health problems. Residential areas are considered sensitive to poor air quality because people usually stay home for extended periods of time, which increases the potential exposure to ambient air quality. The immediate land surrounding the disposal/exchange properties is primarily undeveloped. There are several residences located within approximately 1,000 feet of the disposal/exchange properties, which are the nearest sensitive receptors. There are no schools or hospitals in the vicinity of either property.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development. Thus, there would be no conflict with or obstruction of implementation of the applicable air quality plan, no net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment, no exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and no other emissions, such as odors. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review. Therefore, there would be no impact on air quality.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. Because the Proposed Action is a legal transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, there would be no emissions generated that would result in impacts on air quality. The Proposed Action would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan because no emissions would be generated that could create a conflict, and thus would have no impact. The disposal and exchange of properties is a legal exchange that could not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable Federal or state ambient air quality standard, because the project does not include any construction or operations emissions. Furthermore, the Proposed Action would neither result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations nor result in the creation of objectionable odors. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, there would be no impact on air quality.

Exchange Property

No impact. Under the Proposed Action, the Exchange Property would remain in its current vacant status and would be an undeveloped, state-owned property that would be preserved and managed as part of CDFW's HCWA. Because the Proposed Action is a legal transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, the Proposed Action would not generate emissions that would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan and thus would have no impact. The disposal and exchange of properties is a legal exchange that could not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable Federal or state ambient air quality standard, because the project does not include any construction or operations emissions. Furthermore, the Proposed Action would neither result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations nor result in the creation of objectionable odors. Therefore, there would be no impact on air quality.

4.2.4 Biological Resources

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development, and the property would remain as vacant land. Thus, there would be no biological resource changes in the foreseeable future. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review. There would be no change in the biological characteristics of the properties and thus no impacts. However, because the No Action Alternative would not result in the land disposal and exchange, there would be no overall increase in acreage (2.9 acres) of biological resources under the ownership of CDFW. Additionally, because the Disposal Property has similar quality habitat to the Exchange Property, the No Action Alternative would not lead to an increase in biological value of the HCWA. Thus, this alternative would not result in additional acreage of habitat consistent with the Proposed Action.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. Under the Proposed Action, the Disposal Property, which contains approximately 1.1 acres of coastal sage scrub/disturbed coastal sage scrub habitat dominated primarily by California sagebrush and laurel sumac, would be removed from the RJER (see Figure 5). The removal of ecological reserve protections from the Disposal Property would enable the Tribe to expand their cemetery, subject to compliance with all applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including compliance with San Diego County Ordinances designed to reduce impacts on biological resources. This includes the Biological Mitigation Ordinance, which implements the MSCP.

A biological reconnaissance survey was conducted on October 27, 2021, by Montrose Environmental. A follow-up biological survey was conducted by Ascent biologists on November 13, 2024. As summarized in Table 1 of the biological memorandum for the Disposal Property (Appendix B), the Disposal Property and vicinity contain suitable habitat to potentially support 31 plant species and 12 wildlife species (see Figure 5 for habitat details and Appendix B, Table 1 for species information). Species with no potential to occur on the Disposal Property were ruled out based on lack of suitable habitat, soils, elevation, and negative results during the survey, if the survey coincided with the identifiable bloom period for those plant species. The Disposal Property has suitable habitat to support the western spadefoot toad (*Spea hammondii*), coastal California gnatcatcher, Dulzura pocket mouse (*Chaetodipus californicus femoralis*), San Diego desert woodrat (*Neotoma lepida intermedia*), coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*), and coastal whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegri*). During the 2021 biological survey, no special-status species were detected on the property. A monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) was observed on the property during the survey. USFWS proposed to list the monarch butterfly as threatened under the ESA, but protections do not apply until the

effective date of a final rule. Milkweed, which is used by the species for egg laying and nectar collection, was not observed during the site survey. The species was found flying across the Disposal Property and was not observed landing on any particular plants.

No special-status species were found during biological field surveys in October 2021 nor November 2024, and the Disposal Property does not contain critical habitat, although there is designated critical habitat for the Hermes copper butterfly approximately 30 feet from the southwest boundary of the Disposal Property. The spiny redberry plant, which is the host plant for the Hermes copper butterfly, was not observed on the property but was observed outside the property boundary, south of the off-site ephemeral drainage. Therefore, the land disposal/exchange would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, or conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or the MSCP. In addition, the Disposal Property does not contain any grassland habitat that could potentially function as suitable burrowing owl habitat. Therefore, the land exchange would not impact the ongoing conservation management efforts and MSCP SAP objectives for burrowing owl.

An ephemeral channel, classified as R4SBA (Riverine, Intermittent, Streambed, Temporary Flooded), on the National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS 2025) is immediately south and west of the Disposal Property boundary, although there are no riparian areas, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, or aquatic resources on the Disposal Property itself. The channel was dry when visited by Ascent biologists in November 2024. No uses are proposed that could result in significant direct or indirect impacts on off-site riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, or aquatic resources. Therefore, there would be no impacts on these biological resources.

The Disposal Property and adjacent undeveloped areas to the south and west are part of a wildlife movement corridor connecting to the RJER according to the Natural Landscape Blocks–California Essential Habitat Connectivity dataset and adjacent to, but not within, Natural Areas Small–California Essential Habitat Connectivity maps (CDFW 2023, 2025a). This wildlife corridor has not been identified as a key biological core resource area or linkage area in the Subregional MSCP (County of San Diego 1997a, 2025). Likewise, the Disposal Property is not within a key biological core resource or linkage area (County of San Diego 1997b). Additionally, the suitability of the habitat has been diminished by heavy cattle grazing in the past. No fishery resources exist in the vicinity, primarily because all drainages flow only ephemerally or intermittently. Because the Proposed Action is the disposal of the Disposal Property from the RJER and CDFW ownership, the transfer of it to the JIV, and the transfer of the Exchange Property from JIV ownership to CDFW, no impacts on the movement of any native resident wildlife species or migratory wildlife corridors and no impedance of the use of native wildlife nursery sites would occur.

Because the Proposed Action is the disposal of the Disposal Property from the RJER and CDFW ownership, the transfer of it to the JIV, and the transfer of the Exchange Property from JIV ownership to CDFW, following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance, and those protecting biological resources. Therefore, there would be no conflicts associated with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Because the Disposal Property would be removed from the RJER and the Exchange Property added to the HCWA, there would be no conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan; natural community conservation plan; or other approved local, regional, Federal, or state habitat conservation plan.

Exchange Property

No impact. As summarized in the Exchange Property biological resources assessment (Appendix C), the property contains suitable habitat to support 51 plant species and 18 wildlife species (see Figure 7 for habitat details and Appendix C for species information). Special-status species identified in database searches were assessed for their likelihood to occur in the property based upon previously documented occurrences, field surveys, habitat requirements, and the quality and extent of any suitable habitat within the property. The Exchange Property biological resources assessment noted that the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) reported the following special-status species occurrences within the property: Thorne's hairstreak (*Callophrys thronei*), pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*), western small-footed myotis (*Myotis ciliolabrum*), long-eared myotis (*Myotis evotis*), and Yuma myotis (*Myotis yumanensis*); however, these occurrences are an artifact

of the mapping process with the precise location obscured. Habitat for Thorne's hairstreak (the host plant Tecate Cypress [*Hesperocyparis forbesii*]) is not present on the property. There is also high potential for coastal California gnatcatcher on the site, and habitat for various bat species is present in the rock outcrops of the property. A biological field survey was conducted by Natural Investigations on November 8, 2022. During the survey, no special-status species were detected within the property, which was verified by Ascent biologists on January 14, 2025. Critical habitat for the Quino checkerspot butterfly and Hermes copper butterfly is found approximately 0.25 miles northwest of the Exchange Property.

This property can be considered an important wildlife movement corridor because it is adjacent to the HCWA, undeveloped, and would continue to function as such under the Proposed Action where it would be added to the HCWA. It is also adjacent to, but not within, a key biological core resource area or linkage area described in the Subregional MSCP (County of San Diego 1997a, 1997b, 2025). However, placing this area under conservation would indirectly contribute to the overall function of the MSCP SAP open space network by incrementally increasing overall acreage. There are no fishery resources in or near the property because there are no persistent water sources.

Under the Proposed Action, the Exchange Property would be converted from its current status as an undeveloped, privately owned, rural-residential property, and would be preserved and managed as part of the HCWA. The Exchange Property contains approximately 4.0 acres of chamise chaparral/disturbed sage scrub habitat and would be added to the HCWA. The land disposal/exchange would result in a net increase of 2.9 acres of conservation land in San Diego County. The exchange would also result in additional acreage of conservation land in the County, including habitat suitable for state and federally listed species (e.g., coastal California gnatcatcher). No development or alterations to the Exchange Property would occur, and thus, there would be no adverse biological impacts associated with the property. Furthermore, through the addition of the Exchange Property to the HCWA, the Exchange Property would be protected from future development, protection that is not currently afforded by its existing land use/zoning, and thus, the Proposed Action Alternative would avoid potential future impacts on biological resources that may be present on-site.

4.2.5 Cultural Resources

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development, and the property would remain as vacant land. Thus, there would be no cultural resource changes in the foreseeable future. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review. There would be no impact on cultural resources. Under the No Action Alternative, any existing cultural resources that may be present on-site would continue to be afforded protection by the RJER designation, and thus, the No Action Alternative would avoid potential future impacts on cultural resources that may be present on-site.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. A technical review of previously prepared cultural resources studies in support of the Proposed Action for the Jamul Indian Village Land Disposal and Exchange was prepared by ASM Affiliates in 2025. ASM prepared a Cultural Resources Study and Technical Review report which summarizes a technical review of the cultural resources inventory of the Disposal Property, the cultural resources inventory of the Exchange Property, and presents the results of the field checks of the Disposal and Exchange Properties conducted by ASM (Appendix E). The technical review confirms adequate survey coverage for the APE for the Proposed Action and adequacy of the previous studies in accordance with the guidelines and framework set forth in CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA. ASM worked with the

lead Agencies providing support in their AB 52/Section 106 consultation efforts. The previous cultural resources due diligence constraints assessment, technical memorandum, joint AB 52/Section 106 notification letters, and the SLF searches are provided within Appendix E.

As part of research for the Disposal Property's cultural memorandum (contained within Appendix E), a record search was conducted at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System on October 25, 2021. The search found that four previous surveys intersected the area of potential effect (APE) but did not include the entirety of the Disposal Property. The SCIC reported 37 cultural resources, primarily prehistoric sites, which were identified within a 0.5-mile radius, but not in the Disposal Property.

A review of historic maps showed no development in the Disposal Property and only roads. A pair of buildings were shown on nearby quadrangles, but they are likely associated with the Saint Francis Xavier Cemetery church. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and there would be no impact.

According to consultation with the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) of the JIV, in advance of the archaeological survey in support of the cultural memorandum, there is a dense concentration of prehistoric resources in the vicinity, which is verified by the presence of an ethnographic village nearby, thus indicating a potential for prehistoric resources. JIV's THPO also indicated that historic artifacts have been found immediately north of the APE. To ensure adequate survey coverage for the Disposal Property, an archaeological survey was conducted in 2021 (see Appendix E). During the archaeological survey, parallel transects spaced 50 feet apart were surveyed, and ground visibility was good, averaging about 50 percent. Several fragments of cobalt glass were noted immediately north of the property, in the area JIV's THPO previously noted historic artifacts. During the survey, no cultural resources or historic properties were identified on the property, and therefore, a finding of "no historic properties affected" was recommended in the cultural resources assessment for the property. Because of the adequate survey coverage, lack of resources, no ground disturbance proposed/associated with the disposal/exchange, and the Proposed Action being a legal transfer of ownership which does not entail any development, the Proposed Action would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. Therefore, there would be no impact. Additionally, because there would be no ground disturbance associated with the Proposed Action, there would be no opportunity to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries, and thus no impact.

The removal of the ecological reserve protections would enable the Tribe to develop the site. However, following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, there would be no impact on cultural resources or historic properties associated with the Proposed Action.

Exchange Property

No impact. A background record search was conducted at SCIC on May 23, 2022, of files and literature covering the Exchange Property and a 1-mile radius (contained within Appendix E). The search found that 25 previous surveys have been performed within the 1-mile radius. Two of the studies slightly overlapped the Exchange Property but were then ruled out due to mapping errors. The SCIC reported that 71 cultural resources have been previously identified within the 1-mile radius surrounding the Exchange Property; none of which are in the property. The reported cultural resources consist of 47 prehistoric archaeological sites, four historic archaeological sites, three multicomponent archaeological sites, 12 prehistoric isolated artifact finds, four historic isolated artifact finds, and one isolated find containing both a prehistoric and historic artifact.

A review of historic maps and aerials covering the Exchange Property showed unnamed tributaries, improved roads, structures, and cleared and actively farmed areas in areas adjacent to the Exchange Property, but not directly in the boundary of the site. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and there would be no impact.

The May 27, 2022, archaeological survey was conducted using parallel transects spaced 5 meters apart, and ground visibility was low (from 0–30 percent on the north parcel and 10–60 percent on the south parcel). The survey identified one previously unrecorded cultural resource: a prehistoric site (temporary designation SL-S-001) consisting

of sparse scatter of flaked stone lithic artifacts, including a quartz core and seven pieces of quartz debitage. This find was verified by Ascent subcontractor, ASM Affiliates, during the January 14, 2025, site visit. Ground visibility was good (50–70 percent) during the site visit. Because the property would be provided with the same ecological protection as the existing Disposal Property, with no planned development, the Proposed Action would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, and there would be no impact. Furthermore, through the addition of the Exchange Property to the HCWA, the Exchange Property would be protected against future development, protection that is not currently afforded by its existing land use/zoning, and thus, the Proposed Action Alternative would avoid potential future impacts on cultural resources that may be present on-site. Additionally, because there would be no ground disturbance associated with the Proposed Action, there would be no opportunity to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside dedicated cemeteries, and thus, there would be no impact.

4.2.6 Energy

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development. Thus, there would be no wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation, and no conflict with or obstruction of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review. There would be no impact on energy.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. Because the Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, there would be no wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation, and no conflict with or obstruction of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. The proposed transfer of the Exchange Property would not result in impacts on energy. The Proposed Action would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation because the Exchange Property would become part of the HCWA and would not be developed. Additionally, the Proposed Action would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there would be no construction or operations energy use on the disposal/exchange properties. Therefore, there would be no impacts related to energy. Any activities associated with the future cemetery expansion would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations.

4.2.7 Geology and Soils

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development; and thus, there would be no impacts associated with ground disturbance or geological and soil issues. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The soils are primarily Las Posas fine sandy loam, with 15–30 percent slopes, and very eroded. Approximately 0.1 percent of the property soils are classified as Cieneba-rock outcrop complex, with–75 percent slopes, and very stony (NRCS 2025). The site is underlain by granitic and other intrusive crystalline rocks of all ages (gr), as compiled by Bedrossian et al. (2012: Plate 7). These rocks are typically early cretaceous, consisting of undivided tonalite and granodiorite and include lesser gabbro and metavolcanic rocks (Todd et al. 2004), which have very limited potential for paleontological resources due to the intense heat and pressure of metamorphism that can destroy or severely damage fossiliferous remains. The Disposal Property is also assessed as having limited potential because according to the County of San Diego (2009), it is located in an area of no paleontological sensitivity.

Because the Proposed Action is a legal transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, there would be no impact on geology and soils. The Proposed Action would not result in, or directly or indirectly cause, potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides because no development is associated with the property disposal/exchange. The Proposed Action would, therefore, also not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, nor would the Proposed Action result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, or create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property. The Proposed Action does not include the use or installation of a septic system; therefore, no impacts associated with septic systems would occur. No unique geologic features have been identified on the Disposal Property, and the property has no paleontological sensitivity. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in impacts on geology and soils. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. The Exchange Property consists of approximately 39.8 percent Cieneba rocky coarse sandy loam, with 9–30 percent slopes; 43.6 percent Cieneba-rock outcrop complex, with 30–75 percent slopes, that is very stoney; and 16.7 percent Fallbrook sandy loam, with 15 to 30 percent slopes, that is eroded (NRCS 2025). The site is also underlain by granitic and other intrusive gr of all ages (gr), as compiled by Bedrossian et al. (2012: Plate 7). These rocks are typically early cretaceous, consisting of undivided tonalite and granodiorite, and include lesser gabbro and metavolcanic rocks (Todd et al. 2004), which also have very limited potential for paleontological resources due to the intense heat and pressure of metamorphism that can destroy or severely damage fossiliferous remains. The Disposal Property is also assessed as having limited potential because according to the County of San Diego County (2009), it is located in an area of marginal paleontological sensitivity.

The Proposed Action is the disposal or removal of the Disposal Property from the RJER and CDFW ownership and transfer to the JIV, as well as the transfer of the Exchange Property from JIV ownership to CDFW. The property disposal/exchange would not result in impacts on geology and soils at the Exchange Property because the Exchange Property would become part of the HCWA, and no development would occur. The Proposed Action would, therefore,

not directly or indirectly result in potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides. The Proposed Action would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, nor would the Proposed Action result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, or create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property. The Proposed Action does not include the use or installation of a septic system; therefore, no impacts associated with septic systems would occur. No unique geologic features have been identified on the Exchange Property, and the property has little paleontological sensitivity. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in impacts on geology and soils. Furthermore, through the addition of the Exchange Property to the HCWA, the Exchange Property would be protected against from development, protection that is not currently afforded by its existing land use/zoning, and thus, the Proposed Action Alternative would avoid potential future impacts on paleontological resources that may be present on-site.

4.2.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development, and thus, there would be no generation of GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, and no conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review. There would be no impact on GHG emissions.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with generating GHG emissions or conflicting with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Although the transfer of the Disposal Property would indirectly enable the cemetery expansion, which could generate GHG emissions, following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, there would be no impact on GHG emissions.

Exchange Property

No impact. Because the Proposed Action is a legal transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, there would be no impact on GHG emissions. The Exchange Property would become part of the HCWA, and no development would occur. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with generating GHG emissions or conflicting with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

4.2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could

be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development, and thus, there would be no hazards created or emitted nor generation of hazardous materials. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review. There would be no impact related to hazards or hazardous materials.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials.

Furthermore, a search of the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (the EnviroStor database), which is maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), was performed to determine whether any known hazardous materials are present either on or within 0.5 miles of the Disposal Property. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) maintains the GeoTracker database, an information management system used to track compliance data related to authorized and unauthorized discharges, which was also reviewed. Neither EnviroStor nor GeoTracker identified hazardous materials sites within 0.5-mile of the Disposal Property (DTSC 2025; SWRCB 2025). Additionally, there are no schools within 0.25 miles of the Disposal Property, and the Disposal Property is not located within an airport land use plan. Furthermore, the proposed exchange of the properties would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan or expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires because no development is proposed. The Disposal Property does not have known hazardous materials that could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and no impact would occur. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was performed for the Exchange Property, and no hazardous materials or recognized environmental conditions were identified for the property or within a distance that could affect the use of the property (see Appendix F). A search of the DTSC EnviroStor and SWRCB GeoTracker databases was performed to determine whether any known hazardous materials are present either on or within 0.5 miles of the Exchange Property. There are no known hazardous materials sites within 0.5 miles of the Exchange Property on either of the databases identified by EnviroStor or GeoTracker (DTSC 2025; SWRCB 2025). Additionally, there are no schools within 0.25 miles of the Exchange Property, and the Exchange Property is not located within an airport land use plan. Furthermore, the proposed exchange of the properties would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan or expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires because no development is proposed. The Exchange Property does not have known hazardous materials that could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and no impact would occur. The Exchange Property would become part of the HCWA, and no development would occur. No hazardous materials would be transported or used at the Exchange Property. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with hazards or hazardous materials.

4.2.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could

be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development, and thus, there would be no impact on hydrology and water quality. In addition, future cemetery expansion on the Disposal Property or development of the Exchange Property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with hydrology and water quality.

In addition to the description of nearby surface water features for the Disposal Property provided in Section 2.4, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) publishes Flood Insurance Rate Maps that show the expected frequency and severity of flooding by area, typically for the existing land use and type of drainage/flood control facilities present. The Disposal Property is within Flood Zone D, which is defined as an area where flood hazards have not been determined (FEMA 2023a).

County of San Diego interactive flood maps do not indicate flood risk at the Disposal Property (County of San Diego 2021b); thus, the property is not located in an area prone to flooding, tsunamis, or seiches (e.g., near a fault rupture zone), and therefore, there would be no risk of release of pollutants from inundation.

The Proposed Action would not violate any water quality standards, decrease groundwater supplies, increase groundwater demands, substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the disposal/exchange property sites, or significantly increase impermeable surfaces to the extent that groundwater recharge would be affected because no development would occur. There would be no impact on the availability of groundwater, no increase in runoff, nor impedance of flood flows. As described in Section 2.4, there are no surface water features found on the Disposal Property. No disturbance or development would occur that would affect hydrology or water quality. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with hydrology and water quality. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. The Proposed Action is a legal transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with hydrology and water quality.

In addition to the description of nearby surface water features for the Exchange Property provided in Section 2.4, the Exchange Property is within Zone X, which is defined as an area of minimal flood hazard (FEMA 2023b). County of San Diego interactive flood maps do not indicate flood risk at the Exchange Property (County of San Diego 2021b); thus, the property is not located in an area prone to flooding, tsunamis, or seiches (e.g., near a fault rupture zone). Therefore, there would be no risk of release of pollutants from inundation.

The Proposed Action would not violate any water quality standards, decrease groundwater supplies, increase groundwater demands, substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Exchange Property sites, or significantly increase impermeable surfaces to the extent that groundwater recharge would be affected because no development would occur. There would be no impact on the availability of groundwater, no increase in runoff, nor impedance of flood flows. As described in Section 2.4, there are no surface water features on the Exchange Property. The Exchange Property would become part of the HCWA, and no disturbance or development would occur that would affect hydrology or water quality. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with hydrology and water quality.

4.2.11 Land Use and Planning

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development; thus, there would be no impact on land use and planning. There would be no change to the existing land use of the disposal/exchange properties and thus no impact. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with land use and planning. However, the removal of the reserve designation from the Disposal Property would potentially allow development in accordance with the OS-C Open Space-Conservation and A72 General Agricultural Use land use and zoning designations. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. Under the Proposed Action, the Exchange Property would be converted from its current status as an undeveloped, privately owned, rural-residential property, and would be conserved and managed as part of the HCWA. Therefore, the development rights would be extinguished because of CDFW ownership and designation as HCWA. Because the HCWA is adjacent to the Exchange Property, the Proposed Action would not physically divide an established community. Because no physical activities are proposed on the Exchange Property, the Proposed Action would be consistent with all applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Furthermore, through the addition of the Exchange Property to the HCWA, the Exchange Property would be protected against future development, protection that is not currently afforded by its existing land use/zoning, and thus, the Proposed Action Alternative would avoid potential future impacts associated with land use and planning.

4.2.12 Mineral Resources

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development; therefore, no impact on mineral resources would occur. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The Disposal Property is in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region and is classed as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3), according to the *Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region* (DOC 1996). According to the classification system, MRZ-3 areas are those containing mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance (DOC 2017). However, because the Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with mineral resources. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. The Exchange Property would become part of the HCWA, and no development would occur. Moreover, the mineral rights would also be transferred to CDFW. In addition, the Exchange Property is outside the MRZ-3 zone. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource recovery sites or result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state. Thus, there would be no impacts on mineral resources. Furthermore, through the addition of the Exchange Property to the HCWA, the Exchange Property would be protected against future development, protection that is not currently afforded by its existing land use/zoning, and thus, the Proposed Action Alternative would avoid potential future impacts on mineral resources that may be present on-site.

4.2.13 Noise

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development; thus, there would be no noise impacts. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. No construction or permanent noise sources are proposed at the Disposal Property, and the Disposal Property is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan. Thus, there would be no impacts related to noise and vibration by the Proposed Action. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. No construction or permanent noise sources are proposed at the Exchange Property, and the Exchange Property is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan. Although the HCWA can be used for wildlife viewing and hunting upland game birds (CDFW 2025b), it is unlikely that there would be a considerable influx of people undertaking these activities that would cause a substantial increase in noise. Thus, there would be no impacts related to noise and vibration by the Proposed Action.

4.2.14 Population and Housing

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development, and thus, there would be no impact on population and housing. In addition, any expansion of the cemetery and potential future development of the Exchange Property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with population and housing. The Proposed Action would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly, or displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing because the proposed land exchange does not involve construction of homes, businesses, or infrastructure. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, because the Disposal Property has an OS-C Open Space-Conservation and A72 General Agricultural Use land use/zoning designation, future residential uses would be precluded.

Exchange Property

No impact. The Proposed Action would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly, because the proposed land exchange does not involve construction of homes, businesses, or infrastructure. Although the HCWA can be used for wildlife viewing and hunting upland game birds (CDFW 2025b), it is unlikely that there would be a considerable influx of people undertaking these activities that would induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area. Thus, there would be no impacts related to population and housing by the Proposed Action. Furthermore, through the addition of the Exchange Property to the HCWA, the Exchange Property would be protected against future development, protection that is not currently afforded by its existing land use/zoning, and thus, the Proposed Action Alternative would eliminate potential residential development that is currently allowed under its existing land use/zoning.

4.2.15 Public Services

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development; thus, there would be no impact on public services. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The Disposal Property is in the service area of San Diego County Fire and the San Diego County Sheriff's Department. The nearest school is Oak Grove Middle School, approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the Disposal Property, and the Jamul-Dulzura Union School District and Grossmont Union High School District are the only school districts in the area. There are no parks in the vicinity of the Proposed Action, although the RJER and HCWA are the two prevalent natural areas. The nearest library is the Rancho San Diego Library, 4.5 miles northwest. The Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with public services. No changes in the level of service or increased demands on these services are anticipated from the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action does not involve uses that would increase demands on local schools, parks, or other public facilities, such as libraries, and thus, there would be no impact on these facilities. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. The Exchange Property is in the service area of San Diego County Fire and the San Diego County Sheriff's Department. The nearest school is Oak Grove Middle School, approximately 6 miles northwest of the Exchange Property, and the Jamul-Dulzura Union School and Grossmont Union High School District are the only school districts in the area. The nearest libraries are the Rancho San Diego Library, 10 miles northwest, and the San Diego County Library at Potrero, 10.5 miles southeast. The Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with public services. No changes in the level of service or increased demands on these services are anticipated from the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action does not involve uses that would increase demands on local schools, parks, or other public facilities, such as libraries, and thus, there would be no impact on these facilities.

4.2.16 Recreation

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development. Therefore, there would be no impact on recreation. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. There are no parks in the vicinity of the Disposal Property, although the RJER and HCWA are the two prevalent natural areas nearby. The Proposed Action would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area, and thus would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of a facility would occur or be accelerated. The Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The Proposed Action would have no significant impacts associated with recreation. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. Although the Proposed Action would lead to an expansion of the HCWA, the Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development. The HCWA can be used for wildlife viewing and hunting upland game birds (CDFW 2025b), but it is unlikely that there would be a considerable influx of people undertaking these activities that would cause a substantial physical deterioration of the HCWA. The Proposed Action does not include construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, there would be no impacts associated with recreation.

4.2.17 Transportation

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development, and thus, there would be no impact on transportation. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. The Proposed Action does not include modifications to roadways or design features at the Disposal Property that would increase hazards or result in inadequate emergency access. The Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, or bicycle and pedestrian facilities because no such facilities are proposed. Additionally, the Proposed Action would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) because no development is proposed. Thus, there would be no impacts related to transportation. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. The Proposed Action does not include modifications to roadways or design features at the Exchange Property that would increase hazards or result in inadequate emergency access. Although the HCWA can be used for wildlife viewing and hunting upland game birds (CDFW 2025b), it is unlikely that there would be a considerable influx of people undertaking these activities that would result in additional traffic to adjacent areas of the HCWA. Thus, there would be no impacts related to transportation.

4.2.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. There would be no impact on tribal cultural resources, the proposed expansion of the existing cemetery would not occur, and Tribal members wishing to be interred at the cemetery would need to be buried elsewhere and not necessarily on JIV land. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development; thus, there would be no impact on tribal cultural resources. In addition, any future development of either property would require

independent environmental review. Under the No Action Alternative, any existing tribal cultural resources that may be present on-site would continue to be afforded protection by the RJER designation, and thus, the No Action Alternative would avoid potential future impacts on tribal cultural resources that may be present on-site.

PROPOSED ACTION

As mentioned in Section 2.10 of this EA/IS/ND, in accordance with AB 52 and NHPA Section 106, CDFW and USFWS sent joint notification letters to contacts at the Native American tribes on the list provided by NAHC who were noted as having traditional and cultural affiliation with the project site. In addition, the JIV, one of 12 federally recognized tribes that make up the Kumeyaay Nation of Southern California, has been actively involved in the Proposed Action due to the proximity of the Proposed Action to the Tribe's land.

Disposal Property

No impact. The Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development; therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. Thus, there would be no impacts related to tribal cultural resources. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance. In addition, per the Jamul Indian Village Land Transfer Act, the Disposal Property would be taken into trust and shall be part of the JIV reservation but shall not be used for any class II gaming or class III gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

Exchange Property

No impact. Under the Proposed Action, the Exchange Property would be converted from its current status as an undeveloped, privately owned, rural-residential property, and would be preserved and managed as part of the HCWA. No development of the Exchange Property would occur, and thus, there would be no tribal cultural resource impacts. Furthermore, through the addition of the Exchange Property to the HCWA, the Exchange Property would be protected against future development, protection that is not currently afforded by its existing land use/zoning, and thus, the Proposed Action Alternative would avoid potential future impacts on tribal cultural resources that may be present on-site.

4.2.19 Utilities and Service Systems

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development, and thus, there would be no impact on utilities and service systems. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. Because the Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, the Proposed Action would not construct or relocate water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, electric, natural gas, or telecommunication utilities. Thus, there would be no impacts related to utilities and service systems. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. Because the Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, the Proposed Action would not construct or relocate water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, electric, natural gas, or telecommunication utilities. Thus, there would be no impacts related to utilities and service systems.

4.2.20 Wildfire

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development; thus, there would be no impact on wildfire. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review.

PROPOSED ACTION

Disposal Property

No impact. Wildfire is a continuous threat in Southern California and is particularly concerning in the wildland-urban interface—the geographic area where urban development either abuts or intermingles with wildland or vegetative fuels. During the summer, dry vegetation, prolonged periods of drought, and Santa Ana wind conditions can combine to increase the risk of wildfires in San Diego County. Topography influences fire risk by affecting fire spread rates. Typically, steep terrain results in faster fire spread upslope and slower spread downslope. Conversely, flat terrain tends to have little effect on fire spread, resulting in fires that are driven by vegetation and wind. The Disposal Property includes rolling slopes and areas that are relatively flat and primarily consist of coastal sage scrub, chaparral, other low-lying vegetation, and disturbed land with an elevation range of approximately 930–980 feet amsl.

The Disposal Property is in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone according to the Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area map (CAL FIRE 2024) but would become part of the Federal Responsibility Area upon exchange. According to California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) California Fire Perimeters dataset (CAL FIRE 2025), there have been numerous fires in the vicinity of the Disposal Property, with multiple fire perimeters within 1 mile, including the 1943 unnamed fire, 2003 MINE/OTAY, 2007 HARRIS 2, and 1984 Proctor fires the closest. Wildfire is, therefore, a potential threat to the Disposal Property. However, because the Proposed Action is a transfer of ownership of the two respective properties and does not entail any development, the Proposed Action would not involve construction of habitable structures, there would be no potential to expose occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire, and infrastructure would not be needed to support wildfire protection. The Proposed Action would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, postfire slope instability, or drainage changes. No ground disturbance or development is proposed; therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in an increase in risk of wildfire, and there would be no impact. Following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Exchange Property

No impact. The Exchange Property is a sloped property on boulder-strewn hills and has an elevation range of approximately 1,305–1,470 feet amsl. The Exchange Property is also in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone according to the Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area map (CAL FIRE 2024). There have been several fires within the vicinity of the Exchange Property, with multiple fire perimeters within 1 mile, including the 1970 Laguna fire, the 2007 Harris 2 fire, and a 1926 unnamed fire.

The Exchange Property would not involve construction of habitable structures, there would be no potential to expose occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire, and infrastructure would not be needed to support wildfire protection. CDFW acceptance of the Exchange Property would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, postfire slope instability, or drainage changes. No ground disturbance or development is proposed; therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in an increase in risk of wildfire.

4.2.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

No impact. According to CEQA Guidelines 15064(h)(1), the lead agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable. An environmental impact report must be prepared if the cumulative impact may be significant and the project's incremental effect, though individually limited, is cumulatively considerable. "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. As mentioned in Section 4.1.2 of this EA/IS/ND, per the DOI Handbook, to the extent it assists in reasoned decision-making, USFWS may, but is not required to by NEPA, analyze environmental effects from other projects separate in time, or separate in place, or that fall outside of USFWS's regulatory authority, or that would have to be initiated by a third party.

The Proposed Action itself would not likely result in cumulative effects especially because there are no impacts associated with the land disposal/exchange. Potential cumulative projects in the vicinity of the disposal/exchange properties include growth in the county according to the buildout projections in the County of San Diego's General Plan, and the expansion of the Jamul Casino, such as the hotel that is currently under construction. However, as of May 2025, construction is nearing completion, and the hotel will be open for reservations in August 2025; therefore, the hotel will potentially be fully operational before the land exchange would be finalized. However, following the land disposal and exchange, the Tribe proposes to use the Disposal Property for religious and cultural purposes, including expansion of the existing cemetery, which would be subject to compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, as would all other proposed development within San Diego County. Because the future cemetery expansion is a reasonably foreseeable future action resulting in incremental impacts associated with the Proposed Action, it is considered a cumulative effect. When other projects are considered, continuing development increases urbanization, which can result in impacts. However, the land disposal/exchange would need to occur prior to any future development at the Disposal Property because the land disposal/exchange is the only way for development to be permitted. Thus, there would be no overlap between the Proposed Action and any future cemetery expansion project, and there would not be associated cumulatively considerable effects.

As required in CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, "Mandatory Findings of Significance," and as demonstrated under Sections 4.2.4, "Biological Resources," and 4.2.5, "Cultural Resources," there would be no impact on biological or cultural resources due to the Proposed Action; thus, the contribution to these potential cumulative impacts would also have no cumulatively considerable negative impact on biological and cultural resources in the region. Additionally, the MSCP is designed to address the cumulative impacts from urban growth in the region. As described previously, the Proposed Action would not directly or indirectly affect riparian areas, sensitive natural communities, or aquatic resources, chiefly because there are no aquatic resources in the Proposed Action's vicinity. The Proposed Action would not block migratory routes or wildlife corridors because access to the RJER would be maintained west of the Disposal Property. Rather than degrade the quality of the environment or substantially reduce the habitat of wildlife species, the Proposed Action would result in the net increase of 2.9 acres of preserved land. Furthermore, it is assumed that the Proposed Action and any other cumulative projects would comply with all applicable Federal, state, and local regulations, including compliance with San Diego County Ordinances designed to reduce impacts on biological and cultural resources. For these reasons, transfer of the Disposal Property to JIV would not significantly contribute to adverse, cumulative impacts on biological or cultural resources. No development or ground-disturbing activities are proposed on the Exchange Property that would contribute to adverse, cumulative impacts on biological or cultural resources or that would create effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. In addition, as discussed in Section 4.2.11, development rights would be extinguished at the Exchange Property because

of CDFW ownership and designation as HCWA. Thus, there is no potential for a reduction in the number of, or restriction of the range of, any rare or endangered plant or animal species, or the possibility of elimination of important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory because no ground disturbance is associated with the Proposed Action and no development would be permitted at the Exchange Property. The land disposal/exchange would result in adding the property to the HCWA and a net increase of 2.9 acres of preserved land in San Diego County, which is considered a beneficial impact. Additionally, the 1.1-acre expansion of the JIV's property would be in accordance with the intent of the Jamul Indian Village Land Transfer Act and thus would directly benefit the Tribe. Furthermore, because there is no impact across all topics in the EA/IS/ND, as a result, there would be no impact from the Proposed Action's contribution to these potential cumulative impacts and thus no cumulatively considerable impact.

This page is intentionally left blank.

5 LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS

5.1 LEAD AGENCIES

United States Fish and Wildlife Service

Mary Beth Woulfe ..... Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Section 6 Coordinator
Becky Miller ..... Regional Manager

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Glen M. Lubcke ..... Environmental Program Manager
Tim Dillingham ..... Environmental Program Manager
Jennifer Turner ..... Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisor)
Erinn Wilson-Olgin ..... South Coast Region (Region 5) Regional Manager

5.2 PREPARERS

Ascent

Rid Hollands ..... Project Manager
Chad Beckstrom, AICP ..... Principal-in-Charge
Curtis Alling, AICP ..... Strategic Advisor
Alta Cunningham ..... Director of Cultural Resources
Scott Gressard ..... Director of Biological Services
Nicole Wang ..... Administrative Record
Alyssa Luna ..... GIS
Brian Perry ..... Graphics
Riley Smith ..... Word Processing

ASM Affiliates

Rachel Ruston ..... Director
Holly Drake ..... Senior Archaeologist

Acorn Environmental

Ryan Sawyer, AICP ..... Project Director
Jennifer Wade ..... Project Manager
G.O. Graening ..... Senior Biologist
Bibiana Sparks-Alvarez ..... Senior Environmental Analyst
Kimberly Fuchs ..... Senior Environmental Analyst
Peter Von der Porten ..... Graphics

This page is intentionally left blank.

6 REFERENCES

Bedrossian, T. L., P. Roffers, C. A. Hayhurst, J. T. Lancaster, and W. R. and Short. 2012. Geologic Compilation of Quaternary Surficial Deposits in Southern California (2012 Revision). Available: https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/Prodesc/proddesc_115626.htm. Accessed January 29, 2025.

CAL FIRE. *See* California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2024. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area. Available: https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=988d431a42b242b29d89597ab693d008. Accessed March 13, 2025.

———. 2025. California Fire Perimeters (1950+). Available: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?layers=c3c10388e3b24cec8a954ba10458039d. Accessed May 20, 2025.

California Air Resources Board. 2020. *2020 San Diego Ozone State Implementation Plan*. Available: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/california-state-implementation-plans/nonattainment-area-plans/san-diego-county-0. Accessed January 29, 2025.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2008. *Land Management Plan for the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area*. Available: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=151481&inline. Accessed February 24, 2025.

———. 2023. Natural Landscape Blocks - California Essential Habitat Connectivity (CEHC) [ds621]. Available: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?layers=6a72392df18d4a1a8c24ffc2abe9d034. Accessed May 15, 2025.

———. 2025a. Natural Areas Small - California Essential Habitat Connectivity (CEHC) [ds1073]. Available: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?layers=6a72392df18d4a1a8c24ffc2abe9d034. Accessed February 26, 2025.

———. 2025b. Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area. Available: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Lands/Places-to-Visit/Hollenbeck-Canyon-WA#610944026-hunting-fishing-and-visitor-use. Accessed March 11, 2025.

CARB. *See* California Air Resources Board.

County of San Diego. 1997a. *Multiple Species Conservation Program County of San Diego Subarea Plan*. Available: https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/mscp/docs/SCMSCP/MSCP_County_Subarea_Plan.pdf. Accessed May 15, 2025.

———. 1997b. Multiple Species Conservation Program Cores and Linkages - San Diego County [ds2771]. Available: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?layers=17e1943773d2419090078875f471f83b. Accessed May 15, 2025.

———. 2009. *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Paleontological Resources, Figure 2 Paleontological Resources and Potential Sensitivity*. Modified January 15, 2009. Available: https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/dplu/docs/Paleo-Guidelines.pdf. Accessed March 10, 2025.

———. 2017. Jamul Subregional Planning Area General Plan Land Use Designations Map. Available: https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/docs/GP/16-Jamul.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2024.

———. 2021a. PDS-Zoning and Property Information Map. Available: https://gis-portal.sandiegocounty.gov/arcgis/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=f1b69ba9d3dd4940b8d1efcc9dac2ac4. Accessed February 4, 2025.

———. 2021b. SanGIS Parcel Lookup Tool and Geographic Boundary Viewer. Available: https://sdgis.sandag.org/. Accessed February 4, 2025.

———. 2025. Multiple Species Conservation Program Cores and Linkages – San Diego County [ds2771]. Available: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?layers=17e1943773d2419090078875f471f83b. Accessed May 20, 2025.

Department of Conservation. 1996. *DMG Open-File Report 96-04. Update Of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in The Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region*. Available: https://filerequest.conservation.ca.gov/?q=OFR_96-04. Accessed March 11, 2025.

———. 2017. *Special Report 240 - Update Of Mineral Land Classification: Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate In The Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, California*. Available: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/documents/publications/special-reports/SR_240-MLC-WesternSanDiegoPCR-2017-Report.pdf. Accessed March 11, 2025.

———. 2022. California Important Farmland Finder. Available: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/app/. Accessed January 29, 2025.

Department of the Interior. 2025a. DOI NEPA Interim Final Rulemaking 7-2025. Available: https://www.doi.gov/media/document/doi-nepa-interim-final-rulemaking-7-2025. Accessed July 2, 2025.

Department of the Interior. 2025b. DOI NEPA Handbook. Available: https://www.doi.gov/media/document/doi-nepa-handbook. Accessed July 2, 2025.

Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2025. EnviroStor Database Search. Available: https:///www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?gobal_id=60002837. Accessed February 3, 2025.

DOI. *See* Department of the Interior.

DOC. *See* Department of Conservation.

DTSC. *See* Department of Toxic Substances Control.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2023a. National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette - 06073C1955G. Available: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd. Accessed May 20, 2025.

———. 2023b. National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette - 06073C1975G. Available: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd. Accessed May 20, 2025.

FEMA. *See* Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2025. Web Soil Survey. Available: https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed March 10, 2025.

NRCS. *See* Natural Resources Conservation Service.

San Diego County Air Pollution Control District. 2021. Attainment Status. Available: https://www.sdapcd.org/content/sdapcd/planning/attainment-status.html. Accessed January 29, 2025.

———. 2022. 2022 *Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS).* Available: https://www.sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdapcd/documents/grants/planning/Att.%20A%20-%202022%20RAQS.pdf. Accessed January 31, 2025.

SDAPCD. *See* San Diego County Air Pollution Control District.

State Water Resources Control Board. 2025. GeoTracker. Available: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/. Accessed February 3, 2025.

SWRCB. *See* State Water Resources Control Board.

Todd, V. R., R. M. Alvarez, and Techni Graphic Systems. 2004. Preliminary Geologic Map of the El Cajon 30' X 60' Quadrangle, Southern California. Available: https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/Prodesc/proddesc_69595.htm. Accessed January 29, 2025.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2025. National Wetlands Inventory, Available: https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/. Accessed February 26, 2025.

USFWS. *See* United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Appendix A

Ecological Comparison of Two Properties for Land Swap: Slee Property on Honey Springs Road and R.J.E.R. Cemetery Property, Jamul, California

ECOLOGICAL COMPARISON OF TWO PROPERTIES FOR LAND SWAP: SLEE PROPERTY ON HONEY SPRINGS ROAD AND R.J.E.R. CEMETERY PROPERTY, JAMUL, CALIFORNIA

November 30, 2022



Prepared by:

G.O. Graening, PhD
Natural Investigations Company, Inc.
3104 O Street, #221, Sacramento, CA 95816

1. INTRODUCTION

This technical memo provides a brief ecological comparison of two properties in Jamul, California that are being considered for a land swap so that the Jamul Indian Village can utilize the property adjacent to their Reservation for religious and cultural purposes, including potential expansion of the tribal cemetery (see Exhibits). The two properties are:

- the "Slee Property," an unaddressed property located on Honey Springs Road, two 2-acre parcels (APN 600-01-04 and APN 600- 01-05), owned by the Jamul Indian Village
- the "Cemetery Property," an unaddressed triangular parcel located immediately west of the Jamul Indian Village Catholic Cemetery, approximately 1.3 acres (no APN), owned by CDFW and managed as part of the Rancho Jamul Ecological Preserve

2. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The two properties are located within the "Peninsular Range except San Jacinto Mountains" geographic subregion, which is contained within the Southwestern California geographic subdivision of the larger California Floristic Province (Baldwin et al. 2012). This region has a Mediterranean-type climate, characterized by distinct seasons of hot, dry summers and moderately wet, cool winters. The region is in Climate Zone 21 – "California's Thermal Belts in Southern California's Areas of Occasional Ocean Influence," defined by maritime-influenced climate where temperatures never fall very far below 30 F (Sunset, 2022).

The topography of the Slee Property is a northwest-facing slope of boulder-strewn hills. The elevation ranges from approximately 1,305 feet to 1,470 feet above mean sea level. Drainage runs north and west into an unnamed watercourse, thence Dulzura Creek, and eventually flowing into Jamul Creek and Lower Otay Reservoir. The land uses are undeveloped open space. The surrounding land uses are private estates and wildlife preserves.

The topography of the Cemetery Property is an east-facing ridge and slope of a hill. The elevation ranges from approximately 930 feet to 980 feet above mean sea level. Drainage runs southeast into Willow Creek, then Jamul Creek, which flows to Lower Otay Reservoir. The land uses are undeveloped open space/preserve land. The surrounding land uses are cemetery, gaming facility, private estates, and wildlife preserves.

Conclusion: The two properties have similar environmental settings.

3. VEGETATION COMMUNITY TYPES AND SPECIAL-STATUS PLANTS

The Slee Property contains one terrestrial vegetation community: chamise chaparral: The dominant species within the chaparral is chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*) and laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*). Few grasses and herbs were identifiable under the shrub canopy this late in the season. This vegetation type can be classified as the Holland Type "Chamise Chaparral" or as "37.101.21 *Adenostoma fasciculatum – Malosma laurina*" (CDFW 2022e). The chaparral is mature and undisturbed, and is quite dense, except for occasional game trails and ad hoc hiking trails. Other gaps are created by large boulders. The few gaps in the chaparral canopy contain suitable habitat for a variety of special-status plant species.

The Cemetery Property contains one terrestrial vegetation community: chamise chaparral. Interspersed within this community is another community: non-native annual grassland (42.020.03 *Elymus caput-medusae* or 42.027.00 Wild Oats and Annual Brome Grasslands). The chaparral community is

regenerating from previous land uses, which involved intensive grazing by cattle. The property contains suitable habitat for a variety of special-status plant species, although the dominance of non-native European grasses does diminish the potential for these native species to occur.

Table 1: Comparison of Vegetation Communities on the Properties

Vegetation Community	Cemetery Property	Slee Property
Chamise chaparral	1.3 acres	4 acres

No critical habitat for any federally-listed species occurs within the Slee Property. However, Critical Habitat for listed species is nearby for such species as Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*) and Hermes copper butterfly (*Lycaena hermes*). No critical habitat for any federally-listed species occurs within the Cemetery Property. However, Critical Habitat for Hermes copper butterfly (*Lycaena hermes*) is adjacent to this property. Spiny redberry, the host plant for the federally threatened Hermes Copper butterfly, does not occur within the Cemetery Property (our 2022 study as well as Montrose Environmental Services 2021).

Neither property contains special-status habitats, according to biological field surveys. The CNDDB does not report any special-status habitats on either property. However, special-status habitats are nearby for both properties: Maritime Succulent Scrub; San Diego Mesa Claypan Vernal Pool; Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest; and Southern Interior Cypress Forest. Neither property contains any water resources: there are no channels or wetlands on either property.

> Conclusion: The two properties have similar vegetation communities, but the Slee Property has higher quality community structure. Neither property contains special-status habitats or water resources. Neither property contains designated Critical Habitat for any listed species.

4. WILDLIFE HABITAT AND CORRIDORS AND SPECIAL-STATUS ANIMALS

Wildlife habitat types were classified using CDFW's Wildlife Habitat Relationship System. The Slee Property contains two wildlife habitat types: Chamise – Redshank Chaparral; and Barren (rock outcrop). These habitats provide suitable habitat for a variety of special-status animal species. The Slee Property can be considered part of an important animal movement corridor, as it is adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area.

The Cemetery Property contains two wildlife habitat types: Chamise – Redshank Chaparral; and Annual Grassland. These habitats provide suitable habitat for a variety of special-status animal species. The Cemetery Property can be considered part of an important animal movement corridor, as it is part of the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve.


> Conclusion: The two properties have similar wildlife habitats, but the Slee Property has higher quality habitats with more complexity, due to the undisturbed nature of the chaparral and the boulder outcrops. The Cemetery Property was subjected to heavy cattle grazing a decade ago.

5. SUMMARY

From an ecological perspective, the two properties appear to be suitable for a land swap. Both properties contain similar topography, vegetation communities, and wildlife habitats, and both properties lack water resources. Both properties are adjacent to existing CDFW preserves, and both properties have value as lands bordering large open spaces with functioning wildlife corridors. Both properties are near, but

outside of, critical habitat designations for listed species. The Slee Property contains habitats that are more natural and complex than the Cemetery Property. The Slee Property is adjacent to large residential estates that serve as buffers to development, while the Cemetery Property is near an existing intensive commercial development.

EXHIBITS



Study Area

0 0.25 0.5 Miles

1:24,000

Slee Property
Study Area Location Map

Natural Investigations Company

Map Date 11/7/2022

Dulzura 1997 Quadrangle:Township 17S, Range 2E, Section 28



Habitat Types

Slee Property, Honey Springs Road, Jamul


Natural Investigations Company



Water Resources


Slee Property, Honey Springs Road, Jamul

Natural Investigations Company




SOURCE: "Dulzura, CA" USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle,
T17S R1E, Unsectioned Area of Dulzura, San Bernardino Baseline & Meridian;
ESRI, 2021; AES-Montrose, 11/3/2021

Figure 2
Site and Vicinity




SOURCE: USGS NAIP aerial photograph, 4/25/2020; ESRI, 2021; AES-Montrose, 11/3/2021


Figure 3
Aerial Photograph




SOURCE: FWS National Wetland Inventory, 2021; USGS NAIP aerial photograph, 4/25/2020; USGS National Hydrography Dataset, 2021; ESRI, 2021; AES-Montrose, 11/3/2021

Figure 4
Habitat Types


U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Other Federal
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Other Federal
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Water Districts
School Districts
Water Districts
School Districts
Water Districts
County
Water Districts
Water Districts
Bureau of Land Management
Water Districts
Water Districts
Cemetery Property
Indian Reservations
California Department of Fish and Game
Water Districts
State
State
California Department of Fish and Game
State
California Department of Fish and Game
Bureau of Land Management
City
Source: Esri, Maxar, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community
0
0.4
0.8
Miles
N


California Department of Fish and Game
Fire Districts
California Department of Fish and Game
California Department of Fish and Game
California Department of Fish and Game
California Department of Fish and Game
California Department of Fish and Game
Slee Property
County
Bureau of Land Management
State
Bureau of Land Management
Bureau of Land Management
Source: Esri, Maxar, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community
0
0.4
0.8
Miles
N

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
South Coast Region
CRESTRIDGE ECOLOGICAL RESERVE (ER), McGINTY MOUNTAIN ER, SYCUAN PEAK ER, RANCHO JAMUL ER, OTAY MOUNTAIN ER, HOLLENBECK CANYON WILDLIFE AREA
San Diego County



Ecological Reserve
Wildlife Area
National Forest
Bureau of Land Management
Interstate Highway
State Highway
Local Road
N
0
4 Miles

Disclaimer: Boundaries are approximate.
Maps are intended for general purposes only.

February 2017 - WLB

APPENDIX: USFWS SPECIES LIST

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish And Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue - Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7385
Phone: (760) 431-9440 Fax: (760) 431-5901

In Reply Refer To:
Project Code: 2023-0014037
Project Name: Jamul Indian Village Parcel

November 10, 2022

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A biological assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological

evaluation similar to a biological assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a biological assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found at the Fish and Wildlife Service's Endangered Species Consultation website at:

https://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/faq.html

Migratory Birds: In addition to responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), there are additional responsibilities under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) to protect native birds from project-related impacts. Any activity, intentional or unintentional, resulting in take of migratory birds, including eagles, is prohibited unless otherwise permitted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)). For more information regarding these Acts see https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations.php.

The MBTA has no provision for allowing take of migratory birds that may be unintentionally killed or injured by otherwise lawful activities. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to comply with these Acts by identifying potential impacts to migratory birds and eagles within applicable NEPA documents (when there is a federal nexus) or a Bird/Eagle Conservation Plan (when there is no federal nexus). Proponents should implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize the production of project-related stressors or minimize the exposure of birds and their resources to the project-related stressors. For more information on avian stressors and recommended conservation measures see https://www.fws.gov/birds/bird-enthusiasts/threats-to-birds.php.

In addition to MBTA and BGEPA, Executive Order 13186: *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds*, obligates all Federal agencies that engage in or authorize activities that might affect migratory birds, to minimize those effects and encourage conservation measures that will improve bird populations. Executive Order 13186 provides for the protection of both migratory birds and migratory bird habitat. For information regarding the implementation of Executive Order 13186, please visit https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations/executive-orders/e0-13186.php.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Code in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List

Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Carlsbad Fish And Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue - Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7385
(760) 431-9440

Project Summary

Project Code: 2023-0014037
Project Name: Jamul Indian Village Parcel
Project Type: Land Exchange
Project Description: Land Exchange
Project Location:

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/@32.6636226,-116.78706722102031,14z



Counties: San Diego County, California

Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 10 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries[1], as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

---

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Birds

NAME	STATUS
Coastal California Gnatcatcher *Polioptila californica californica* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8178	Threatened
Least Bell's Vireo *Vireo bellii pusillus* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5945	Endangered
Southwestern Willow Flycatcher *Empidonax traillii extimus* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6749	Endangered

Insects

NAME	STATUS
Hermes Copper Butterfly *Lycaena hermes* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4379	Threatened
Monarch Butterfly *Danaus plexippus* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743	Candidate
Quino Checkerspot Butterfly *Euphydryas editha quino (=E. e. wrighti)* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5900	Endangered

Flowering Plants

NAME	STATUS
Mexican Flannelbush *Fremontodendron mexicanum* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7495	Endangered
Otay Tarplant *Deinandra (=Hemizonia) conjugens* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5687	Threatened
San Diego Ambrosia *Ambrosia pumila* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8287	Endangered
San Diego Thornmint *Acanthomintha ilicifolia* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/351	Threatened

Critical habitats

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

IPaC User Contact Information

Agency: Natural Investigations, Inc.
Name: Tim Nosal
Address: 3104 O Street #221
City: Sacramento
State: CA
Zip: 95816
Email trnosal@comcast.net
Phone: 9169696868

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish And Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue - Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7385
Phone: (760) 431-9440 Fax: (760) 431-5901

In Reply Refer To:
Project Code: 2023-0014592
Project Name: CDFW Parcel

November 10, 2022

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A biological assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological

evaluation similar to a biological assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a biological assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found at the Fish and Wildlife Service's Endangered Species Consultation website at:

https://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/faq.html

Migratory Birds: In addition to responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), there are additional responsibilities under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) to protect native birds from project-related impacts. Any activity, intentional or unintentional, resulting in take of migratory birds, including eagles, is prohibited unless otherwise permitted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)). For more information regarding these Acts see https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations.php.

The MBTA has no provision for allowing take of migratory birds that may be unintentionally killed or injured by otherwise lawful activities. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to comply with these Acts by identifying potential impacts to migratory birds and eagles within applicable NEPA documents (when there is a federal nexus) or a Bird/Eagle Conservation Plan (when there is no federal nexus). Proponents should implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize the production of project-related stressors or minimize the exposure of birds and their resources to the project-related stressors. For more information on avian stressors and recommended conservation measures see https://www.fws.gov/birds/bird-enthusiasts/threats-to-birds.php.

In addition to MBTA and BGEPA, Executive Order 13186: *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds*, obligates all Federal agencies that engage in or authorize activities that might affect migratory birds, to minimize those effects and encourage conservation measures that will improve bird populations. Executive Order 13186 provides for the protection of both migratory birds and migratory bird habitat. For information regarding the implementation of Executive Order 13186, please visit https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations/executive-orders/e0-13186.php.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Code in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List

Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Carlsbad Fish And Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue - Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7385
(760) 431-9440

Project Summary

Project Code: 2023-0014592
Project Name: CDFW Parcel
Project Type: Land Exchange
Project Description: Land Exchange
Project Location:

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/@32.702495150000004,-116.87412983938856,14z



Counties: San Diego County, California

Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 10 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries[1], as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

---

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Birds

NAME	STATUS
Coastal California Gnatcatcher *Polioptila californica californica* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8178	Threatened
Least Bell's Vireo *Vireo bellii pusillus* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5945	Endangered
Southwestern Willow Flycatcher *Empidonax traillii extimus* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6749	Endangered

Insects

NAME	STATUS
Hermes Copper Butterfly *Lycaena hermes* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location overlaps the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4379	Threatened
Monarch Butterfly *Danaus plexippus* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743	Candidate
Quino Checkerspot Butterfly *Euphydryas editha quino (=E. e. wrighti)* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5900	Endangered

Flowering Plants

NAME	STATUS
Mexican Flannelbush *Fremontodendron mexicanum* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7495	Endangered
Otay Tarplant *Deinandra (=Hemizonia) conjugens* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5687	Threatened
San Diego Ambrosia *Ambrosia pumila* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8287	Endangered
San Diego Thornmint *Acanthomintha ilicifolia* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/351	Threatened

Critical habitats

There is 1 critical habitat wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction.

NAME	STATUS
Hermes Copper Butterfly *Lycaena hermes* https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4379#crithab	Final

IPaC User Contact Information

Agency: Natural Investigations, Inc.
Name: Tim Nosal
Address: 3104 O Street #221
City: Sacramento
State: CA
Zip: 95816
Email trnosal@comcast.net
Phone: 9169696868

APPENDIX: SITE PHOTOS OF SLEE PROPERTY

















APPENDIX: SITE PHOTOS OF CEMETERY PROPERTY







Appendix B

Biological Memorandum

MONTROSE ENVIRONMENTAL

Montrose Environmental Solutions, formerly AES
1801 7th Street, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95811
P: 916.447.3479 F: 916.447.1665

BIOLOGICAL MEMORANDUM

To:	Jamul Indian Village of California
From:	David Pfuhler, Biologist
Project:	Jamul Land Transfer Project
Date:	11/3/2021

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This memorandum has been prepared for the Jamul Indian Village of California (Tribe) who proposes a land transfer for an approximately one-acre piece of land currently owned by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) located adjacent to and immediately west of existing tribal trust lands in the County of San Diego (Property). In exchange, the Tribe proposes to purchase an off-site parcel of comparable size and habitat for CDFW as a form of repayment/mitigation. The one- acre Property is located at the Jamul Indian Village, immediately west of the Jamul Casino at 14145 Campo Rd, Jamul, CA and a short distance west of Highway 94 (**Attachment A Figures 1, 2 and 3**). The Property is located in an un-sectioned area within Township 17 South, Range 1 East, as depicted on the Dulzura, CA 7.5' USGS quadrangle map. The southern edge of the Property is adjacent to an ephemeral drainage. The purpose of this assessment is to identify sensitive biological resources within the Property and a 250-foot buffer (Study Area) that may be affected by the Proposed Project.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

The following information was obtained and reviewed:

- Aerial photographs of the Property and surrounding area;
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) list, updated October 26, 2021 (USFWS, 2021a; **Attachment B**);
- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) list, updated October 25, 2021 (CDFW, 2021; **Attachment B**);
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS) list, updated October 25, 2021 (CNPS, 2021; **Attachment B**);
- USFWS National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map of wetland features, updated November 3, 2021 (**Attachment A Figure 4**); and
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) custom soils report, updated November 3, 2021 (NRCS, 2021; **Attachment B**).

A biological resources survey was conducted within the Study Area on October 27, 2021. The survey was conducted by walking throughout the entirety of the Study Area. Transects were walked where accessible. Binoculars were used to assist in surveying efforts. Data was collected via a Trimble Geo XH hand-held GPS receiver. Survey goals consisted of identifying habitat types, sensitive habitats, wetlands, and waters of the U.S, and special-status species. Sensitive habitats include those that are designated

by CDFW, considered by local experts to be communities of limited distribution, or likely to be waters of the U.S. or State by the appropriate regulatory agencies. Habitat requirements of special-status species were compared to habitats observed, which were determined based on aerial photographs, ground-truthing, and background data review.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 SOIL TYPES

The Property is comprised of Las Posas fine sandy loam at 15 to 30 percent slopes, and Cieneba very rocky coarse sandy loam at 30 to 75 percent slopes. Las Posas fine sandy loam is well drained and Cieneba very rocky coarse sandy loam is somewhat excessively drained. A custom soils report for the Property can be found in **Attachment C**.

3.2 HABITAT TYPES

Habitat types identified within the Study Area are shown in **Figure 4**. Chaparral habitat encompasses most of the Property. The NWI classifies the ephemeral drainage that flows to the south of the property as riverine, intermittent, streambed and temporarily flooded habitat and the stream to the east of the Property as palustrine, forested, scrub-shrub, and seasonally flooded habitat (**Figure 4**). Habitat types on the Property are further discussed below.

Chaparral

This habitat type occurs throughout the entire Property and is the dominant habitat type throughout the Study Area. At the time of the survey, scattered litter was found throughout the property. The chaparral habitat on the Property occurred on a south facing slope while the remaining portions of the study area were a north facing slope forming a valley which contained the ephemeral drainage described below. The habitat fostered many bird species throughout the shrub layer. Dominant plant species observed include chamise (*Adenostoma fasciclatum*), laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*), Mediterranean storksbill (*Erodium malacoides*), compact brome (*Bromus madritensis*), *ephedra spp*., and desert broom (*Baccharis sarothroides*).

Ephemeral drainage

This habitat type occured along the southern border of the Property. The drainage was approximately 0.5 meters wide where the channel as apparent. The drainage appeared as a swale along most of the property boundary and a defined channel became present as it flowed to the southeast into the riverine system. Chamise, laurel sumac and *mentha spp.* line most of the drainage.

Riparian

Riparian corridor bordered the riverine system mapped by NWI and confirmed in the Study Area during the survey. The riparian habitat is dominated by willow (*Salix* sp.), interior live oak (*Quercus wislizeni*), coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), and California willowherb (*Epilobium foliosum*).

Riverine

A riverine system is located to the east of the property. Wetted portions of this habitat were approximately 1.5 meters in width with an incised channel defining the ordinary high water mark. The trees described within the riparian habitat description shade this system. The system flows from the north to south. The consistent flow of the channel did not allow for plants to establish within the

streambed.

3.3 SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES

Data review and special-status species searches found 55 special-status plant species and 30 special-status wildlife species with the potential to occur in the region of the Property (**Attachment B**). The name, regulatory status, distribution, habitat requirements, period of identification, and potential to occur for each species are listed in **Table 1**.

Based on the site-specific habitats and special-status species habitat requirements for each species that may occur within the vicinity of the Study Area, as shown in **Table 1**, the Study Area contains suitable habitat to potentially support 31 special-status plant species and 12 special-status animal species. Species with no potential to occur on the Study Area were ruled out based on lack of suitable habitat, soils, elevation, necessary substrate, and negative results during the survey if it coincided with the identifiable bloom period for plant species. The survey was conducted outside the bloom window of the potentially occurring special-status plant species.

Of the species with the potential to occur within the Study Area, the Property contains suitable habitat for the following special status animal species:

- western spadefoot toad (*Spea hammondii*)
- Coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*)
- Dulzura pocket mouse (*Chaetodipus californicus femoralis*)
- San Diego desert woodrat (*Neotoma lepida intermedia*)
- coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*)
- Coastal whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegri*)

The Chaparral habitat found in the Study Area and Property provides suitable habitat and nesting habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher. California gnatcatcher was not observed during the field survey and there are no recorded occurrences within the Property; however, it was observed within the Study Area (adjacent to the Property) in 2016 (**Figure 4**).

A monarch butterfly was observed on the Property during the survey. Milkweed which is used by the species for egg laying and nectar collection was not observed during the site survey. The species was found flying across the Property and was not observed landing on any particular plants.

3.5 CRITICAL HABITAT

Proposed designated critical habitat for the Hermes copper butterfly occurs within the Study Area (USFWS, 2021b; **Attachment B**). Spiny redberry, the host plant for the federally proposed threatened Hermes Copper butterfly, does not occur within the property, but was observed in one location within the Study Area (outside of the Property) south of the riparian habitat area.

3.4 WILDLIFE MOVEMENT

Wildlife movement is currently restricted to the east by development and the north and west by a barbed wire fence. The Property occurs just north of an ephemeral drainage that feeds a riverine system to the southeast of the Property, which may foster wildlife movement along the riparian fringes.

The Property is the northernmost part of the Jamul Ecological Reserve. Fauna observed throughout this habitat included lark sparrow (Chondestes grammacus), coyote (Canis latrans), American crow (Corvus brachyrhynchos), scrub jay (Aphelocoma californica), California towhee (Melozone crissalis), Monarch butterfly (Danaus plexippus), wrentit (Chamaea fasciata), red-tailed hawk (Buteo jamaicensis), raven (Corvus corax), desert cottontail (Sylvilagus audubonii), Costa's hummingbird (*Calypte costae*), and goldfinch (*Spinus tristis*).

TABLE 1

REGIONALLY OCCURRING SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
PLANTS					
Acanthominta ilicifolia *San Diego thorn-mint*	FT/CE/1B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pool habitats. Elevations range from 10-960 meters.	April-June	**No**, appropriate mesic habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Adolphia californica California adolphia	--/--/2B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grassland habitats. Elevations range from 10-740 meters.	December-May	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Ambrosia monogyra singlewhorl burrobrush	--/--/2B.2	Known to occur in Orange, Riverside, Kern, San Bernardino, Imperial, and San Diego counties, and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and Sonoran desert scrub habitats. Found in sandy soils. Elevations range from 10-500 meters	August-November	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Ambrosia pumila San Diego ambrosia	FE/--/1B.1	Known to occur in Riverside and San Diego counties and Baja California.	Found in upper flood plain terraces and in chaparral, coastal scrub, and valley/ foothill grassland often in disturbed areas. Elevations range from 20-415 meters.	May - September	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Arctostaphylos otayensis Otay manzanita	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county.	Found in chaparral and cismontane woodland habitats. Elevations range from 275-1700 meters.	January-April	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Astragalus deanei Dean's milk-vetch	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, riparian habitats. Elevations range from 75-695 meters.	February-May	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Astragalus oocarpus San Diego milk-vetch	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county.	Found in chaparral and cismontane woodland (openings) habitats. Elevations range from 305-1524 meters.	May-August	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Atriplex pacifica South coast saltscale	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Ventura counties, and Arizona, Baja California, and Sonora, Mexico.	Found in coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes, coastal scrub, and playas. Elevations range from 0-140 meters.	May-October	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Bloomeria clevelandii San Diego goldenstar	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pool habitats. Elevations range from 50-465 meters.	April-May	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Brodiaea orcuttii Orcutt's brodiaea	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in Riverside and San Diego counties and Baja California.	Found in close-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, meadows and seeps, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pool habitats. Elevations range from 30-1692 meters.	May-July	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Calochortus dunnii Dunn's mariposa-lily	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in close-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, and valley and foothill grassland. Elevations range from 185-1830 meters.	April-June	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Carex obispoensis San Luis Obispo sedge	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in Monterey, San Diego, and San Luis Obispo counties and Baja California.	Found in close-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grassland habitats. Elevations range from 10-820 meters.	April-June	**No**, appropriate habitat type is not found within the Study Area.
Ceanothus cyaneus Lakeside ceanothus	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in close-cone coniferous forest and chaparral habitats. Elevations range from 235-755 meters.	April-June	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Ceanothus otayensis Otay Mountain ceanothus	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral (gabbroic, metavolcanic) habitat. Elevations range from 600-1100 meters.	January-April	**No**, the Study Area is outside of the elevation range of this species.
Chorizanthe polygonoides var. *longispina* long-spined spineflower	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in Orange, Riverside, and San Diego counties and Baja California.	Found in chaparral, coastal scrub, meadows and seeps, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pool habitats. Elevations range from 30-1530 meters.	April-July	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Clarkia delicata delicate clarkia	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and cismontane woodland habitats. Elevations range from 235-1000 meters.	April-June	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Clinopodium chandleri San Miguel savory	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in Orange, Riverside, and San Diego counties and Baja California.	Found in chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, riparian woodland, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pool habitats. Elevations range from 120-1075 meters.	March-July	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Comarostaphylis diversifolia ssp. diversifolia summer holly	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in Orange and San Diego counties and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and cismontane woodland habitats. Elevations range from 30-790 meters.	April-June	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Cordylanthus parviflorus small-flowered bird's-beak	--/--/2B.3	Known to occur in San Bernardino and San Diego counties.	Found in Joshua tree woodland, Mojavean desert scrub, and pinyon and juniper woodland. Elevations range from 700-2200 meters.	August-October	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Corethrogyne filaginifolia var. incana San Diego sand aster	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California from fewer than 10 occurrences.	Found in coastal bluff scrub, chaparral, and coastal scrub habitats. Elevations range from 3-115 meters.	June-September	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Cylindropuntia californica var. californica snake cholla	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and coastal scrub habitats. Elevations range from 30-150 meters.	April-May	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Deinandra conjugens Otay tarplant	FT/CE/1B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in coastal scrub and valley and foothill grassland habitats. Found in clay soils. Elevations range from 25-300 meters.	April-June	**No**, appropriate soils or habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Deinandra floribunda Tecate tarplant	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and coastal scrub habitats. Elevations range from 70-1220 meters.	August-October	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Dicranostegia orcuttiana Orcutt's bird's-beak	--/--/2B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in coastal scrub habitat. Elevations range from 10-350 meters.	April-July	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Dudleya variegate variegated dudleya	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pool habitats. Elevations range from 3-580 meters.	April-June	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Ericameria palmeri var. Palmeri Palmer's goldenbush	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Kern, San Bernardino, and San Diego counties, and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and coastal scrub habitats. Elevations range from 30-600 meters.	September-November	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Eryngium aristulatum var. *parishii* San Diego button-celery	FE/CE/1B.1	Known to occur in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Diego counties and Baja California.	Found in coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pool habitats. Found in mesic soils. Elevations range from 20-620 meters.	April-June	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Ferocactus viridescens San Diego barrel cactus	--/--/2B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pool habitats. Elevations range from 3-450 meters.	May-June	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Fraxinus parryi chaparral ash	--/--/2B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral habitat. Elevations range from 213-620 meters.	March-May	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Fremontodendron mexicanum Mexican flannelbush	FE/CR/1B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in closed-coned coniferous forest, chaparral, and cismontane woodland habitats. Elevations range from 10-716 meters.	March-June	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Galium proliferum desert bedstraw	--/--/2B.2	Known to occur in San Bernardino and San Diego counties.	Found in Joshua tree woodland, Mojavean desert scrub, and pinyon and juniper woodland. Elevations range from 1190-1630 meters.	March-June	**No**, the Study Area is outside of the elevation range of this species
Grindelia hallii San Diego gumplant	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in San Bernardino and San Diego counties.	Found in chaparral, lower montane coniferous forest, meadows and seeps, and valley and foothill grassland habitats. Elevations range from 185-1745 meters.	May-October	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area
Hesperocyparis forbesii Tecate cypress	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in Orange, Riverside, and San Diego counties and Baja California.	Found in closed-coned coniferous forest, and chaparral habitats. Elevations range from 80-1500 meters.	Year-round	**No**, the species was not observed during the site survey.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Horkelia truncata Ramona horkelia	--/--/1B.3	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and cismontane woodland habitats. Elevations range from 400-1300 meters.	May-June	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Hosackia crassifolia var. otayensis Otay Mountain lotus	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral (metavolcanics, often disturbed areas) habitat. Elevations range from 213-620 meters.	May-August	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Isocoma menziesii var. decumbens decumbent goldenbush	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Diego counties, and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and coastal scrub habitats. Found in sandy soils, often disturbed areas. Elevations range from 10-135 meters.	April-November	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Iva hayesiana San Diego marsh-elder	--/--/2B.2	Known to occur in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Santa Barbara, Ventura, and San Diego counties, and Baja California.	Found in marshes, swamps, and playas. Elevations range from 10-500 meters	April-October	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Lasthenia glabrata ssp. coulteri Coulter's goldfields	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in Colusa, Kern, Los Angeles, Merced, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Solano, Tehama, Tulare, Ventura, and Yolo Counties.	Found in marshes and swamps (coastal salt), playas, and vernal pools. Elevations range from 1-1220 meters.	February-June	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Lepechinia ganderi Gander's pitcher sage	--/--/1B.3	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California from fewer than 20 occurrences.	Found in close-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grassland habitats. Elevations range from 305-1005 meters.	June-July	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Monardella hypoleuca ssp. Lanata felt-leaved monardella	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and cismontane woodland habitats. Elevations range from 300-1575 meters.	June-August	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Nama stenocarpa mud nama	--/--/2B.2	Known to occur in Imperial, Kings, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Diego counties, and Baja California.	Found in marshes and swamps (lake margins, riverbanks). Elevations range from 5-500 meters.	January-July	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Navarretia fossalis spreading navarretia	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego, and San Luis Obispo counties, and Baja California.	Found in chenopod scrub, marshes and swamps (shallow freshwater), playas, and vernal pools. Elevations range from 30-655 meters.	April-June	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Nolina interrata Dehesa nolina	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral (gabbroic, metavolcanic, serpentinite) habitat. Elevations range from 185-855 meters.	June-July	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Orcuttia californica California Orcutt grass	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, and Ventura counties, and Baja California.	Found in vernal pools. Elevations range from 15-660 meters.	April-August	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Packera ganderi Gander's ragwort	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in Riverside and San Diego counties.	Found in chaparral (burned areas, gabbroic outcrops) habitat. Elevations range from 400-1200 meters.	April-June	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Pogogyne nudiuscula Otay Mesa mint	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in vernal pools. Elevations range from 90-250 meters.	May-July	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Quercus cedrosensis Cedros Island oak	--/--/2B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in close-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, and coastal scrub habitats. Elevations range from 255-960 meters.	April-May	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Quercus dumosa Nuttall's scrub oak	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Ventura counties and Baja California.	Found in closed-coned coniferous forest, chaparral, and coastal scrub habitats. Elevations range from 15-400 meters.	February-August	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Ribes canthariforme Moreno currant	--/--/1B.3	Known to occur in San Diego county.	Found in chaparral and riparian scrub habitats. Elevations range from 340-1200 meters.	February-April	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Salvia munzii Munz's sage	--/--/2B.2	Known to occur in San Diego county and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and coastal scrub habitats. Elevations range from 115-1065 meters.	February-April	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Senecio aphanactis chaparral ragwort	--/--/2B.2	Known to occur in Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Los Angeles, Merced, Monterey, Orange, Riverside, Santa Barbara, San Benito, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Santa Catalina Island, Santa Cruz Island, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Solano, Santa Rosa Island, and Ventura counties and Baja California.	Sometimes alkaline soils. Chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub. Elevations from 15-800 meters.	January-April	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Sphaerocarpos drewiae bottle liverwort	--/--/1B.1	Known to occur in Riverside and San Diego counties and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and coastal scrub habitats. Elevations range from 115-1065 meters.	Year-round	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Stemodia durantifolia purple stemodia	--/--/2B.1	Known to occur in Riverside and San Diego counties and Baja California.	Found in Sonoran desert scrub (often mesic, sandy) habitat. Elevations range from 180-300 meters.	April-December	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Suaeda esteroa estuary seablite	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Ventura counties, and Baja California.	Found in marshes and swamps (coastal salt). Elevations range from 0-5 meters.	March-October	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area.
Tetracoccus dioicus Parry's tetracoccus	--/--/1B.2	Known to occur in Orange, Riverside, and San Diego counties and Baja California.	Found in chaparral and coastal scrub habitats. Elevations range from 165-1000 meters.	April-May	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
ANIMALS					
Amphibians					

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Anaxyrus californicus Arroyo toad	FE/CSC/--	From Monterey County south to San Diego County.	Riparian habitats with a shallow, exposed bank, slow current, and sandy or gravelly substrate. The most favorable breeding habitat for arroyo toads consists of slow-moving streams with shallow pools, nearby sandbars, and adjacent stream terraces. Outside of the breeding season, arroyo toads are essentially terrestrial and are known to use a variety of upland habitats including but not limited to: sycamore-cottonwood woodlands, oak woodlands, coastal sage scrub, chaparral, and grassland.	March – July	**No,** appropriate riverine conditions were not observed during the survey.
Spea hammondii western spadefoot toad	--/CSC/--	Known to occur from the north end of California's great central valley near Redding, south, east of the Sierras and the deserts, into northwest Baja California.	Mostly below 3,000 feet in elevation. Their aquatic habitat is vernal pools, temporary wetlands, rivers creeks, or temporary rain pools. Their terrestrial habitat is typically lowland habitats such as washes, river floodplains, alluvial fans, playas, alkali flats, foothills, or mountains. They prefer sandy or gravelly soil with open vegetation and short grasses (often in valley and foothill grasslands, open chaparral, and pine-oak woodland) (Butte HCP, 2011).	November-March	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within those observed on the Study Area.
Birds					
Buteo swainsoni Swainson's hawk	--/CT/--	In California, breeds in the Central Valley, Klamath Basin, Northeastern Plateau, Lassen County, and Mojave Desert. Very limited breeding reported from Lanfair Valley, Owens Valley, Fish Lake Valley, Antelope Valley, and in eastern San Luis Obispo County.	Breeds in stands with few trees in juniper-sage flats, riparian areas, and in oak savannah. Requires adjacent suitable foraging areas such as grasslands, alfalfa, or grain fields supporting rodent populations.	March – October	**No,** suitable foraging habitat was not observed during the survey.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Empidonax traillii extimus southwestern willow flycatcher	FE/CE/--	Kern, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Santa Barbara counties. Breeding range occurs in California south of the Santa Ynez River.	Breeds in dense riparian habitats along rivers, streams, or other wetlands. The vegetation can be dominated by dense growths of willows or other shrubs and medium-sized trees. There may be an overstory of cottonwood, tamarisk, or other large trees. One of the most important characteristics of the habitat appears to be the presence of dense vegetation, usually throughout all vegetation layers present. Almost all Southwestern Willow Flycatcher breeding habitats are within close proximity (less than 60 feet) of water or very saturated soil. This water may be in the form of large rivers, smaller streams, springs, or marshes.	April-September	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the riparian habitat of the Study Area.
Polioptila californica californica Coastal California gnatcatcher	FT/CSC/--	Occurs in coastal southern California south of Los Angeles. Also known to occur in Mexico.	Prefers coastal sage scrub, but is occasionally found in chaparral, riparian and grassland habitats adjacent to coastal sage scrub.	March - August	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral areas observed on the Study Area.
Vireo bellii pusillus least Bell's vireo	FE/CE/--	Known to occur in Butte, Fresno, Imperial, Inyo, Kern, Los Angeles, Mariposa, Merced, Monterey, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Benito, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba counties. However some counties only have one occurrence.	Summer resident of Southern California in low riparian in vicinity of water or in dry river bottoms; below 2000 ft. Nests placed along margins of bushes or on twigs projecting into pathways, usually willow, Baccharis, mesquite. Found in riparian forest, riparian scrub, and riparian woodland.	All Year	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the riparian habitat of the Study Area.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Setophaga petechia yellow warbler	--/CSC/--	Extends from southern California, north along the coast into northern California counties, from Mendocino to Lassen, and in the eastern counties. Sparse populations occur within the Central Valley.	Relatively low, open-canopy riparian woodlands (willow-cottonwood) or in montane chaparral situations in open conifer forest. In migration, it visits woodland, forests and shrublands.	Year round	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area
Icteria virens yellow-breasted chat	-/CSC/-	Erratic and localized in occurrence. Common along western edge of southern deserts, in Santa Clara Co. and on coastal slope from Monterey Co. south; uncommon in foothills surrounding Central Valley. Winters in southern coastal lowlands, Colorado River Valley; and in Northern California in small numbers.	Nests in dense riparian habitats. Typical N CA habitats include valley foothill hardwood and valley foothill hardwood-conifer.	March - August	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area
Campylorhynchus brunneicapilus sandiegensis Coastal cactus wren	-/CSC/-	Coastal populations of the Cactus Wren occur from southern Ventura county, southeast to the Baldwin Hills and the Palos Verdes Peninsula in Los Angeles County, and east along the southern flank of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains from the northern San Fernando Valley in Los Angeles County to Mentone in San Bernardino County. Populations also extend south along the coastal slopes and interior valleys west of the Peninsular ranges in western Riverside, Orange, and San Diego counties to extreme northwestern Baja California, Mexico, in the vicinity of Tijuana and Valle de las Palmas	Coastal populations of the Cactus Wren are obligate inhabitants of coastal sage scrub, a natural vegetation community of low, semi-woody vegetation found only in coastal and near-coastal portions of the state, generally below 3000 ft.. While some coastal birds have been observed using riparian woodland areas below 2000 ft., it is unlikely that this habitat type is used for nesting.	All Year	**No,** appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area
Agelaius tricolor Tricolored blackbird	--/CT, CSC/--	California and Baja California, Mexico.	Nests in dense thickets of cattails, tules, willow, blackberry, wild rose, and other tall herbs near fresh water.	All Year	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area
Invertebrates					

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Branchinecta sandiegonensis San Diego fairy shrimp	FE/--/--	The February 3, 1997, listing rule states that San Diego fairy shrimp were known to inhabit a minimum of 25 vernal pool complexes in coastal areas of San Diego, Orange, and Santa Barbara counties, and northwestern Baja California, Mexico (62 FR 4925).	San Diego fairy shrimp are generally restricted to vernal pools and other non-vegetated ephemeral (i.e., containing water a short time) basins 2 to 12 inches in depth in coastal southern California and northwestern Baja California, Mexico.	Consult Agency	**No,** appropriate ephemeral conditions were not observed during the survey.
Lycaena hermes Hermes copper butterfly	FC/--/--	The Hermes copper ranges over 150 miles, from the vicinity of Fallbrook in northern San Diego County south to near Santo Tomás in Baja California, Mexico.	Found in coastal sage scrub and southern mixed chaparral habitats. Eggs are lain on the spiny redberry (*Rhamnus crocea*). Adults feed almost exclusively on nectar from California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*). For unknown reasons, the butterfly is restricted to only a small portion of the redberry range. It generally appears to utilize redberry stands growing in deeper, well-drained soils of canyon bottoms and north-facing hillsides, with host and nectar plants intermixed or in close proximity.	Consult Agency	**Yes,** the host plant for this species, the spiny redberry, was observed within the Study Area (not on the Property)
Danus plexippus Monarch butterfly	FC/--/--	Known to occur in Mexico and north America. Populations that occur where winter conditions are not suitable travel along well-established migratory routes to overwintering areas. Overwintering sites are known to occur in Mexico and coastal California.	Migratory populations begin migration in the fall and can be found along established migratory routes where nectar sources are available. During breeding (typically February to March), monarch butterflies require milkweed to lay their eggs on. Overwintering monarchs require sites with sufficient roosts for the population (such as eucalyptus trees) that provide appropriate sunlight and shelter from the wind. Where climate is suitable for year round habitation, monarchs are found in areas with nectar sources and milkweed as breeding can occur year round.	Year round	**Yes,** A monarch butterfly was observed during the survey. Milkweeds were not observed during the survey.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Euphydryas editha quino Quino checkerspot butterfly	FE/--/--	This species is currently known only from western Riverside County, southern San Diego County, and northern Baja California, Mexico.	Adults tend to occur in barren spots amidst low growing vegetation and avoid densely wooded areas and other types of closed canopy vegetation. Common host plant in this part of San Diego County is *Plantago erecta*,. *Plantago erecta* occurs in southern California within annual forbland, scrub, grassland, and open chaparral plant communities. It can be found on soils with or without cryptogamic crusts (a thin organic crust composed of cyanobacteria, lichens, mosses, and fungi), and is often associated with fine-textured clay soils.	Consult Agency	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area
Mammals					
Lasiurus blossevillii western red bat	--/CSC/--	Occurs from Shasta County to the Mexican border, west of the Sierra Nevada/Cascade crest and deserts.	The winter range includes western lowlands and coastal regions south of San Francisco Bay. Roosting habitat includes forests and woodlands from sea level up through mixed conifer forests. Roosts primarily in trees (less often in shrubs) along the edge of habitats adjacent to streams, fields or urban areas. Foraging habitats occurs in open areas. They may be found in unusual habitats during migration.	Year Round (spring migrations March to May AND autumn migrations September to October)	**No**, appropriate roosting habitat is not found within the Study Area
Lasiurus xanthihus western yellow bat	--/CSC/--	The western yellow bat is uncommon in California, known only in Los Angeles and San Bernardino Cos. south to the Mexican border.	This species has been recorded below 600 m (2000 ft) in valley foothill riparian, desert riparian, desert wash, and palm oasis habitats.	All Year	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the riparian habitat within the Study Area.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Corynorhinus townsendii Townsend's big-eared bat	--/CSC/--	Known to occur throughout California, excluding subalpine and alpine habitats. Its range extends through Mexico to British Columbia and the Rocky Mountain states. Also occurs in several regions of the central Appalachians.	Requires caves, mines, tunnels, buildings, or other cave analog structures such as hallowed out redwoods for roosting. Hibernation sites must be cold, but above freezing.	Year-round	**No**, appropriate roosting habitat is not found within the Study Area
Antrozous pallidus pallid bat	--/CSC/--	Locally common species at low elevations. It occurs throughout California except for the high Sierra Nevada from Shasta to Kern counties, and the northwestern corner of the state from Del Norte and western Siskiyou counties to northern Mendocino county.	Habitats occupied include grasslands, shrublands, woodlands, and forests from sea level up through mixed conifer forests, generally below 2,000 meters. The species is most common in open, dry habitats with rocky areas for roosting. Roosts also include cliffs, abandoned buildings, bird boxes, under exfoliating bark, and under bridges.	Year-round	**No**, appropriate roosting habitat is not found within the Study Area
Eumops perotis californicus *western mastiff bat*	--/CSC/--	From central California, southward to central Mexico. In California, they have been recorded from Butte County southward in the western lowlands through the southern California coastal basins and the western portions of the southeastern desert region.	Favor rugged, rocky areas where suitable crevices are available for day-roosts. Characteristically, day-roosts are located in large cracks in exfoliating slabs of granite or sandstone.	All year	**No**, appropriate roosting habitat is not found within the Study Area
Nyctinomops macrotis big free-tailed bat	--/CSC/--	Rare in California. Records of the species are from urban areas of San Diego Co., and vagrants found in fall and winter. A probable vagrant was collected in Alameda Co., but this record is suspect.	Big free-tailed bats in other areas prefer rugged, rocky terrain. Found to 2500 m (8000 ft) in New Mexico, southern Arizona, and Texas. Roosts in buildings, caves, and occasionally in holes in trees. Also roosts in crevices in high cliffs or rock outcrop. Probably does not breed in California.	May - September	**No**, appropriate roosting habitat is not found within the Study Area
Nyctinomops femorosaccus pocketed free-tailed bat	--/CSC/--	It inhabits the southwestern United States and northwestern Mexico. The bat has been seen in southern Arizona, southern California, southeastern New Mexico, western Texas, and into Mexico to the state of Michoacan.	Pocketed Free-tailed Bats are primarily desert bats, found in the southwestern United States and western Mexico. They roost in crevices of cliffs and rocky outgroups, in groups numbering up to about 100 individuals.	All year	**No**, appropriate roosting habitat is not found within the Study Area

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Lepus californicus bennettii San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit	--/CSC/--	Ranges from Los Padres National Forest southward and west of the peninsular range into northwestern Baja California, Mexico	Preferred habitats include open grasslands, agricultural fields, and sparse coastal scrub. Not typically found in high grass or dense brush. Nesting sites are generally under bushes or shrubs that have shallow depressions and are occasionally lined with fur.	All year	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area
Chaetodipus californicus femoralis Dulzura pocket mouse	--/CSC/--	Common resident of sandy herbaceous areas, usually in association with rocks or course gravel in southwestern California. In San Diego Co., occurs mainly in arid coastal and desert border areas. Range also includes portions of Riverside and San Bernardino cos.	Elevational range is from sea level to 1350 m (4500 ft) (Santa Rosa Mts., Riverside Co.) and 1800 m (6000 ft) (Cactus Flat, north slope San Bernardino Mts.). Habitats of the San Diego pocket mouse include coastal scrub, chamise-redshank chaparral, mixed chaparral, sagebrush, desert wash, desert scrub, desert succulent shrub, pinyon-juniper, and annual grassland.	All Year	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Neotoma lepida intermedia San Diego desert woodrat	--/CSC/--	It is found in northeastern California in Great Basin areas of eastern Modoc Co. to southeastern Lassen Co. Inhabits virtually all of southern California, with range extending northward along the coast to Monterey Co., and along the Coast Range to San Francisco Bay. In southeastern California, found from southern Mono Co. south throughout the Mojave Desert and from north-central Tulare Co. south through the Tehachapi and San Bernardino Mts.	Common to abundant in Joshua tree, pinyon-juniper, mixed and chamise-redshank chaparral, sagebrush, and most desert habitats. Also found in a variety of other habitats. Most abundant in rocky areas with Joshua trees. Elevational range from sea level to 2600 m (8500 ft). Northern and elevational distribution may be limited by temperature	All Year	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Taxidea taxus American badger	--/CSC/--	Found throughout most of California in suitable habitat.	Suitable habitat occurs in the drier open stages of most shrub, forest, and herbaceous habitats with friable soils. Badgers are generally associated with treeless regions, prairies, parklands, and cold desert areas.	All Year	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Reptiles					
Emys marmorata western pond turtle	--/CSC/--	Distribution ranges from Washington to northern Baja California.	Inhabit rivers, streams, lakes, ponds, reservoirs, stock ponds, and permanent wetland habitats with basking sites.	Year-round	**No**, appropriate habitat to provide a permanently wet condition was not found within the Study Area
Anniella stenninsi Southern legless lizard	--/CSC/--	Found throughout Southern California south of the Transverse Ranges into northern Baja California, Mexico	Occurs in moist warm loose soil with plant cover. Moisture is essential. Occurs in sparsely vegetated areas of beach dunes, chaparral, pine-oak woodlands, desert scrub, sandy washes, and stream terraces with sycamores, cottonwoods, or oaks. Leaf litter under trees and bushes in sunny areas and dunes stabilized with bush lupine and mock heather often indicate suitable habitat. Often can be found under surface objects such as rocks, boards, driftwood, and logs.	All Year	**No**, appropriate habitat to provide mesic conditions was not found within the Study Area
Phrynosoma blainvillii coast horned lizard	--/CSC/--	Found in parts of the historical range spanning from the Baja California border west of the deserts and Sierra Nevada, north to the Bay Area and inland as far north as the Shasta Reservoir. Onto the Kern Plateau east of the crest of the Sierra Nevada.	Open areas of sandy soil and low vegetation in valleys, foothills, and semiarid mountains. Also grasslands, coniferous forests, woodlands, and chaparral, with open patches of loose soil. Also lowlands along sandy washes with scattered shrubs and along dirt roads or near ant hills.	Spring-Early Fall	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.
Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegri Coastal whiptail	--/CSC/--	This subspecies is found in coastal Southern California, mostly west of the Peninsular Ranges and south of the Transverse Ranges, and north into Ventura County. Ranges south into Baja California.	Found in a variety of ecosystems, primarily hot and dry open areas with sparse foliage - chaparral, woodland, and riparian areas.	May-August	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the chaparral habitat within the Study Area.

SCIENTIFIC NAME COMMON NAME	FEDERAL/STATE /CNPS LIST	DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	PERIOD OF IDENTIFICATION	POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN STUDY AREA
Masticophis fuliginosus Baja California coachwhip	--/CSC/--	Occurs in California only in a small area of southern San Diego County limited to 6 miles (10km) north of the Baja California border	A habitat generalist in Baja California, inhabiting scrub, coastal sand dunes, rocky arroyos, thorn forests, marshlands, and sandy flats. In California, found mainly in open areas such as grassland, shrubland, and coastal sand dunes.	April- August	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area
Thamnophis hammondii Two-striped gartersnake	--/CSC/--	Ranges continuously from near Salinas in Monterey County south along the coast mostly west of the south Coast Ranges, to southern California where it ranges east through the Transverse Ranges, and south through the coastal area and the Peninsular Ranges into northern Baja California. Occurs in some perennial desert slope streams north of the Transverse Ranges and east of the Peninsular Ranges, and into the Mohave Desert in Victorville. Also occurs on Catalina Island.	Among the most aquatic of the gartersnakes. Generally found near water sources - pools, creeks, cattle tanks, and others, often in rocky areas. Associated vegetation: oak woodland, willow, coastal sage scrub, scrub oak, sparse pine, chaparral, and brushland.	Late March-October	**Yes,** suitable habitat may be found within the riparian habitat within the Study Area.
Crotalus ruber Red-diamond rattlesnake	--/CSC/--	Found in southwestern California, from the Morongo Valley west to the coast and south along the peninsular ranges to mid Baja California.	Inhabits arid scrub, coastal chaparral, oak and pine woodlands, rocky grassland, cultivated areas. On the desert slopes of the mountains, it ranges into rocky desert flats.	July-September	**No**, appropriate habitat is not found within the Study Area

STATUS CODES:

FEDERAL: United States Fish and Wildlife Service
- FE Federally Endangered
- FT Federally Threatened
- FC Candidate for Federal Listing

STATE: California Department of Fish and Game
- CE California Listed Endangered
- CT California Listed Threatened
- CSC California Species of Special Concern

CNPS: California Native Plant Society (California Rare Plant Rank [CRPR])
- 1A Plants Presumed Extinct in California
- 1B Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California and Elsewhere
- 2B Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California, But More Common Elsewhere
- 3 Plants About Which We Need More Information – A Review List
- 4 Plants of Limited Distribution – A Watch List

CNPS Threat Ranks:
- 0.1 Seriously Threatened in California (Over 80% of occurrences threatened/high degree and immediacy of threat)
- 0.2 Fairly Threatened in California (20-80% occurrences threatened/moderate degree and immediacy of threat)
- 0.3 Not Very Threatened in California (<20% of occurrences threatened/low degree and immediacy of threat or no current threats known)

4.0 REFERENCES

Baldwin, et. al., 2012. The Jepson Manual: Vascular Plants of California, 2nd edition. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), 2016. Rarefind 5, Occurrence Details Occurrence Number 549 OGG16F0005. Available online at: https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/rarefind/view/RareFind.aspx. Accessed November 2021.

CDFW, 2018. Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities. Available online at: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959&inline. Accessed September 2020.

CDFW, 2021. California Natural Diversity Database: RareFind 5, Version 5.2.14. Available online at: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB. Accessed October 2021.

CNPS, 2021. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants. California Native Plant Society. Available online at: http://www.cnps.org/inventory. Accessed October 2021.

NRCS, 2021. Web Soil Survey, National Cooperative Soil Survey. Available online at: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/Home-Page.htm. Accessed September 2020

USFWS, 2021a. Official Species List for Jamul. Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. Available online at: https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/. Accessed October 2021.

USFWS, 2021b. Critical Habitat for Threatened and Endangered Species [USFWS]. Available online at: https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html. Accessed October 2021.

ATTACHMENTS


ATTACHMENT A

MAPS




SOURCE: ESRI, 2021; AES-Montrose, 11/3/2021

Figure 1
Regional Location




SOURCE: "Dulzura, CA" USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle,
T17S R1E, Unsectioned Area of Dulzura, San Bernardino Baseline & Meridian;
ESRI, 2021; AES-Montrose, 11/3/2021

Figure 2
Site and Vicinity



SOURCE: USGS NAIP aerial photograph, 4/25/2020; ESRI, 2021; AES-Montrose, 11/3/2021

Figure 3
Aerial Photograph



SOURCE: FWS National Wetland Inventory, 2021; USGS NAIP aerial photograph, 4/25/2020; USGS National Hydrography Dataset, 2021; ESRI, 2021; AES-Montrose, 11/3/2021

Figure 4
Habitat Types

ATTACHMENT B

Species SEARCH RESULTS

Selected Elements by Element Code

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

California Natural Diversity Database

Query Criteria: Quad IS (Dulzura (3211667) OR Jamul Mountains (3211668))

Element Code	Species	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
AAABB01230	***Anaxyrus californicus*** arroyo toad	Endangered	None	G2G3	S2S3	SSC
AAABF02020	***Spea hammondii*** western spadefoot	None	None	G2G3	S3	SSC
ABNFD01020	***Phalacrocorax auritus*** double-crested cormorant	None	None	G5	S4	WL
ABNKC12040	***Accipiter cooperii*** Cooper's hawk	None	None	G5	S4	WL
ABNKC19070	***Buteo swainsoni*** Swainson's hawk	None	Threatened	G5	S3	
ABPAE33043	***Empidonax traillii extimus*** southwestern willow flycatcher	Endangered	Endangered	G5T2	S1	
ABPAT02011	***Eremophila alpestris actia*** California horned lark	None	None	G5T4Q	S4	WL
ABPBG02095	***Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus sandiegensis*** coastal cactus wren	None	None	G5T3Q	S3	SSC
ABPBJ08081	***Polioptila californica californica*** coastal California gnatcatcher	Threatened	None	G4G5T3Q	S2	SSC
ABPBW01114	***Vireo bellii pusillus*** least Bell's vireo	Endangered	Endangered	G5T2	S2	
ABPBX03010	***Setophaga petechia*** yellow warbler	None	None	G5	S3S4	SSC
ABPBX24010	***Icteria virens*** yellow-breasted chat	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
ABPBX91091	***Aimophila ruficeps canescens*** southern California rufous-crowned sparrow	None	None	G5T3	S3	WL
ABPBX97021	***Artemisiospiza belli belli*** Bell's sage sparrow	None	None	G5T2T3	S3	WL
ABPBXB0020	***Agelaius tricolor*** tricolored blackbird	None	Threatened	G1G2	S1S2	SSC
AMACC01020	***Myotis yumanensis*** Yuma myotis	None	None	G5	S4	
AMACC01070	***Myotis evotis*** long-eared myotis	None	None	G5	S3	
AMACC01140	***Myotis ciliolabrum*** western small-footed myotis	None	None	G5	S3	
AMACC05030	***Lasiurus cinereus*** hoary bat	None	None	G3G4	S4	
AMACC05060	***Lasiurus blossevillii*** western red bat	None	None	G4	S3	SSC

Element Code	Species	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
AMACC05070	***Lasiurus xanthinus*** western yellow bat	None	None	G4G5	S3	SSC
AMACC08010	***Corynorhinus townsendii*** Townsend's big-eared bat	None	None	G4	S2	SSC
AMACC10010	***Antrozous pallidus*** pallid bat	None	None	G4	S3	SSC
AMACD02011	***Eumops perotis californicus*** western mastiff bat	None	None	G4G5T4	S3S4	SSC
AMACD04010	***Nyctinomops femorosaccus*** pocketed free-tailed bat	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
AMACD04020	***Nyctinomops macrotis*** big free-tailed bat	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
AMAEB03051	***Lepus californicus bennettii*** San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit	None	None	G5T3T4	S3S4	SSC
AMAFD05021	***Chaetodipus californicus femoralis*** Dulzura pocket mouse	None	None	G5T3	S3	SSC
AMAFF08041	***Neotoma lepida intermedia*** San Diego desert woodrat	None	None	G5T3T4	S3S4	SSC
AMAJF04010	***Taxidea taxus*** American badger	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
ARAAD02030	***Emys marmorata*** western pond turtle	None	None	G3G4	S3	SSC
ARACC01060	***Anniella stebbinsi*** Southern California legless lizard	None	None	G3	S3	SSC
ARACF12100	***Phrynosoma blainvillii*** coast horned lizard	None	None	G3G4	S3S4	SSC
ARACH01114	***Plestiodon skiltonianus interparietalis*** Coronado skink	None	None	G5T5	S2S3	WL
ARACJ02060	***Aspidoscelis hyperythra*** orange-throated whiptail	None	None	G5	S2S3	WL
ARACJ02143	***Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri*** coastal whiptail	None	None	G5T5	S3	SSC
ARADB1001A	***Diadophis punctatus similis*** San Diego ringneck snake	None	None	G5T4Q	S2?	
ARADB21026	***Masticophis fuliginosus*** Baja California coachwhip	None	None	G5	S1S2	SSC
ARADB36160	***Thamnophis hammondii*** two-striped gartersnake	None	None	G4	S3S4	SSC
ARADE02090	***Crotalus ruber*** red-diamond rattlesnake	None	None	G4	S3	SSC
CTT44322CA	***San Diego Mesa Claypan Vernal Pool*** San Diego Mesa Claypan Vernal Pool	None	None	G2	S2.1	

Element Code	Species	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
CTT61310CA	***Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest*** Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	None	None	G4	S4	
CTT83230CA	***Southern Interior Cypress Forest*** Southern Interior Cypress Forest	None	None	G2	S2.1	
ICBRA03060	***Branchinecta sandiegonensis*** San Diego fairy shrimp	Endangered	None	G2	S2	
IICOLX8010	***Deltaspis ivae*** marsh-elder long-horned beetle	None	None	G1	S1	
IIHYM24480	***Bombus crotchii*** Crotch bumble bee	None	None	G3G4	S1S2	
IILEPC1160	***Lycaena hermes*** Hermes copper butterfly	Proposed Threatened	None	G1	S1	
IILEPE2150	***Callophrys thornei*** Thorne's hairstreak	None	None	G1	S2	
IILEPK405L	***Euphydryas editha quino*** quino checkerspot butterfly	Endangered	None	G5T1T2	S1S2	
NBHEP35030	***Sphaerocarpos drewiae*** bottle liverwort	None	None	G1	S1	1B.1
PDAPI0Z042	***Eryngium aristulatum var. parishii*** San Diego button-celery	Endangered	Endangered	G5T1	S1	1B.1
PDAST0C0M0	***Ambrosia pumila*** San Diego ambrosia	Endangered	None	G1	S1	1B.1
PDAST0S160	***Artemisia palmeri*** San Diego sagewort	None	None	G3?	S3?	4.2
PDAST2M025	***Corethrogyne filaginifolia var. incana*** San Diego sand aster	None	None	G4T1Q	S1	1B.1
PDAST3L0C1	***Ericameria palmeri var. palmeri*** Palmer's goldenbush	None	None	G4T2?	S2	1B.1
PDAST470D4	***Grindelia hallii*** San Diego gumplant	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
PDAST4R070	***Deinandra conjugens*** Otay tarplant	Threatened	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
PDAST4R0B0	***Deinandra floribunda*** Tecate tarplant	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
PDAST50010	***Ambrosia monogyra*** singlewhorl burrobrush	None	None	G5	S2	2B.2
PDAST57091	***Isocoma menziesii var. decumbens*** decumbent goldenbush	None	None	G3G5T2T3	S2	1B.2
PDAST580A0	***Iva hayesiana*** San Diego marsh-elder	None	None	G3	S2	2B.2
PDAST5L0A1	***Lasthenia glabrata ssp. coulteri*** Coulter's goldfields	None	None	G4T2	S2	1B.1

Element Code	Species	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
PDAST8H060	***Senecio aphanactis*** chaparral ragwort	None	None	G3	S2	2B.2
PDAST8H1F0	***Packera ganderi*** Gander's ragwort	None	Rare	G2	S2	1B.2
PDBOR0H010	***Harpagonella palmeri*** Palmer's grapplinghook	None	None	G4	S3	4.2
PDBRA1M114	***Lepidium virginicum var. robinsonii*** Robinson's pepper-grass	None	None	G5T3	S3	4.3
PDBRA2G060	***Streptanthus bernardinus*** Laguna Mountains jewelflower	None	None	G3G4	S3S4	4.3
PDCAC08060	***Ferocactus viridescens*** San Diego barrel cactus	None	None	G3?	S2S3	2B.1
PDCAC0D2Y1	***Cylindropuntia californica var. californica*** snake cholla	None	None	G3T2	S1	1B.1
PDCHE041C0	***Atriplex pacifica*** south coast saltscale	None	None	G4	S2	1B.2
PDCHE0P0D0	***Suaeda esteroa*** estuary seablite	None	None	G3	S2	1B.2
PDCRA040R0	***Dudleya variegata*** variegated dudleya	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
PDERI040Y0	***Arctostaphylos otayensis*** Otay manzanita	None	None	G1	S1	1B.2
PDERI0B011	***Comarostaphylis diversifolia ssp. diversifolia*** summer holly	None	None	G3T2	S2	1B.2
PDEUP1C010	***Tetracoccus dioicus*** Parry's tetracoccus	None	None	G2G3	S2	1B.2
PDFAB0F2R0	***Astragalus deanei*** Dean's milk-vetch	None	None	G1	S1	1B.1
PDFAB0F6B0	***Astragalus oocarpus*** San Diego milk-vetch	None	None	G2?	S2?	1B.2
PDFAG050D0	***Quercus dumosa*** Nuttall's scrub oak	None	None	G3	S3	1B.1
PDFAG05650	***Quercus cedrosensis*** Cedros Island oak	None	None	G3	S1	2B.2
PDGRO02070	***Ribes canthariforme*** Moreno currant	None	None	G2	S2	1B.3
PDHYD0A0H0	***Nama stenocarpa*** mud nama	None	None	G4G5	S1S2	2B.2
PDLAM01010	***Acanthomintha ilicifolia*** San Diego thorn-mint	Threatened	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
PDLAM08030	***Clinopodium chandleri*** San Miguel savory	None	None	G3	S2	1B.2

Element Code	Species	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
PDLAM0V040	***Lepechinia ganderi*** Gander's pitcher sage	None	None	G3	S3	1B.3
PDLAM180A2	***Monardella hypoleuca ssp. lanata*** felt-leaved monardella	None	None	G4T3	S3	1B.2
PDLAM1S140	***Salvia munzii*** Munz's sage	None	None	G2	S2	2B.2
PDOLE040K0	***Fraxinus parryi*** chaparral ash	None	None	G3?	S1	2B.2
PDONA050D0	***Clarkia delicata*** delicate clarkia	None	None	G3	S3	1B.2
PDPGN040K1	***Chorizanthe polygonoides var. longispina*** long-spined spineflower	None	None	G5T3	S3	1B.2
PDPLM0C080	***Navarretia fossalis*** spreading navarretia	Threatened	None	G2	S2	1B.1
PDRAN0H031	***Myosurus minimus ssp. apus*** little mousetail	None	None	G5T2Q	S2	3.1
PDRHA01010	***Adolphia californica*** California adolphia	None	None	G3	S2	2B.1
PDRHA04070	***Ceanothus cyaneus*** Lakeside ceanothus	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
PDRHA04430	***Ceanothus otayensis*** Otay Mountain ceanothus	None	None	G1G2	S1	1B.2
PDROS0W0G0	***Horkelia truncata*** Ramona horkelia	None	None	G3	S3	1B.3
PDRUB0N1V0	***Galium proliferum*** desert bedstraw	None	None	G5	S2	2B.2
PDSCR0J0G0	***Dicranostegia orcuttiana*** Orcutt's bird's-beak	None	None	G2G3	S1	2B.1
PDSCR1U010	***Stemodia durantifolia*** purple stemodia	None	None	G5	S2	2B.1
PDSTE03020	***Fremontodendron mexicanum*** Mexican flannelbush	Endangered	Rare	G2	S1	1B.1
PGCUP040C0	***Hesperocyparis forbesii*** Tecate cypress	None	None	G2	S2	1B.1
PMAGA08070	***Nolina interrata*** Dehesa nolina	None	Endangered	G2	S2	1B.1
PMCYP039J0	***Carex obispoensis*** San Luis Obispo sedge	None	None	G3?	S3?	1B.2
PMLIL0C0B0	***Brodiaea orcuttii*** Orcutt's brodiaea	None	None	G2	S2	1B.1
PMLIL0D0C0	***Calochortus dunnii*** Dunn's mariposa-lily	None	Rare	G2G3	S2S3	1B.2

Element Code	Species	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
PMLIL1H010	***Bloomeria clevelandii*** San Diego goldenstar	None	None	G2	S2	1B.1
PMPOA4G010	***Orcuttia californica*** California Orcutt grass	Endangered	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1

Record Count: 106

Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California

California Native Plant Society

Search Results

55 matches found. Click on scientific name for details

Search Criteria: CRPR is one of [**1A:1B:2A:2B**] , Quad is one of [**3211667:3211668**]

▲ SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	FAMILY	LIFEFORM	BLOOMING PERIOD	FED LIST	STATE LIST	GLOBAL RANK	STATE RANK	CA RARE PLANT RANK	PHOTO
Acanthomintha ilicifolia	San Diego thorn-mint	Lamiaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jun	FT	CE	G1	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Adolphia californica	California adolphia	Rhamnaceae	perennial deciduous shrub	Dec-May	None	None	G3	S2	2B.1	No Photo Available
Ambrosia monogyra	singlewhorl burrobrush	Asteraceae	perennial shrub	Aug-Nov	None	None	G5	S2	2B.2	No Photo Available
Ambrosia pumila	San Diego ambrosia	Asteraceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Apr-Oct	FE	None	G1	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Arctostaphylos otayensis	Otay manzanita	Ericaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	Jan-Apr	None	None	G1	S1	1B.2	No Photo Available
Astragalus deanei	Dean's milk-vetch	Fabaceae	perennial herb	Feb-May	None	None	G1	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Astragalus oocarpus	San Diego milk-vetch	Fabaceae	perennial herb	May-Aug	None	None	G2?	S2?	1B.2	No Photo Available
Atriplex pacifica	south coast saltscale	Chenopodiaceae	annual herb	Mar-Oct	None	None	G4	S2	1B.2	No Photo Available
Bloomeria clevelandii	San Diego goldenstar	Themidaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	Apr-May	None	None	G2	S2	1B.1	No Photo Available
Brodiaea orcuttii	Orcutt's brodiaea	Themidaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	May-Jul	None	None	G2	S2	1B.1	No Photo Available
Calochortus dunnii	Dunn's mariposa-lily	Liliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	(Feb)Apr-Jun	None	CR	G2G3	S2S3	1B.2	No Photo Available
Carex obispoensis	San Luis Obispo sedge	Cyperaceae	perennial cespitose herb	Apr-Jun	None	None	G3?	S3?	1B.2	No Photo Available
Ceanothus cyaneus	Lakeside ceanothus	Rhamnaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	Apr-Jun	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2	No Photo Available

Ceanothus otayensis	Otay Mountain ceanothus	Rhamnaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	Jan-Apr	None	None	G1G2	S1	1B.2	No Photo Available
Chorizanthe polygonoides var. *longispina*	long-spined spineflower	Polygonaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jul	None	None	G5T3	S3	1B.2	No Photo Available
Clarkia delicata	delicate clarkia	Onagraceae	annual herb	Apr-Jun	None	None	G3	S3	1B.2	No Photo Available
Clinopodium chandleri	San Miguel savory	Lamiaceae	perennial shrub	Mar-Jul	None	None	G3	S2	1B.2	No Photo Available
Comarostaphylis diversifolia ssp. *diversifolia*	summer holly	Ericaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	Apr-Jun	None	None	G3T2	S2	1B.2	No Photo Available
Cordylanthus parviflorus	small-flowered bird's-beak	Orobanchaceae	annual herb (hemiparasitic)	Aug-Oct	None	None	G4	S2	2B.3	No Photo Available
Corethrogyne filaginifolia var. *incana*	San Diego sand aster	Asteraceae	perennial herb	Jun-Sep	None	None	G4T1Q	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Cylindropuntia californica var. *californica*	snake cholla	Cactaceae	perennial stem	Apr-May	None	None	G3T2	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Deinandra conjugens	Otay tarplant	Asteraceae	annual herb	(Apr)May-Jun	FT	CE	G1	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Deinandra floribunda	Tecate tarplant	Asteraceae	annual herb	Aug-Oct	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2	No Photo Available
Dicranostegia orcuttiana	Orcutt's bird's-beak	Orobanchaceae	annual herb (hemiparasitic)	(Mar)Apr-Jul(Sep)	None	None	G2G3	S1	2B.1	No Photo Available
Dudleya variegata	variegated dudleya	Crassulaceae	perennial herb	Apr-Jun	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2	No Photo Available
Ericameria palmeri var. *palmeri*	Palmer's goldenbush	Asteraceae	perennial evergreen shrub	(Jul)Sep-Nov	None	None	G4T2?	S2	1B.1	No Photo Available
Eryngium aristulatum var. *parishii*	San Diego button-celery	Apiaceae	annual/perennial herb	Apr-Jun	FE	CE	G5T1	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Ferocactus viridescens	San Diego barrel cactus	Cactaceae	perennial stem	May-Jun	None	None	G3?	S2S3	2B.1	No Photo Available
Fraxinus parryi	chaparral ash	Oleaceae	perennial shrub	Mar-May	None	None	G3?	S1	2B.2	No Photo

										Available
Fremontodendron mexicanum	Mexican flannelbush	Malvaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	Mar-Jun	FE	CR	G2	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Galium proliferum	desert bedstraw	Rubiaceae	annual herb	Mar-Jun	None	None	G5	S2	2B.2	No Photo Available
Grindelia hallii	San Diego gumplant	Asteraceae	perennial herb	May-Oct	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2	No Photo Available
Hesperocyparis forbesii	Tecate cypress	Cupressaceae	perennial evergreen tree		None	None	G2	S2	1B.1	No Photo Available
Horkelia truncata	Ramona horkelia	Rosaceae	perennial herb	May-Jun	None	None	G3	S3	1B.3	No Photo Available
Hosackia crassifolia var. *otayensis*	Otay Mountain lotus	Fabaceae	perennial herb	May-Aug	None	None	G5T1	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Isocoma menziesii var. *decumbens*	decumbent goldenbush	Asteraceae	perennial shrub	Apr-Nov	None	None	G3G5T2T3	S2	1B.2	No Photo Available
Iva hayesiana	San Diego marsh-elder	Asteraceae	perennial herb	Apr-Oct	None	None	G3	S2	2B.2	No Photo Available
Lasthenia glabrata ssp. *coulteri*	Coulter's goldfields	Asteraceae	annual herb	Feb-Jun	None	None	G4T2	S2	1B.1	No Photo Available
Lepechinia ganderi	Gander's pitcher sage	Lamiaceae	perennial shrub	Jun-Jul	None	None	G3	S3	1B.3	No Photo Available
Monardella hypoleuca ssp. *lanata*	felt-leaved monardella	Lamiaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jun-Aug	None	None	G4T3	S3	1B.2	No Photo Available
Nama stenocarpa	mud nama	Namaceae	annual/perennial herb	Jan-Jul	None	None	G4G5	S1S2	2B.2	No Photo Available
Navarretia fossalis	spreading navarretia	Polemoniaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jun	FT	None	G2	S2	1B.1	No Photo Available
Nolina interrata	Dehesa nolina	Ruscaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Jul	None	CE	G2	S2	1B.1	No Photo Available
Orcuttia californica	California Orcutt grass	Poaceae	annual herb	Apr-Aug	FE	CE	G1	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Packera ganderi	Gander's ragwort	Asteraceae	perennial herb	Apr-Jun	None	CR	G2	S2	1B.2	No Photo

										Available
Pogogyne nudiuscula	Otay Mesa mint	Lamiaceae	annual herb	May-Jul	FE	CE	G1	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Quercus cedrosensis	Cedros Island oak	Fagaceae	perennial evergreen tree	Apr-May	None	None	G3	S1	2B.2	No Photo Available
Quercus dumosa	Nuttall's scrub oak	Fagaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	Feb-Apr(May-Aug)	None	None	G3	S3	1B.1	No Photo Available
Ribes canthariforme	Moreno currant	Grossulariaceae	perennial deciduous shrub	Feb-Apr	None	None	G2	S2	1B.3	No Photo Available
Salvia munzii	Munz's sage	Lamiaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	Feb-Apr	None	None	G2	S2	2B.2	No Photo Available
Senecio aphanactis	chaparral ragwort	Asteraceae	annual herb	Jan-Apr(May)	None	None	G3	S2	2B.2	No Photo Available
Sphaerocarpos drewiae	bottle liverwort	Sphaerocarpaceae	ephemeral liverwort		None	None	G1	S1	1B.1	No Photo Available
Stemodia durantifolia	purple stemodia	Plantaginaceae	perennial herb	(Jan)Apr-Dec	None	None	G5	S2	2B.1	No Photo Available
Suaeda esteroa	estuary seablite	Chenopodiaceae	perennial herb	(Jan-May)Jul-Oct	None	None	G3	S2	1B.2	No Photo Available
Tetracoccus dioicus	Parry's tetracoccus	Picrodendraceae	perennial deciduous shrub	Apr-May	None	None	G2G3	S2	1B.2	No Photo Available

Showing 1 to 55 of 55 entries

Suggested Citation:

California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program. 2021. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v9-01 1.0). Website https://www.rareplants.cnps.org [accessed 25 October 2021].

Copyright © 2010-2021 California Native Plant Society. All rights reserved.


Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species [USFWS]

Final Linear Features

Final Polygon Features

Proposed Linear Features

Proposed Polygon Features



A specific geographic area(s) that contains features essential for the conservation of a threatened or endangered species and that may require special management and protection.

SanGIS, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, USGS, METI/NASA, EPA, USDA | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | The data found in this file were developed by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service field offices. For more information please refer to the species level metadata found with the individual shapefiles. The ECOS Joint Development Team is responsible for creating and serving this conglomerate file. No data alterations are made by ECOS.

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish And Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue - Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7385
Phone: (760) 431-9440 Fax: (760) 431-5901
http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/

In Reply Refer To: October 26, 2021
Consultation Code: 08ECAR00-2022-SLI-0088
Event Code: 08ECAR00-2022-E-00210
Project Name: Jamul

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, and proposed species, designated critical habitat, and candidate species that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 *et seq.*), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm; http://www.towerkill.com; and http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List

Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Carlsbad Fish And Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue - Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7385
(760) 431-9440

Project Summary

Consultation Code: 08ECAR00-2022-SLI-0088
Event Code: Some(08ECAR00-2022-E-00210)
Project Name: Jamul
Project Type: DEVELOPMENT
Project Description: Development
Project Location:

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/@32.7032625,-116.87235928804115,14z



Counties: San Diego County, California

Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 10 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries[1], as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

---

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Birds

NAME	STATUS
California Condor *Gymnogyps californianus* Population: U.S.A. only, except where listed as an experimental population There is **final** critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8193	Endangered
Coastal California Gnatcatcher *Polioptila californica californica* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8178	Threatened
Least Bell's Vireo *Vireo bellii pusillus* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5945	Endangered
Southwestern Willow Flycatcher *Empidonax traillii extimus* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6749	Endangered

Insects

NAME	STATUS
Monarch Butterfly *Danaus plexippus* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743	Candidate
Quino Checkerspot Butterfly *Euphydryas editha quino (=E. e. wrighti)* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5900	Endangered

Flowering Plants

NAME	STATUS
Mexican Flannelbush *Fremontodendron mexicanum* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7495	Endangered
Otay Tarplant *Deinandra (=Hemizonia) conjugens* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5687	Threatened
San Diego Ambrosia *Ambrosia pumila* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8287	Endangered
San Diego Thornmint *Acanthomintha ilicifolia* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/351	Threatened

Critical habitats

There is 1 critical habitat wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction.

NAME	STATUS
Hermes Copper Butterfly *Lycaena hermes* For information on why this critical habitat appears for your project, even though Hermes Copper Butterfly is not on the list of potentially affected species at this location, contact the local field office. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4379#crithab	Proposed

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

National Wetlands Inventory

Jamul Ecological Reserve



November 3, 2021

Wetlands

- Estuarine and Marine Deepwater
- Estuarine and Marine Wetland
- Freshwater Emergent Wetland
- Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland
- Freshwater Pond
- Lake
- Other
- Riverine

This map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is not responsible for the accuracy or currentness of the base data shown on this map. All wetlands related data should be used in accordance with the layer metadata found on the Wetlands Mapper web site.

Appendix C

Biological Resources Assessment for the Slee Property on Honey Springs Road, Jamul, California

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT
FOR THE
SLEE PROPERTY ON HONEY SPRINGS ROAD, JAMUL, CALIFORNIA



November 17, 2022

Prepared by:

G.O. Graening, PhD and Tim Nosal, MS
Natural Investigations Company, Inc.
3104 O Street, #221, Sacramento, CA 95816

NATURAL INVESTIGATIONS CO.
WWW.NATURALINVESTIGATIONS.COM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 2
1.1. PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION 2
1.2. SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT 2
1.3. REGULATORY SETTING 2
1.3.1. Special-status Species Regulations 2
1.3.2. Water Resource Protection 3
2. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING 5
3. METHODOLOGY 5
3.1. PRELIMINARY DATA GATHERING AND RESEARCH 5
3.2. FIELD SURVEY 5
3.3. MAPPING AND OTHER ANALYSES 6
4. RESULTS 7
4.1. VEGETATION COMMUNITIES AND WILDLIFE HABITAT TYPES 7
4.1.1. Terrestrial Vegetation Communities 7
4.1.2. Wildlife Habitat Types 7
4.1.3. Critical Habitat and Special-status Habitat 7
4.1.4. Habitat Plans and Wildlife Corridors 7
4.2. LISTED SPECIES AND OTHER SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES 7
4.2.1. Reported Occurrences of Listed Species and Other Special-status Species 8
4.2.2. Listed Species or Special-status Species Observed During Field Survey 9
4.2.3. Potential for Listed Species or Special-status Species to Occur in the Study Area 9
4.3. POTENTIALLY-JURISDICTIONAL WATER RESOURCES 9
5. REFERENCES 10
EXHIBITS ..... A
APPENDIX 1: USFWS SPECIES LIST ..... B
APPENDIX 2: SITE PHOTOS C
APPENDIX 3: SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES TABLE AND POTENTIAL TO OCCUR ..... D

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

A biological resources assessment was conducted on the "Slee Property," located on Honey Springs Road in Jamul, California. The unaddressed, 4-acre property consists of two, 2-acre parcels: APN 600-01-04 and APN 600- 01-05 (see Exhibits). For this assessment, the Study Area was defined as the entire 4-acre property. The Slee Property is proposed as part of a land exchange between CDFW and the Jamul Indian Village (the Project). The Slee Property would be transferred from the Jamul Indian Village to CDFW and then preserved as part of the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area, which is adjacent to the site. No physical improvements or land disturbance is proposed as part of the Project and thus there would be no physical environmental impacts.

1.2. SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT

This assessment provides information about the biological resources within the Study Area, and the regulatory environment affecting such resources. As no physical changes to the Slee Property are proposed there would be no impacts and no need for mitigation. The specific scope of services performed for this assessment consisted of the following tasks:

- Compile all readily-available historical biological resource information about the Study Area;
- Spatially query state and federal databases for any occurrences of special-status species or habitats within the Study Area and vicinity;
- Perform a reconnaissance-level field survey of the Study Area, including photographic documentation;
- Inventory all flora and fauna observed during the field survey;
- Characterize and map the habitat types present within the Study Area, including any potentially-jurisdictional water resources;
- Evaluate the likelihood for the occurrence of any special-status species;
- Prepare and submit a report summarizing all of the above tasks.

1.3. REGULATORY SETTING

The following section summarizes some applicable regulations of biological resources on real property in California.

1.3.1. Special-status Species Regulations

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service implement the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA) (16 USC §1531 et seq.). Threatened and endangered species on the federal list (50 CFR §17.11, 17.12) are protected from "take" (direct or indirect harm), unless a FESA Section 10 Permit is granted or a FESA Section 7 Biological Opinion with incidental take provisions is rendered. Pursuant to the requirements of FESA, an agency reviewing a proposed project within its jurisdiction must determine whether any federally listed species may be present in the project area and determine whether the proposed project will have a potentially significant impact upon such species. Under FESA, habitat loss is considered to be an impact to the species. In addition, the agency is required to determine whether the project is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species proposed to be listed under FESA or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat proposed to be designated for such species (16 USC §1536[3], [4]). Therefore, project-related impacts to these species or their habitats would be considered significant and would require mitigation. Species that are candidates for listing are not protected under FESA; however,

USFWS advises that a candidate species could be elevated to listed status at any time, and therefore, applicants should regard these species with special consideration.

The California Endangered Species Act of 1970 (CESA) (California Fish and Game Code §2050 *et seq*., and CCR Title 14, §670.2, 670.51) prohibits "take" (defined as hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill) of species listed under CESA. A CESA permit must be obtained if a project will result in take of listed species, either during construction or over the life of the project. Section 2081 establishes an incidental take permit program for state-listed species. Under CESA, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has the responsibility for maintaining a list of threatened and endangered species designated under state law (CFG Code 2070). CDFW also maintains lists of species of special concern, which serve as "watch lists." Pursuant to requirements of CESA, an agency reviewing proposed projects within its jurisdiction must determine whether any state-listed species may be present in the Study Area and determine whether the proposed project will have a potentially significant impact upon such species. Project-related impacts to species on the CESA list would be considered significant and would require mitigation.

California Fish and Game Code Sections 4700, 5050, and 5515 designates certain mammal, amphibian, and reptile species "fully protected", making it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy these species except under issuance of a specific permit. The California Native Plant Protection Act of 1977 (CFG Code §1900 *et seq*.) requires CDFW to establish criteria for determining if a species or variety of native plant is endangered or rare. Section 19131 of the code requires that landowners notify CDFW at least 10 days prior to initiating activities that will destroy a listed plant to allow the salvage of plant material.

Many bird species, especially those that are breeding, migratory, or of limited distribution, are protected under federal and state regulations. Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 USC §703-711), migratory bird species and their nests and eggs that are on the federal list (50 CFR §10.13) are protected from injury or death, and project-related disturbances must be reduced or eliminated during the nesting cycle. California Fish and Game Code (§3503, 3503.5, and 3800) prohibits the possession, incidental take, or needless destruction of any bird nests or eggs. Fish and Game Code §3511 designates certain bird species "fully protected", making it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy these species except under issuance of a specific permit. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 USC §668) specifically protects bald and golden eagles from harm or trade in parts of these species.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §15380) defines "rare" in a broader sense than the definitions of threatened, endangered, or fully protected. Under the CEQA definition, CDFW can request additional consideration of species not otherwise protected. CEQA requires that the impacts of a project upon environmental resources must be analyzed and assessed using criteria determined by the lead agency. Sensitive species that would qualify for listing but are not currently listed may be afforded protection under CEQA. The CEQA Guidelines (§15065) require that a substantial reduction in numbers of a rare or endangered species be considered a significant effect. CEQA Guidelines (§15380) provide for assessment of unlisted species as rare or endangered under CEQA if the species can be shown to meet the criteria for listing. Plant species on the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Lists 1A, 1B, or 2 are typically considered rare under CEQA. California "Species of Special Concern" is a category conferred by CDFW on those species that are indicators of regional habitat changes or are considered potential future protected species. While they do not have statutory protection, Species of Special Concern are typically considered rare under CEQA and thereby warrant specific protection measures.

1.3.2. Water Resource Protection

Real property that contains water resources are subject to various federal and state regulations and activities occurring in these water resources may require permits, licenses, variances, or similar authorization from federal, state and local agencies, as described next.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (as amended), commonly known as the Clean Water Act (CWA), established the basic structure for regulating discharges of pollutants into "waters of the United States". Waters of the US includes essentially all surface waters, all interstate waters and their tributaries, all impoundments of these waters, and all wetlands adjacent to these waters. CWA Section 404 requires approval prior to dredging or discharging fill material into any waters of the US, especially wetlands. The permitting program is designed to minimize impacts to waters of the US, and when impacts cannot be avoided, requires compensatory mitigation. The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is responsible for administering Section 404 regulations. Substantial impacts to jurisdictional wetlands may require an Individual Permit. Small-scale projects may require only a Nationwide Permit, which typically has an expedited process compared to the Individual Permit process. Mitigation of wetland impacts is required as a condition of the CWA Section 404 Permit and may include on-site preservation, restoration, or enhancement and/or off-site restoration or enhancement. The characteristics of the restored or enhanced wetlands must be equal to or better than those of the affected wetlands to achieve no net loss of wetlands.

Under CWA Section 401, every applicant for a federal permit or license for any activity which may result in a discharge to a water body must obtain State Water Quality Certification that the proposed activity will comply with State water quality standards. The California State Water Resources Control Board is responsible for administering CWA Section 401 regulations.

Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 requires approval from USACE prior to the commencement of any work in or over navigable Waters of the US, or which affects the course, location, condition or capacity of such waters. Navigable waters of the United States are defined as waters that have been used in the past, are now used, or are susceptible to use, as a means to transport interstate or foreign commerce up to the head of navigation. Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 permits are required for construction activities in these waters.

California Fish and Game Code (§1601 - 1607) protects fishery resources by regulating "*any activity that may substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake*." CDFW requires notification prior to commencement, and issuance of a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement, if a proposed project will result in the alteration or degradation of ''waters of the State". The limit of CDFW jurisdiction is subject to the judgment of the Department; currently, this jurisdiction is interpreted to be the "stream zone", defined as "*that portion of the stream channel that restricts lateral movement of water*" and delineated at "*the top of the bank or the outer edge of any riparian vegetation, whichever is more landward*". CDFW reviews the proposed actions and, if necessary, submits to the applicant a proposal for measures to protect affected fish and wildlife resources. The final proposal that is mutually agreed upon by the CDFW and the applicant is the Streambed Alteration Agreement. Projects that require a Streambed Alteration Agreement may also require a CWA 404 Section Permit and/or CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification.

For construction projects that disturb one or more acres of soil, the landowner or developer must obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit, 2009-0009-DWQ).

2. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Study Area is located within the "Peninsular Range except San Jacinto Mountains" geographic subregion, which is contained within the Southwestern California geographic subdivision of the larger California Floristic Province (Baldwin et al. 2012). This region has a Mediterranean-type climate, characterized by distinct seasons of hot, dry summers and moderately wet, cool winters. The Study Area and vicinity is in Climate Zone 21 – "California's Thermal Belts in Southern California's Areas of Occasional Ocean Influence," defined by maritime-influenced climate where temperatures never fall very far below 30 F (Sunset, 2022). The topography of the Study Area is a northwest-facing slope of boulder-strewn hills. The elevation ranges from approximately 1,305 feet to 1,470 feet above mean sea level. Drainage runs north and west into an unnamed watercourse, thence Dulzura Creek, and eventually flowing into Jamul Creek and Lower Otay Reservoir. The land uses of the Study Area are undeveloped open space. The surrounding land uses are private estates and wildlife preserves.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. PRELIMINARY DATA GATHERING AND RESEARCH

Prior to conducting the field survey, the following information sources were reviewed:

- Any readily-available previous biological resource studies pertaining to the Study Area or vicinity
- Aerial photography of the Study Area (current and historical)
- United States Geologic Service 7.5 degree-minute topographic quadrangles of the Study Area and vicinity
- USFWS National Wetland Inventory
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service soil survey maps
- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), electronically updated monthly by subscription
- USFWS species list (IPaC Trust Resources Report).

3.2. FIELD SURVEY

Consulting biologist Dr. Geo Graening conducted a reconnaissance-level field survey on November 8, 2022, 2021. Weather conditions were cool with rain. A variable-intensity pedestrian survey was performed, and modified to account for differences in terrain, vegetation density, and visibility. All visible fauna and flora observed were recorded in a field notebook, and identified to the lowest possible taxon. Survey efforts emphasized the search for any special-status species that had documented occurrences in the CNDDB within the vicinity of the Study Area and those species on the USFWS species list (Appendix 1).

When a specimen could not be identified in the field, a photograph or voucher specimen (depending upon permit requirements) was taken and identified in the laboratory using a dissecting scope where necessary. Dr. Graening holds the following scientific collection permits: CDFW Scientific Collecting Permit No. SC-006802; and CDFW Plant Voucher Specimen Permit 09004. Taxonomic determinations were facilitated by referencing museum specimens or by various texts, including the following: Powell and Hogue (1979); Pavlik (1991); (1993); Brenzel (2012); Stuart and Sawyer (2001); Lanner (2002); Sibley (2003); Baldwin et al. (2012); Calflora (2021); CDFW (2021b,c); NatureServe 2021; and University of California at Berkeley (2021a,b).

The locations of any special-status species sighted were marked on aerial photographs and/or georeferenced with a geographic positioning system (GPS) receiver. Habitat types occurring in the Study Area were mapped on aerial photographs, and information on habitat conditions and the suitability of the habitats to support special-status species was also recorded. The Study Area was also informally

assessed for the presence of potentially-jurisdictional water features, including riparian zones, isolated wetlands and vernal pools, and other biologically-sensitive aquatic habitats

3.3. MAPPING AND OTHER ANALYSES

Locations of species' occurrences and habitat boundaries within the Study Area were digitized to produce the final habitat maps. The boundaries of potentially jurisdictional water resources within the Study Area were identified and measured in the field, and similarly digitized to calculate acreage and to produce informal delineation maps. Geographic analyses were performed using geographical information system software (ArcGIS 10, ESRI, Inc.). Vegetation communities (assemblages of plant species growing in an area of similar biological and environmental factors), were classified by Vegetation Series (distinctive associations of plants, described by dominant species and particular environmental setting) using the CNPS Vegetation Classification system (Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf, 1995). Informal wetland delineation methods consisted of an abbreviated, visual assessment of the three requisite wetland parameters (hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, hydrologic regime) defined in the US Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual (Environmental Laboratory, 1987). Wildlife habitats were classified according to the CDFW's California Wildlife Habitat Relationships System (CDFW, 2021c). Species' habitat requirements and life histories were identified using the following sources: Baldwin et al. (2012); CNPS (2021), Calflora (2021); CDFW (2021a,b,c); and University of California at Berkeley (2021a,b).

4. RESULTS

4.1. VEGETATION COMMUNITIES AND WILDLIFE HABITAT TYPES

4.1.1. Terrestrial Vegetation Communities

The Study Area contains one terrestrial vegetation community: chamise chaparral (see Exhibits). Chamise chaparral habitat is found throughout the Study Area. The dominant species within the chaparral is chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*) and laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*). Few grasses and herbs were identifiable under the shrub canopy this late in the season. This vegetation type can be classified as the Holland Type "Chamise Chaparral" or as "37.101.21 *Adenostoma fasciculatum – Malosma laurina*" (CDFW 2022e).

4.1.2. Wildlife Habitat Types

Wildlife habitat types were classified using CDFW's Wildlife Habitat Relationship System. The Study Area contains the following wildlife habitat types: Chamise – Redshank Chaparral; and Barren (rock outcrop).

4.1.3. Critical Habitat and Special-status Habitat

No critical habitat for any federally-listed species occurs within the Study Area. However, Critical Habitat for Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*) and Hermes copper butterfly (*Lycaena hermes*) is found approximately 0.25 mile northwest of the Study Area. The CNDDB reported the following special-status habitats in a 10-mile radius outside of the Study Area: Maritime Succulent Scrub; San Diego Mesa Claypan Vernal Pool; Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest and Southern Interior Cypress Forest. No special-status habitats were detected within the Study Area during the field survey.

4.1.4. Habitat Plans and Wildlife Corridors

Wildlife movement corridors link remaining areas of functional wildlife habitat that are separated primarily by human disturbance, but natural barriers such as rugged terrain and abrupt changes in vegetation cover are also possible. Wilderness and open lands have been fragmented by urbanization, which can disrupt migratory species and separate interbreeding populations. Corridors allow migratory movements and act as links between these separated populations.

No designated wildlife corridors exist within the Study Area, but the Study Area is adjacent to wildlife preserve lands. No fishery resources exist in or near the Study Area because there are no persistent water resources; the nearest fisher resource is Lower Otay Lake. The Study Area is located within the plan boundaries of the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program.

4.2. LISTED SPECIES AND OTHER SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES

For the purposes of this assessment, "special status" is defined to be species that are of management concern to state or federal natural resource agencies, and include those species that are:

- Listed as endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate for listing under the Federal Endangered Species Act;
- Listed as endangered, threatened, rare, or proposed for listing, under the California Endangered Species Act of 1970;
- Designated as endangered or rare, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (§1901);
- Designated as fully protected, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (§3511, §4700, or §5050);
- Designated as a species of special concern by CDFW;
- Plants considered to be rare, threatened or endangered in California by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS); this consists of species on Lists 1A, 1B, and 2 of the CNPS Ranking System; or

- Plants listed as rare under the California Native Plant Protection Act.

4.2.1. Reported Occurrences of Listed Species and Other Special-status Species

A list of special-status plant and animal species that have occurred within the Study Area and vicinity was compiled based upon the following:

- Any previous and readily-available biological resource studies pertaining to the Study Area;
- Informal consultation with USFWS by generating an electronic Species List (Information for Planning and Conservation website at https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/); and
- A spatial query of the CNDDB using the standard 9 quadrangle boundary
- A query of the California Native Plant Society's database *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California* (online edition).

The CNDDB was queried and any reported occurrences of special-status species were plotted in relation to the Study Area boundary using GIS software (see exhibits). The CNDDB reported the following special-status species occurrences within the Study Area.

- Thorne's hairstreak (*Callophrys thornei*)
- Pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*)
- Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*)
- Western small-footed myotis (*Myotis ciliolabrum*)
- Long-eared myotis (*Myotis evotis*)
- Yuma myotis (*Myotis yumanensis*)

These occurrences are an artifact of the mapping process. The CDFW has obscured the precise location of these occurrences. Habitat for the Thorne's hairstreak (the host plant Tecate Cypress [*Cupressus forbesii*]) is not present within the Study Area. Habitat for various bat species is present in the rock outcrops of the Study Area. Within a 10-mile buffer of the Study Area boundary, the CNDDB reported several special-status species occurrences, summarized in the table in Appendix 3 along with any additional CNPS species.

A USFWS species list was generated online using the USFWS' IPaC Trust Resource Report System (see Appendix 1). This list is generated using a regional and/or watershed approach and does not necessarily indicate that the Study Area provides suitable habitat. The list identified the following species:

- Coastal California Gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*) Threatened
- Least Bell's Vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*) Endangered
- Southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*) Endangered
- Hermes Copper Butterfly (*Lycaena hermes*) Threatened
- Monarch Butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) Candidate
- Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino* (+ E. e. wrighti) Endangered
- Mexican flannelbush (*Fremontodendron mexicanum*) Endangered
- Otay tarplant (*Deinandra* (=*Hemizonia*) *conjugens*) Threatened
- San Diego Ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*) Endangered
- San Diego Thornmint (*Acanthomintha ilicifolia*) Threatened

Migratory birds should be considered for the potential to occur within the Study Area and immediate vicinity.

4.2.2. Listed Species or Special-status Species Observed During Field Survey

During the field survey, no federally-listed species or special-status species were detected within the Study Area. The following common wildlife were detected within the Study Area during the field survey: shoulderband snail (*Monadenia*); scat of coyote (*Canis latrans*); middens of woodrat (*Neotoma* sp.); hermit thrush (*Catharus guttatus*); and common songbirds.

4.2.3. Potential for Listed Species or Special-status Species to Occur in the Study Area

See Appendix 3 for a complete table of Special-status Species and their potential to occur in the Study Area. The listed species and special-status species identified in database searches were further assessed for their likelihood to occur within the Study Area based upon previously documented occurrences, field surveys, their habitat requirements, and the quality and extent of any suitable habitat within the Study Area.

4.3. POTENTIALLY-JURISDICTIONAL WATER RESOURCES

The USFWS National Wetland Inventory reported one water feature within the Study Area (see Exhibits): a riverine feature. However, the field survey determined that the Study Area does not contain any channels or wetlands (see Exhibits). The channel that was identified by the UFSWS National Wetland Inventory begins approximately 500 feet west of the northwestern corner of the Study Area. There are no vernal pools or other isolated wetlands in the Study Area.

5. REFERENCES

Baldwin, B.G., D.H. Goldman, D.J. Keil, R. Patterson, and T.J. Rosatti, editors. 2012. The Jepson Manual: Vascular Plants of California, second edition, thoroughly revised and expanded. University of California Press, Berkeley, California. 1,600 pp.

Brenzel, K.N. 2012. Sunset Western Garden Book, 9th edition. Time Home Entertainment, Inc. New York, New York. 768 pp.

Calflora. 2021. Calflora, the on-line gateway to information about native and introduced wild plants in California. Internet database available at http://calflora.org/.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021a. RareFind, California Natural Diversity Data Base. Biogeographic Data Branch, Sacramento, California. (updated monthly by subscription service)

California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2021b. California's Plants and Animals. Habitat Conservation Planning Branch, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento, California. http://www.dfg.ca.gov/hcpb/species/search_species.shtml.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021c. California's Wildlife. California Wildlife Habitat Relationships System, Biogeographic Data Branch, California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Internet database available at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/whdab/html/cawildlife.html.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021d. California Essential Connectivity Project., Habitat Conservation Planning Branch, California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Internet database available at https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/BIOS.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021e. List of California Terrestrial Natural Communities Recognized by the California Natural Diversity Database. Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program. Available on the Internet at: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities.

California Native Plant Society. 2021. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants. Rare Plant Scientific Advisory Committee, David P. Tibor, convening editor. California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, California. Internet database available at http://cnps.web.aplus.net/cgi-bin/inv/inventory.cgi.

Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. Technical Report Y-87-1. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station. Vicksburg, Mississippi. 92 pp.

Lanner, R. M. 2002. Conifers of California. Cachuma Press, Los Olivos, California. 274 pp.

Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2021. Web Soil Survey. National Cooperative Soil Survey, U.S. Department of Agriculture. NRCS Soils Website (Internet database and digital maps) available at: https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm.

NatureServe. 2021. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. Internet database available at http://www.natureserve.org/explorer.

Pavlik, B. M., P. C. Muick, S. G. Johnson, and M. Popper. 1991. Oaks of California. Cachuma Press and the California Oak Foundation. Los Olivos, California. 184 pp.

Sawyer, J. O., and T. Keeler-Wolf. 1995. A manual of California vegetation. California Native Plant Society, Sacramento, California. Available electronically at http://davisherb.ucdavis.edu/cnpsActiveServer/index.html.

Sibley, D. A. 2003. The Sibley Field Guide to Birds of Western North America. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, New York.


Stuart, J. D., and J. O. Sawyer. 2001. Trees and Shrubs of California. California Natural History Guides. University of California Press, Berkeley, California. 467 pp.

University of California at Berkeley. 2021a. Jepson Online Interchange for California Floristics. Jepson Flora Project, University Herbarium and Jepson Herbarium, University of California at Berkeley. Internet database available at http://ucjeps.berkeley.edu/interchange.html.

University of California at Berkeley. 2021b. CalPhotos. Biodiversity Sciences Technology Group, University of California at Berkeley. Internet database available at http://calphotos.berkeley.edu/

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2021. Wetlands Digital Data. National Wetlands Inventory Center. Digital maps downloaded from the Internet at https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/.

EXHIBITS



Study Area

0 0.25 0.5 Miles

1:24,000

Slee Property
Study Area Location Map

Natural Investigations Company

Map Date 11/7/2022


Dulzura 1997 Quadrangle:Township 17S, Range 2E, Section 28



Habitat Types

Slee Property, Honey Springs Road, Jamul

Natural Investigations Company



Data Sources: California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. RareFind 5.x, California Natural Diversity Data Base. Biogeographic Data Branch, Sacramento, California. (updated monthly by subscription service)



Study Area

0 150 300 Feet


1:2,500

Slee Property
USDA Soils Map

Natural Investigations Company

Map Date 11/7/2022

Dulzura 1997 Quadrangle:Township 17S, Range 2E, Section 28



Study Area

0 150 300 Feet

1:2,500

Slee Property
National Wetlands Inventory
Features Map

Natural Investigations Company

Map Date 11/7/2022

Dulzura 1997 Quadrangle:Township 17S, Range 2E, Section 28



Water Resources

Slee Property, Honey Springs Road, Jamul

Natural Investigations Company

APPENDIX 1: USFWS SPECIES LIST

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish And Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue - Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7385
Phone: (760) 431-9440 Fax: (760) 431-5901

In Reply Refer To:
Project Code: 2023-0014037
Project Name: Jamul Indian Village Parcel

November 10, 2022

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A biological assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological

evaluation similar to a biological assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a biological assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found at the Fish and Wildlife Service's Endangered Species Consultation website at:

https://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/faq.html

Migratory Birds: In addition to responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), there are additional responsibilities under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) to protect native birds from project-related impacts. Any activity, intentional or unintentional, resulting in take of migratory birds, including eagles, is prohibited unless otherwise permitted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)). For more information regarding these Acts see https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations.php.

The MBTA has no provision for allowing take of migratory birds that may be unintentionally killed or injured by otherwise lawful activities. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to comply with these Acts by identifying potential impacts to migratory birds and eagles within applicable NEPA documents (when there is a federal nexus) or a Bird/Eagle Conservation Plan (when there is no federal nexus). Proponents should implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize the production of project-related stressors or minimize the exposure of birds and their resources to the project-related stressors. For more information on avian stressors and recommended conservation measures see https://www.fws.gov/birds/bird-enthusiasts/threats-to-birds.php.

In addition to MBTA and BGEPA, Executive Order 13186: *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds*, obligates all Federal agencies that engage in or authorize activities that might affect migratory birds, to minimize those effects and encourage conservation measures that will improve bird populations. Executive Order 13186 provides for the protection of both migratory birds and migratory bird habitat. For information regarding the implementation of Executive Order 13186, please visit https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations/executive-orders/e0-13186.php.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Code in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List

Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Carlsbad Fish And Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue - Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7385
(760) 431-9440

Project Summary

Project Code: 2023-0014037
Project Name: Jamul Indian Village Parcel
Project Type: Land Exchange
Project Description: Land Exchange
Project Location:

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/@32.6636226,-116.78706722102031,14z



Counties: San Diego County, California

Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 10 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries[1], as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

---

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Birds

NAME	STATUS
Coastal California Gnatcatcher *Polioptila californica californica* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8178	Threatened
Least Bell's Vireo *Vireo bellii pusillus* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5945	Endangered
Southwestern Willow Flycatcher *Empidonax traillii extimus* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6749	Endangered

Insects

NAME	STATUS
Hermes Copper Butterfly *Lycaena hermes* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4379	Threatened
Monarch Butterfly *Danaus plexippus* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743	Candidate
Quino Checkerspot Butterfly *Euphydryas editha quino (=E. e. wrighti)* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5900	Endangered

Flowering Plants

NAME	STATUS
Mexican Flannelbush *Fremontodendron mexicanum* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7495	Endangered
Otay Tarplant *Deinandra (=Hemizonia) conjugens* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5687	Threatened
San Diego Ambrosia *Ambrosia pumila* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8287	Endangered
San Diego Thornmint *Acanthomintha ilicifolia* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/351	Threatened

Critical habitats

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

IPaC User Contact Information

Agency: Natural Investigations, Inc.
Name: Tim Nosal
Address: 3104 O Street #221
City: Sacramento
State: CA
Zip: 95816
Email trnosal@comcast.net
Phone: 9169696868

APPENDIX 2: SITE PHOTOS

















APPENDIX 3: SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES TABLE AND POTENTIAL TO OCCUR

Special-status Species Reported by CNDDB and CNPS in the Vicinity of the Study Areas

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	General Habitat**	Microhabitat**	Potential to Occur in Project Area***
ANIMALS					
Arroyo toad	*Anaxyrus californicus*	FE/CSSC	Desert wash; Riparian scrub; Riparian woodland; South coast flowing waters; South coast standing waters	Rivers with sandy banks, willows, cottonwoods, and sycamores; loose, gravelly areas of streams in drier parts of range.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Western spadefoot	*Spea hammondii*	CSSC	Cismontane woodland; Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland; Vernal pool; Wetland	Vernal pools are essential for breeding and egg-laying.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Double-crested cormorant	*Nannopterum auritum*	CWL	Riparian forest; Riparian scrub; Riparian woodland	Nests along coast on sequestered islets, usually on ground with sloping surface, or in tall trees along lake margins.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Northern harrier	*Circus hudsonius*	CSSC	Coastal scrub; Great Basin grassland; Marsh & swamp; Riparian scrub; Valley & foothill grassland; Wetland	Nests on ground in shrubby vegetation, usually at marsh edge; nest built of a large mound of sticks in wet areas.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Cooper's hawk	*Accipiter cooperii*	CWL	Cismontane woodland; Riparian forest; Riparian woodland; Upper montane coniferous forest	Nest sites mainly in riparian growths of deciduous trees, as in canyon bottoms on river flood-plains; also, live oaks.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Swainson's hawk	*Buteo swainsoni*	CT	Great Basin grassland; Riparian forest; Riparian woodland; Valley & foothill grassland	Requires adjacent suitable foraging areas such as grasslands, or alfalfa or grain fields supporting rodent populations.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Golden eagle	*Aquila chrysaetos*	CFP/CWL	Broadleaved upland forest; Cismontane woodland; Coastal prairie; Great Basin grassland; Great Basin scrub; Lower montane coniferous forest; Pinon & juniper woodlands; Upper montane coniferous forest; Valley & foothill grassland	Cliff-walled canyons provide nesting habitat in most parts of range; also, large trees in open areas.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Prairie falcon	*Falco mexicanus*	CWL	Great Basin grassland; Great Basin scrub; Mojavean desert scrub; Sonoran desert scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	Breeding sites located on cliffs. Forages far afield, even to marshlands and ocean shores.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Yellow rail	*Coturnicops noveboracensis*	CSSC	Freshwater marsh; Meadow & seep	Freshwater marshlands.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Western yellow-billed cuckoo	*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*	FT/CE	Riparian forest	Nests in riparian jungles of willow, often mixed with cottonwoods, with lower story of blackberry, nettles, or wild grape.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Burrowing owl	*Athene cunicularia*	CSSC	Coastal prairie; Coastal scrub; Great Basin grassland; Great Basin scrub; Mojavean desert scrub; Sonoran desert scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	Subterranean nester, dependent upon burrowing mammals, most notably, the California ground squirrel.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Southwestern willow flycatcher	*Empidonax traillii extimus*	FE/CE	Riparian woodland	Riparian woodlands in Southern California.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
California horned lark	*Eremophila alpestris actia*	CWL	Meadow & seep; Marine intertidal & splash zone communities	Short-grass prairie, "bald" hills, mountain meadows, open coastal plains, fallow grain fields, alkali flats.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Coastal cactus wren	*Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus sandiegensis*	CSSC	Coastal scrub	Wrens require tall *Opuntia* cactus for nesting and roosting.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Coastal California gnatcatcher	*Polioptila californica californica*	FT/CSSC	Coastal bluff scrub; Coastal scrub	Low, coastal sage scrub in arid washes, on mesas and slopes. Not all areas classified as coastal sage scrub are occupied.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Least Bell's vireo	*Vireo bellii pusillus*	FE/CE	Riparian forest; Riparian scrub; Riparian woodland	Nests placed along margins of bushes or on twigs projecting into pathways, usually willow, baccharis, mesquite.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Yellow warbler	*Setophaga petechia*	CSSC	Riparian forest; Riparian scrub; Riparian woodland	Frequently found nesting and foraging in willow shrubs and thickets, and in other riparian plants including cottonwoods, sycamores, ash, and alders.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Yellow-breasted chat	*Icteria virens*	CSSC	Riparian forest; Riparian scrub; Riparian woodland	Nests in low, dense riparian, consisting of willow, blackberry, wild grape; forages and nests within 10 ft of ground.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow	*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*	CWL	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Frequents relatively steep, often rocky hillsides with grass and forb patches.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Bell's sage sparrow	*Artemisiospiza belli belli*	CWL	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Nest located on the ground beneath a shrub or in a shrub 6-18 inches above ground. Territories about 50 yds apart.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Grasshopper sparrow	*Ammodramus savannarum*	CCSSC	Valley & foothill grassland	Favors native grasslands with a mix of grasses, forbs and scattered shrubs. Loosely colonial when nesting.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Tricolored blackbird	*Agelaius tricolor*	CT/CSSC	Freshwater marsh; Marsh & swamp; Swamp; Wetland	Requires open water, protected nesting substrate, and foraging area with insect prey within a few km of the colony.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
California leaf-nosed bat	*Macrotus californicus*	CSSC	Riparian scrub; Sonoran desert scrub	Needs rocky, rugged terrain with mines or caves for roosting.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Mexican long-tongued bat	*Choeronycteris mexicana*	CSSC	Pinon & juniper woodlands; Riparian scrub; Sonoran thorn woodland	Feeds on nectar and pollen of night-blooming succulents. Roosts in relatively well-lit caves, and in and around buildings.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.

Yuma myotis	*Myotis yumanensis*		Lower montane coniferous forest; Riparian forest; Riparian woodland; Upper montane coniferous forest	Distribution is closely tied to bodies of water. Maternity colonies in caves, mines, buildings or crevices.	Potential to occur: Species has been previously documented to occur within the Study Area or nearby. Suitable habitat observed onsite.
Long-eared myotis	*Myotis evotis*			Nursery colonies in buildings, crevices, spaces under bark, and snags. Caves used primarily as night roosts.	Potential to occur: Species has been previously documented to occur within the Study Area or nearby. Suitable habitat observed onsite.
Western small-footed myotis	*Myotis ciliolabrum*			Prefers open stands in forests and woodlands. Requires drinking water. Feeds on a wide variety of small flying insects.	Potential to occur: Species has been previously documented to occur within the Study Area or nearby. Suitable habitat observed onsite.
Hoary bat	*Lasiurus cinereus*		Broadleaved upland forest; Cismontane woodland; Lower montane coniferous forest; North coast coniferous forest	Roosts in dense foliage of medium to large trees. Feeds primarily on moths. Requires water.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Western yellow bat	*Lasiurus xanthinus*	CSSC	Desert wash	Roosts in trees, particularly palms. Forages over water and among trees.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Townsend's big-eared bat	*Corynorhinus townsendii*	CSSC	Broadleaved upland forest; Chaparral; Chenopod scrub; Great Basin grassland; Great Basin scrub; Joshua tree woodland; Lower montane coniferous forest; Mojavean desert scrub; Meadow & seep; Riparian forest; Riparian woodland; Sonoran desert scrub; Sonoran	Roosts in the open, hanging from walls and ceilings. Roosting sites limiting. Extremely sensitive to human disturbance.	Potential to occur: Species has been previously documented to occur within the Study Area or nearby. Suitable habitat observed onsite.
Pallid bat	*Antrozous pallidus*	CSSC	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Desert wash; Great Basin grassland; Great Basin scrub; Mojavean desert scrub; Riparian woodland; Sonoran desert scrub; Upper montane coniferous forest; Valley & foothill grassland	Roosts must protect bats from high temperatures. Very sensitive to disturbance of roosting sites.	Potential to occur: Species has been previously documented to occur within the Study Area or nearby. Suitable habitat observed onsite.
Western mastiff bat	*Eumops perotis californicus*	CSSC	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	Roosts in crevices in cliff faces, high buildings, trees and tunnels.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Pocketed free-tailed bat	*Nyctinomops femorosaccus*	CSSC	Joshua tree woodland; Pinon & juniper woodlands; Riparian scrub; Sonoran desert scrub	Rocky areas with high cliffs.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Big free-tailed bat	*Nyctinomops macrotis*	CSSC		Need high cliffs or rocky outcrops for roosting sites. Feeds principally on large moths.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit	*Lepus californicus bennettii*		Coastal scrub	Coastal sage scrub habitats in Southern California.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Dulzura pocket mouse	*Chaetodipus californicus femoralis*	CSSC	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	Attracted to grass-chaparral edges.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Northwestern San Diego pocket mouse	*Chaetodipus fallax fallax*	CSSC	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Sandy, herbaceous areas, usually in association with rocks or coarse gravel.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
San Diego desert woodrat	*Neotoma lepida intermedia*	CSSC	Coastal scrub	Moderate to dense canopies preferred. They are particularly abundant in rock outcrops, rocky cliffs, and slopes.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
American badger	*Taxidea taxus*	CSSC	Alkali marsh; Alpine dwarf scrub; Alpine; Alkali playa; Bog & fen; Brackish marsh; Broadleaved upland forest; Coastal bluff scrub; Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral; Chenopod scrub; Cismontane woodland; Coastal dunes; Coastal prairie; Coastal scru	Needs sufficient food, friable soils and open, uncultivated ground. Preys on burrowing rodents. Digs burrows.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Western pond turtle	*Emys marmorata*	CSSC	Aquatic; Artificial flowing waters; Klamath/North coast flowing waters; Klamath/North coast standing waters; Marsh & swamp; South coast flowing waters; South coast standing waters; Sacramento/San Joaquin flowing waters; Sacramento/San Joaquin standing wa	Needs basking sites and suitable (sandy banks or grassy open fields) upland habitat up to 0.5 km from water for egg-laying.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Southern California legless lizard	*Anniella stebbinsi*	CSSC	Broadleaved upland forest; Chaparral; Coastal dunes; Coastal scrub	Variety of habitats; generally in moist, loose soil. They prefer soils with a high moisture content.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
San Diego banded gecko	*Coleonyx variegatus abbotti*	CSSC	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Found in granite or rocky outcrops in coastal scrub and chaparral habitats.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Cope's leopard lizard	*Gambelia copeii*	CSSC	Chaparral; Sonoran desert scrub	Open flat areas within vegetation.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.

Coast horned lizard	*Phrynosoma blainvillii*	CSSC	Coastal bluff scrub; Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Coastal scrub; Desert wash; Pinon & juniper woodlands; Riparian scrub; Riparian woodland; Valley & foothill grassland	Open areas for sunning, bushes for cover, patches of loose soil for burial, and abundant supply of ants and other insects.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Coronado skink	*Plestiodon skiltonianus interparietalis*	CWL	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Pinon & juniper woodlands	Prefers early successional stages or open areas. Found in rocky areas close to streams and on dry hillsides.	Low potential to occur: Marginal habitat is present.
Orange-throated whiptail	*Aspidoscelis hyperythra*	CWL	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Coastal scrub	Prefers washes and other sandy areas with patches of brush and rocks. Perennial plants necessary for its major food: termites.	Low potential to occur: Marginal habitat is present.
Coastal whiptail	*Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri*	CSSC		Ground may be firm soil, sandy, or rocky.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
California glossy snake	*Arizona elegans occidentalis*	CSSC		Generalist reported from a range of scrub and grassland habitats, often with loose or sandy soils.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
San Diego ringneck snake	*Diadophis punctatus similis*			Prefer areas with surface litter or herbaceous vegetation. Often in somewhat moist areas near intermittent streams.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Baja California coachwhip	*Masticophis fuliginosus*	CSSC		Open areas in grassland and coastal sage scrub.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Coast patch-nosed snake	*Salvadora hexalepis virgultea*	CSSC	Coastal scrub	Require small mammal burrows for refuge and overwintering sites.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Two-striped gartersnake	*Thamnophis hammondii*	CSSC	Marsh & swamp; Riparian scrub; Riparian woodland; Wetland	Highly aquatic, found in or near permanent fresh water. Often along streams with rocky beds and riparian growth.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Red-diamond rattlesnake	*Crotalus ruber*	CSSC	Chaparral; Mojavean desert scrub; Sonoran desert scrub	Occurs in rocky areas and dense vegetation. Needs rodent burrows, cracks in rocks or surface cover objects.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
San Diego fairy shrimp	*Branchinecta sandiegonensis*	FE	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Vernal pool; Wetland	Vernal pools.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Riverside fairy shrimp	*Streptocephalus woottoni*	FE	Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland; Vernal pool; Wetland	Inhabit seasonally astatic pools filled by winter/spring rains. Hatch in warm water later in the season.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Western tidal-flat tiger beetle	*Habroscelimorpha gabbii*		Estuary; Mud shore/flats	Generally found on dark-colored mud in the lower zone; occasionally found on dry saline flats of estuaries.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Marsh-elder long-horned beetle	*Deltaspis ivae*			Found in a few scattered locations in San Diego and Riverside counties; larva breeds in *Iva hayesiana* root collars.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Crotch bumble bee	*Bombus crotchii*			Food plant genera include *Antirrhinum, Phacelia, Clarkia, Dendromecon, Eschscholzia*, and *Eriogonum*.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Haromonius halictid bee	*Halictus harmonius*			Known only from the foothills of the San Bernardino Mts., possibly also the San Jacinto Mts.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Hermes copper butterfly	*Lycaena hermes*	FT	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Host plant is *Rhamnus crocea*. Although *R. Crocea* is widespread throughout the coast range, *Lycaena hermes* is not.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Thorne's hairstreak	*Callophrys thornei*		Alpine boulder & rock field	Only known from vicinity of Otay mountain.	Present: Species has been previously documented to occur within the Study Area. No habitat observed onsite.
Quino checkerspot butterfly	*Euphydryas editha quino*	FE	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Hills and mesas near the coast. Need high densities of food plants *Plantago erecta, P. insularis*, and *Orthocarpus purpurescens*.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
PLANTS					Absent: No habitat onsite.
San Diego thorn-mint	*Acanthomintha ilicifolia*	FT/CE/1B.1	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland; Vernal pool; Wetland	Endemic to active vertisol clay soils of mesas and valleys. Usually on clay lenses within grassland or chaparral communities. 25-945 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
California adolphia	*Adolphia californica*	2B.1	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	From sandy/gravelly to clay soils within grassland, coastal sage scrub, or chaparral; various exposures. 5-335 m.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Yucaipa onion	*Allium marvinii*	1B.2	Chaparral	In openings on clay soils. 850-1070 m.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
San Diego bur-sage	*Ambrosia chenopodiifolia*	2B.1	Coastal scrub		Absent: No habitat onsite.
Singlewhorl burrobrush	*Ambrosia monogyra*	2B.2	Chaparral; Sonoran desert scrub	Sandy soils. 5-475 m.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
San Diego ambrosia	*Ambrosia pumila*	FE/1B.1	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	Sandy loam or clay soil; sometimes alkaline. In valleys; persists where disturbance has been superficial. Sometimes on margins or near vernal pools. 3-580 m.	Low potential to occur: Marginal habitat is present.
Otay manzanita	*Arctostaphylos otayensis*	1B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland	Metavolcanic soils with other chaparral associates. 75-1040 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
San Diego sagewort	*Artemisia palmeri*	4.2	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Riparian forest; Riparian scrub; Riparian woodland	In drainages and riparian areas in sandy soil within chaparral and other habitats. 15-915 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.

Western spleenwort	*Asplenium vespertinum*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Coastal scrub	Rocky	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Dean's milk-vetch	*Astragalus deanei*	1B.1	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Coastal scrub; Riparian forest	Open, brushy south-facing slopes in Diegan coastal sage, sometimes on recently burned-over hillsides. 70-795 m.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Jacumba milk-vetch	*Astragalus douglasii var. perstrictus*	1B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Pinon & juniper woodlands; Riparian scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	Stony hillsides and gravelly or sandy flats in open oak woodland. 500-1375 m.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
San Diego milk-vetch	*Astragalus oocarpus*	1B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland	Openings in chaparral or on gravelly flats and slopes in thin oak woodland. 120-1795 m.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
South coast saltscale	*Atriplex pacifica*	1B.2	Alkali playa; Coastal bluff scrub; Coastal dunes; Coastal scrub	Alkali soils. 1-400 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Encinitas baccharis	*Baccharis vanessae*	FT/CE/1B.1	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland	On sandstone soils in steep, open, rocky areas with chaparral associates. 60-900 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Golden-spined cereus	*Bergerocactus emoryi*	2B.2	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Limited to the coastal belt. 3-520 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
San Diego goldenstar	*Bloomeria clevelandii*	1B.1	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland; Vernal pool; Wetland	Mesa grasslands, scrub edges; clay soils. Often on mounds between vernal pools in fine, sandy loam. 60-465 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Orcutt's brodiaea	*Brodiaea orcuttii*	1B.1	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Meadow & seep; Ultramafic; Valley & foothill grassland; Vernal pool; Wetland	Mesic, clay habitats; usually in vernal pools and small drainages. 30-1615 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Brewer's calandrinia	*Calandrinia breweri*	4.2	Chaparral, Coastal scrub	Burned areas, Disturbed areas, Loam (sometimes), Sandy (sometimes)	Low potential to occur: Marginal habitat is present.
Dunn's mariposa-lily	*Calochortus dunnii*	CR/1B.2	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral; Ultramafic; Valley & foothill grassland	On gabbro or metavolcanic soils; also known from sandstone; often associated with chaparral. 255-1615 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Lewis' evening-primrose	*Camissoniopsis lewisii*	3	Cismontane woodland, Coastal bluff scrub, Coastal dunes, Coastal scrub, Valley and foothill grassland	Clay (sometimes), Sandy (sometimes)	Absent: No habitat onsite.
San Luis Obispo sedge	*Carex obispoensis*	1B.2	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral; Coastal prairie; Coastal scrub; Ultramafic; Valley & foothill grassland	Usually in transition zone on sand, clay, serpentine, or gabbro. In seeps. 5-845 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Mojave paintbrush	*Castilleja plagiotoma*	4.3	Great Basin scrub, Joshua tree "woodland", Lower montane coniferous forest, Pinyon and juniper woodland		Absent: No habitat onsite.
Payson's jewelflower	*Caulanthus simulans*	4.2	Chaparral, Coastal scrub	Granitic, Sandy	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Lakeside ceanothus	*Ceanothus cyaneus*	1B.2	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral	195-1040 m.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Viejas Mountain ceanothus	*Ceanothus foliosus var. viejasensis*	1B.2	Chaparral; Ultramafic	Gabbro. 785-1370 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Vine Hill ceanothus	*Ceanothus foliosus var. vineatus*	1B.1	Chaparral		Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Otay Mountain ceanothus	*Ceanothus otayensis*	1B.2	Chaparral; Ultramafic	Metavolcanic or gabbroic soils. 75-1160 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Smooth tarplant	*Centromadia pungens ssp. laevis*	1B.1	Alkali playa; Chenopod scrub; Meadow & seep; Riparian woodland; Valley & foothill grassland; Wetland	Alkali meadow, alkali scrub; also in disturbed places. 5-1170 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Southern mountain misery	*Chamaebatia australis*	4.2	Chaparral		Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Peninsular spineflower	*Chorizanthe leptotheca*	4.2	Chaparral, Coastal scrub, Lower montane coniferous forest	Granitic	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Long-spined spineflower	*Chorizanthe polygonoides var. longispina*	1B.2	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Meadow & seep; Ultramafic; Valley & foothill grassland; Vernal pool	Gabbroic clay. 30-1630 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Seaside cistanthe	*Cistanthe maritima*	4.2	Coastal bluff scrub, Coastal scrub, Valley and foothill grassland	Sandy	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Delicate clarkia	*Clarkia delicata*	1B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Ultramafic	Often on gabbro soils. 95-1800 m.	Low potential to occur: Marginal habitat is present.
San Miguel savory	*Clinopodium chandleri*	1B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Coastal scrub; Riparian woodland; Ultramafic; Valley & foothill grassland	Rocky, gabbroic or metavolcanic substrate. 120-975 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Summer holly	*Comarostaphylis diversifolia ssp. diversifolia*	1B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland	Often in mixed chaparral in California, sometimes post-burn. 30-855 m.	Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.

Small-flowered morning-glory	*Convolvulus simulans*	4.2	Chaparral, Coastal scrub, Valley and foothill grassland	Clay, Seeps, Serpentinite	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Small-flowered bird's-beak	*Cordylanthus parviflorus*	2B.3	Joshua tree "woodland", Mojavean desert scrub, Pinyon and juniper woodland		**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Short-bracted bird's-beak	*Cordylanthus rigidus ssp. brevibracteatus*	4.3	Chaparral, Lower montane coniferous forest, Pinyon and juniper woodland, Upper montane coniferous forest	Granitic, Openings	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
San Diego sand aster	*Corethrogyne filaginifolia var. incana*	1B.1	Coastal bluff scrub; Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Most sites are disturbed, so hard to tell. Possibly in disturbed sites and ecotones. 35-275 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Snake cholla	*Cylindropuntia californica var. californica*	1B.1	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	15-290 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Otay tarplant	*Deinandra conjugens*	FT/CE/1B.1	Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	Coastal plains, mesas, and river bottoms; often in open, disturbed areas; clay soils. 60-275 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Tecate tarplant	*Deinandra floribunda*	1B.2	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Often in little drainages or disturbed areas. 150-1330 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Paniculate tarplant	*Deinandra paniculata*	4.2	Coastal scrub, Valley and foothill grassland, Vernal pools	Sandy (sometimes), Vernally Mesic (usually)	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Colorado Desert larkspur	*Delphinium parishii ssp. subglobosum*	4.3	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Pinyon and juniper woodland, Sonoran desert scrub		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
North island bush-poppy	*Dendromecon harfordii var. harfordii*	3.2	Chaparral, Closed-cone coniferous forest	Rocky	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Western dichondra	*Dichondra occidentalis*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Coastal scrub, Valley and foothill grassland		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Orcutt's bird's-beak	*Dicranostegia orcuttiana*	2B.1	Coastal scrub	Found in coastal scrub associations on slopes; also reported from intermittently moist swales, and in washes. 0-200 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Cleveland's bush monkeyflower	*Diplacus clevelandii*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Lower montane coniferous forest	Disturbed areas (often), Gabbroic, Openings, Rocky	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Variegated dudleya	*Dudleya variegata*	1B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	In rocky or clay soils; sometimes associated with vernal pool margins. 3-550 m.	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.
Palmer's goldenbush	*Ericameria palmeri var. palmeri*	1B.1	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	On granitic soils, on steep hillsides. Mesic sites. 5-625 m.	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.
Vanishing wild buckwheat	*Eriogonum evanidum*	1B.1	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Lower montane coniferous forest; Pinon & juniper woodlands	Sandy sites. 975-2240 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
San Diego button-celery	*Eryngium aristulatum var. parishii*	FE/CE/1B.1	Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland; Vernal pool; Wetland	San Diego mesa hardpan and claypan vernal pools and southern interior basalt flow vernal pools; usually surrounded by scrub. 15-880 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Palomar monkeyflower	*Erythranthe diffusa*	4.3	Chaparral, Lower montane coniferous forest	Gravelly (sometimes), Sandy (sometimes)	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Abrams' spurge	*Euphorbia abramsiana*	2B.2	Mojavean desert scrub; Sonoran desert scrub	Sandy sites. -45-1445 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Cliff spurge	*Euphorbia misera*	2B.2	Coastal bluff scrub; Coastal scrub; Mojavean desert scrub	Rocky sites. 3-430 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
San Diego barrel cactus	*Ferocactus viridescens*	2B.1	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	Often on exposed, level or south-sloping areas; often in coastal scrub near crest of slopes. 3-490 m.	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.
Chaparral ash	*Fraxinus parryi*	2B.2	Chaparral	Open mixed chaparral and in the chaparral-sage scrub interface in California. 213-620 m.	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.
Mexican flannelbush	*Fremontodendron mexicanum*	FE/CR/1B.1	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Ultramafic	Usually scattered along the borders of creeks or in dry canyons; found on gabbro, serpentine, or metavolcanics. 300-490 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Desert bedstraw	*Galium proliferum*	2B.2	Joshua tree woodland; Limestone; Mojavean desert scrub; Pinon & juniper woodlands	Rocky, limestone substrate. 105-1695 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Sticky geraea	*Geraea viscida*	2B.2	Chaparral	Loamy coarse sand to gravelly sand soils; often in post burned areas and in bulldozed areas. 500-1645 m.	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.
Mission Canyon bluecup	*Githopsis diffusa ssp. filicaulis*	3.1	Chaparral		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
San Diego gumplant	*Grindelia hallii*	1B.2	Chaparral; Lower montane coniferous forest; Meadow & seep; Valley & foothill grassland	Frequently occurs in low moist areas in meadows. Associated species commonly include *Wyethia, Ranunculus, Sidalcea*. 180-1810 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Palmer's grapplinghook	*Harpagonella palmeri*	4.2	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Valley & foothill grassland	Clay soils; open grassy areas within shrubland. 20-955 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.

Hogwallow starfish	*Hesperevax caulescens*	4.2	Valley and foothill grassland, Vernal pools	Alkaline (sometimes)	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Tecate cypress	*Hesperocyparis forbesii*	1B.1	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral	Primarily on north-facing slopes; groves often associated with chaparral. On clay or gabbro. 60-1650 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Graceful tarplant	*Holocarpha virgata ssp. elongata*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Coastal scrub, Valley and foothill grassland		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Vernal barley	*Hordeum intercedens*	3.2	Coastal dunes, Coastal scrub, Valley and foothill grassland, Vernal pools		**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Ramona horkelia	*Horkelia truncata*	1B.3	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Ultramafic	Habitats in California include: mixed chaparral, vernal streams, and disturbed areas near roads. Clay soil; at least sometimes on gabbro. 380-1190 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Otay Mountain lotus	*Hosackia crassifolia var. otayensis*	1B.1	Chaparral	Metavolcanic, often in disturbed areas. 380-1005 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
San Diego sunflower	*Hulsea californica*	1B.3	Chaparral; Lower montane coniferous forest; Upper montane coniferous forest	Burns, clearings, or openings in chaparral and pine-oak woodland. 365-1860 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Decumbent goldenbush	*Isocoma menziesii var. decumbens*	1B.2	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Sandy soils; often in disturbed sites. 1-915 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
San Diego marsh-elder	*Iva hayesiana*	2B.2	Alkali playa; Marsh & swamp; Wetland	Riverwashes. 1-430 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Southern California black walnut	*Juglans californica*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Coastal scrub, Riparian woodland		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Southwestern spiny rush	*Juncus acutus ssp. leopoldii*	4.2	Coastal dunes, Marshes and swamps, Meadows and seeps		**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Coulter's goldfields	*Lasthenia glabrata ssp. coulteri*	1B.1	Alkali playa; Marsh & swamp; Salt marsh; Vernal pool; Wetland	Usually found on alkaline soils in playas, sinks, and grasslands. 1-1375 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Pride-of-California	*Lathyrus splendens*	4.3	Chaparral		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Gander's pitcher sage	*Lepechinia ganderi*	1B.3	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Ultramafic; Valley & foothill grassland	Usually found in chaparral or coastal scrub; sometimes in Tecate cypress woodland. Gabbro or metavolcanic substrate. 300-1005 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Robinson's pepper-grass	*Lepidium virginicum var. robinsonii*	4.3	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Dry soils, shrubland. 4-1435 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Humboldt lily	*Lilium humboldtii ssp. humboldtii*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Lower montane coniferous forest	Openings	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Ocellated Humboldt lily	*Lilium humboldtii ssp. ocellatum*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Coastal scrub, Lower montane coniferous forest, Riparian woodland	Openings	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
California box-thorn	*Lycium californicum*	4.2	Coastal bluff scrub, Coastal scrub		**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Small-flowered microseris	*Microseris douglasii ssp. platycarpha*	4.2	Cismontane woodland, Coastal scrub, Valley and foothill grassland, Vernal pools	Clay	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Felt-leaved monardella	*Monardella hypoleuca ssp. lanata*	1B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland	Occurs in understory in mixed chaparral, chamise chaparral, and southern oak woodland; sandy soil. 425-1585 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Jennifer's monardella	*Monardella stoneana*	1B.2	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Riparian scrub	Usually found in rocky, intermittent streambeds. 170-795 m.	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.
California spineflower	*Mucronea californica*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Coastal dunes, Coastal scrub, Valley and foothill grassland	Sandy	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Little mousetail	*Myosurus minimus ssp. apus*	3.1	Valley & foothill grassland; Vernal pool; Wetland	Alkaline soils. 20-640 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Mud nama	*Nama stenocarpa*	2B.2	Marsh & swamp; Wetland	Lake shores, river banks, intermittently wet areas. 15-815 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Spreading navarretia	*Navarretia fossalis*	FT/1B.1	Alkali playa; Chenopod scrub; Marsh & swamp; Vernal pool; Wetland	San Diego hardpan and San Diego claypan vernal pools; in swales and vernal pools, often surrouded by other habitat types. 15-850 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Chaparral nolina	*Nolina cismontana*	1B.2	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Ultramafic	Primarily on sandstone and shale substrates; also known from gabbro. 140-1100 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Dehesa nolina	*Nolina interrata*	CE/1B.1	Chaparral; Ultramafic	Typically on rocky hillsides or ravines on ultramafic soils (gabbro, serpentine, or metavolcanic). 255-735 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
California adder's-tongue	*Ophioglossum californicum*	4.2	Chaparral, Valley and foothill grassland, Vernal pools	Mesic	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.

California Orcutt grass	*Orcuttia californica*	FE/CE/1B.1	Vernal pool; Wetland	10-660 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Baja California birdbush	*Ornithostaphylos oppositifolia*	CE/2B.1	Chaparral		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Gander's ragwort	*Packera ganderi*	CR/1B.2	Chaparral; Ultramafic	Recently burned sites and gabbro outcrops. 485-1070 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Golden-rayed pentachaeta	*Pentachaeta aurea ssp. aurea*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Coastal scrub, Lower montane coniferous forest, Riparian woodland, Valley and foothill grassland		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Woolly chaparral-pea	*Pickeringia montana var. tomentosa*	4.3	Chaparral	Clay, Gabbroic, Granitic	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.
Coleman's rein orchid	*Piperia colemanii*	4.3	Chaparral, Lower montane coniferous forest	Sandy (often)	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Chaparral rein orchid	*Piperia cooperi*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Valley and foothill grassland		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Narrow-petaled rein orchid	*Piperia leptopetala*	4.3	Cismontane woodland, Lower montane coniferous forest, Upper montane coniferous forest		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Otay Mesa mint	*Pogogyne nudiuscula*	FE/CE/1B.1	Vernal pool; Wetland	Dry beds of vernal pools and moist swales with *Eryngium aristulatum* var. *parishii* and *Orcuttia californica*. 135-165 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Fish's milkwort	*Polygala cornuta var. fishiae*	4.3	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Riparian woodland		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
White rabbit-tobacco	*Pseudognaphalium leucocephalum*	2B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Coastal scrub; Riparian woodland	Sandy, gravelly sites. 35-515 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Cedros Island oak	*Quercus cedrosensis*	2B.2	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral; Coastal scrub	130-975 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Nuttall's scrub oak	*Quercus dumosa*	1B.1	Closed-cone coniferous forest; Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Generally on sandy soils near the coast; sometimes on clay loam. 15-640 m.	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.
Engelmann oak	*Quercus engelmannii*	4.2	Chaparral, Cismontane woodland, Riparian woodland, Valley and foothill grassland		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Moreno currant	*Ribes canthariforme*	1B.3	Chaparral; Riparian scrub	Among boulders in oak-manzanita thickets; shaded or partially shaded sites. 30-1430 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Coulter's matilija poppy	*Romneya coulteri*	4.2	Chaparral, Coastal scrub	Burned areas (often)	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.
Munz's sage	*Salvia munzii*	2B.2	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Rolling hills and slopes, in rocky soil. 35-575 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Tracy's sanicle	*Sanicula tracyi*	4.2	Cismontane woodland, Lower montane coniferous forest, Upper montane coniferous forest	Openings	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Southern mountains skullcap	*Scutellaria bolanderi ssp. austromontana*	1B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Lower montane coniferous forest	In gravelly soils on streambanks or in mesic sites in oak or pine woodland. 425-2000 m.	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.
Ashy spike-moss	*Selaginella cinerascens*	4.1	Chaparral, Coastal scrub		**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Chaparral ragwort	*Senecio aphanactis*	2B.2	Chaparral; Cismontane woodland; Coastal scrub	Drying alkaline flats. 20-1020 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Cove's cassia	*Senna covesii*	2B.2	Desert wash; Sonoran desert scrub	Dry, sandy desert washes, slopes. 255-1295 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
Hammitt's clay-cress	*Sibaropsis hammittii*	1B.2	Chaparral; Valley & foothill grassland	Mesic microsites in open areas on clay soils in *Stipa* grassland. Often surrounded by *Adenostoma* chaparral. 715-1040 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Bottle liverwort	*Sphaerocarpos drewiae*	1B.1	Chaparral; Coastal scrub	Liverwort in openings; on soil. 60-585 m.	**Potential to occur**: Suitable habitat present.
Purple stemodia	*Stemodia durantifolia*	2B.1	Sonoran desert scrub	Sandy soils; mesic sites. 35-385 m.	**Absent**: No habitat onsite.
San Diego County needle grass	*Stipa diegoensis*	4.2	Chaparral, Coastal scrub	Mesic (often), Rocky	**Low potential to occur**: Marginal habitat is present.

Laguna Mountains jewelflower	*Streptanthus bernardinus*	4.3	Chaparral; Lower montane coniferous forest; Upper montane coniferous forest	Clay or decomposed granite soils; sometimes in disturbed areas such as streamsides or roadcuts. 1440-2500 m.	Low potential to occur: Marginal habitat is present.
Estuary seablite	*Suaeda esteroa*	1B.2	Marsh & swamp; Salt marsh; Wetland	Coastal salt marshes in clay, silt, and sand substrates. 0-80 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
Parry's tetracoccus	*Tetracoccus dioicus*	1B.2	Chaparral; Coastal scrub; Ultramafic	Stony, decomposed gabbro soil. 135-705 m.	Absent: No habitat onsite.
San Diego County viguiera	*Viguiera laciniata*	4.3	Chaparral, Coastal scrub		Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
Rush-like bristleweed	*Xanthisma junceum*	4.3	Chaparral, Coastal scrub		Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.

*Definitions of Status Codes: FE = Federally listed as endangered; FT = Federally listed as threatened; FPE = Federally proposed for listing as endangered; FPT = Federally proposed for listing as threatened; FC = Candidate for Federal listing; MB = Migratory Bird Act; CE = California State listed as endangered; CT = California State listed as threatened; CSSC = California species of special concern; CR = California rare species; CFP = California fully protected species; CRPR (California Rare Plant Rank) List 1A = Plants presumed extinct in California by; CRPR List 1B = Plants designated rare, threatened or endangered in California and elsewhere; CRPR List 2A = Plants presumed extirpated in California but common elsewhere; CRPR 2B = Plants rare threatened or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere; CRPR 3 Review List: Plants about which more information is needed and CRPR 4 = Watch List: Plants of limited distribution. CRPR Threat Ranks: 0.1 = seriously threatened in California; S2 = moderately threatened in California; S3 = not very threatened in California .

**Copied verbatim from CNDDB, unless otherwise noted.

***Definitions of Occurrence Probability Rankings:

- Present: Species was observed during site visit. Or
- Present: Species has been previously documented to occur within the Study Area.
- Potential to occur: Suitable habitat present.
- Low potential to occur: Marginal habitat is present.
- Absent: No habitat onsite.

Appendix D

CEQA Checklist

CEQA Checklist

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. Where noted below with a checked box for yes, the topic with a potentially significant impact will be addressed in an environmental impact report.

- ☐ Aesthetics
- ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Biological Resources
- ☐ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Energy
- ☐ Geology / Soils
- ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ☐ Hazards / Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
- ☐ Land Use / Planning
- ☐ Mineral Resources
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Population / Housing
- ☐ Public Services
- ☐ Recreation
- ☐ Transportation
- ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
- ☐ Utilities / Service Systems
- ☐ Wildfire
- ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
- ☒ None
- ☐ None with Mitigation Incorporated

Docusign Envelope ID: FB623690-BD6F-403F-AB87-2DBF05EA2AD6

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

Yes I find that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

No 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.

No I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

No 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.

No 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 Signed by: Glen Lubcke AD7D070BCB66466... Date 7/28/2025

Printed Name Glen Lubcke Title Environmental Program Manager

Agency California Department of Fish and Wildlife

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
    a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
    b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
    c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
    a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
    b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

I. AESTHETICS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Aesthetics. Except as provided in Public Resources Code section 21099 (where aesthetic impacts shall not be considered significant for qualifying residential, mixed-use residential, and employment centers), would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.1, Aesthetics, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. Agriculture and Forest Resources. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997, as updated) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.2, Agriculture and Forestry Services, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

III. AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. Air Quality. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations. Are significance criteria established by the applicable air district available to rely on for significance determinations? Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.3, Air Quality, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	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 Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.4, Biological Resources, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. Cultural Resources. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially disturb human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.5, Cultural Resources, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

VI. ENERGY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.6, Energy for the analysis. There would be no impact.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Geology and Soils. Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.7, Geology and Soils, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) 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; or	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.10, Hydrology/Water Quality, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.11, Land Use and Planning, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.12, Mineral Resources, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

XIII. NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.Noise. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, or a substantial temporary or permanent increase in noise levels above existing ambient levels that could result in an adverse effect on humans?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.13, Noise, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Population and Housing. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.14, Population and Housing, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. Public Services. Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.15, Public Services, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

XVI. RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. Recreation. Would the project:				
a) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.16, Recreation, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. Transportation. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.17, Transportation, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources. Has a California Native American Tribe requested consultation in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1(b)? Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Fail to comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.19, Utilities and Service Systems, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

XX. WILDFIRE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. Wildfire. Is the project located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as high fire hazard severity zones? If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Require the installation of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.20, Wildfire, for the analysis. There would be no impact.


XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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.)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please refer to EA/IS Section 4.2.21, Mandatory Findings of Significance, for the analysis. There would be no impact.

Appendix E

Cultural Resources Study and Technical Review



Cultural Resources Study and Technical Review for the Jamul Indian Village Land Disposal Exchange Project

Prepared for:

Mr. Chad Beckstrom and Mr. Rid Hollands

Ascent Environmental, Inc.

455 Capital Mall, Suite 300

Sacramento, California 95814

Prepared by:

Rachel Ruston, Principal Archaeologist

Holly Drake M.A. RPA, Associate Archaeologist

Amanda Jokela, Associate Archaeologist

Brian Williams, CEO and Principal Archaeologist

ASM Affiliates
5640 Kearny Mesa Road, Suite I
San Diego, CA 92111

July 2025

PN 47430:00

Intentionally blank

Cultural Resources Study and Technical Review for the Jamul Indian Village Land Disposal Exchange Project in unincorporated San Diego County, California

Prepared for:

Mr. Chad Beckstrom and Mr. Rid Hollands

Submitted to:

Ascent Environmental, Inc.
455 Capital Mall, Suite 300
Sacramento, California 95814

Prepared by:

Rachel Ruston
Principal Archaeologist

Holly Drake M.A. RPA
Associate Archaeologist

Amanda Jokela
Associate Archaeologist

Brian Williams
CEO and Principal Archaeologist

ASM Affiliates
5640 Kearny Mesa Road, Suite I
San Diego, CA 92111

July 2025
PN 47430:00/00E

Intentionally blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter **Page**

INTRODUCTION 1
PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION 1
PROJECT AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT 9
PROJECT PERSONNEL 9

REGULATORY CONTEXT 10
JAMUL LAND TRANSFER ACT 10
National Environmental Policy Act 10
National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 10
National Register Criteria for Evaluation 12
California Environmental Quality Act 13
Discovery of Human Remains 14
San Diego County Local Register of Historical Resources 16
Traditional Cultural Properties / Tribal Cultural Resources 16

SOURCES CONSULTED 17

1. BACKGROUND 19
1.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS 19
1.2 GEOGRAPHY 19
1.3 GEOLOGY AND SOILS 20
1.4 BIOLOGY 20
1.5 CULTURAL SETTING 20
1.5.1 Prehistoric Period 20
1.5.2 Early Prehistoric Period Complexes (pre c. 12,000 B.C.–5000 B.C.) 21
1.5.3 Archaic Period Complexes (5000 B.C.–800 C.E.) 21
1.5.4 Late Prehistoric Period Complexes (800 C.E.-1769) 22
1.5.5 Historic Period 22
1.5.6 Spanish Period 22
1.5.7 Mexican Period 23
1.5.8 American Period 23
1.6 HISTORIC OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT AREA 25
1.6.1 General Kumeyaay Ethnographic Background 26
1.6.2 Kumeyaay Material Culture 27
1.6.3 Kumeyaay Social Structure, Society, and Beliefs 27
1.6.4 Kumeyaay Subsistence and Settlement Pattern 27
1.7 PREVIOUS RESEARCH IN THE AREA 28
1.7.1 Prominent Studies in the Project Vicinity 28
1.8. RESEARCH CONTEXT 28

2. RECORDS SEARCH RESULTS 29
2.1 PREVIOUS STUDIES 29
2.2 PREVIOUS RECORDED SITES WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO STUDY AREA 31

3. FIELD METHODS 35

4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES 37
4.1 PREHISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES 37

4.1.1 Temp ID-SL-S-001 37
4.2 HISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES 37
4.3 PREHISTORIC ISOLATES 37
4.4 RESOURCES OF UNKNOWN AGE 37
4.5 PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC MULTI-COMPONENT SITES 37
4.6 OTHER LOCATIONS OF HISTORIC ACTIVITIES, OBJECTS, OR INFRASTRUCTURE 37
4.7 PREHISTORIC SYNTHESIS 38

5. NATIVE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION/ CONSULTATION 39

6. IMPACTS, SIGNIFICANCE, AND MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS 41

6.1 INTERPRETATION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT IDENTIFICATION 41
6.1.1 Resource Significance 41
6.1.2 Impact Identification 41
6.1.3 TEMP ID-SL-S-001 42

REFERENCES 45

APPENDICES 53

APPENDIX A .....
AB 52/Section 106 Letters .....
APPENDIX B .....
CONFIDENTIAL Cultural Memorandum: Jamul Land Transfer Project (2021) .....
APPENDIX C .....
CONFIDENTIAL Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property .....

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1. USGS topographic map Project location of the Disposal Property. 4
Figure 2. USGS topographic map of the Exchange Property. 6
Figure 3. Overview aerial map of Disposal and Exchange Properties. 7
Figure 4. Overview aerial map of Disposal and Exchange Properties showing RJER and HCWA. 8

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies within Project Area (Disposal Property) 29
Table 2. Cultural Resources Studies Conducted within 0.5 Mile of the Project Areas 30
Table 3. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Area (Exchange Property) 32
Table 4. Previously Recorded Archaeological Resources within 0.5 Mile of Project Areas 32

Intentionally blank

INTRODUCTION

The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV or Tribe) is seeking to acquire a 1.1-acre portion of the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER) from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to support the future expansion of its cemetery. To facilitate this request, CDFW is proposing to dispose of the 1.1-acre segment of RJER (the "Disposal Property") in exchange for the approximately 4.0-acre Slee property (the "Exchange Property"), which was recently acquired by the Tribe and is located adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA).

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange constitutes a discretionary action subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Although the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER) is owned and managed by CDFW, its establishment was partially funded through a Section 6 grant from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, as well as a grant from the California Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB). Section 6 of the Act authorizes USFWS to provide federal financial assistance through the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund to states and territories for the development and implementation of conservation programs benefiting listed, candidate, and at-risk species on non-federal lands. Because the 1.1-acre Disposal Property—part of the RJER—was acquired using Section 6 funds, USFWS review and approval are required for any proposed land disposal or exchange. Accordingly, the action is also subject to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). To complete the proposed exchange, and in accordance with USFWS Federal Financial Assistance Manual Part 520, Chapter 7.37 (Real Property, After Close of Escrow), a Notice of Federal Participation must be recorded on the title of the Exchange Property to reflect its federal nexus as a substitute for the Disposal Property.

The Proposed Action involves the disposal of a 1.1-acre portion of Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 597-080-07, currently held in fee title by CDFW and encumbered by a federal nexus due to its original acquisition with federal funds. This parcel is proposed to be conveyed to the JIV to support the future expansion of its existing cemetery. While the cemetery expansion itself falls outside the jurisdiction of both CDFW and USFWS and is not part of the Proposed Action, it would remain subject to all applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance.

Ascent retained ASM Affiliates (ASM) to perform a technical review of previously prepared cultural resources studies for the Jamul Indian Village Land Disposal and Exchange (Project). The JIV has requested use of a 1.1-acre parcel, the Disposal Property (APN 597-080-07), located adjacent to the existing JIV Cemetery, located in unincorporated San Diego County, California, and managed by the CDFW. A 4.0-acre pair of parcels held in fee by JIV, the Exchange Property (APNs 600-10-105 and 600-10-104), is located near the southeast corner of the HCWA and will be conveyed to CDFW in exchange for the removal of the Disposal Property from the RJER. The objective of this study was to assess the technical review of the cultural resources inventory of the Disposal Property, the cultural resources inventory of the Exchange Property, to present the results of the field check of the Disposal Property conducted by ASM Affiliates), and to provide Section 106 and CEQA Standards and Reporting in support of the Action. This report summarizes the technical review of the cultural resources inventory of the Disposal Property, the cultural resources inventory of the Exchange Property, and presents the results of the field check of the Disposal Property conducted by ASM Affiliates.

PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV), located in southeastern unincorporated San Diego County, has requested use of a 1.1-acre parcel, the Disposal Property (APN 597-080-07), located adjacent to the

existing JIV Cemetery and managed by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW). A 4.0-acre pair of parcels held in fee by JIV, the Exchange Property (APNs 600-10-105 and 600-10-104), is located near the southeast corner of the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) and will be conveyed to CDFW in exchange for the removal of the Disposal Property (APN 597-080-07), from the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER) (Figures 1 & 2). As the CDFW manages the Disposal Property, the CDFW acts as the lead agency for this project to ensure compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Because the original purchase of the Disposal Property was funded via a United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) grant under Section 6 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the USFWS is required to review and approve land disposals/exchange with the RJER. Therefore, this Project is a federal undertaking and subject to the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) with the USFWS acting as lead agency to ensure compliance with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). ASM Affiliates (ASM) was contracted to provide a technical review of previously prepared cultural resources studies for the Jamul Indian Village Land Disposal and Exchange (Project). The lead agencies are responsible for conducting Tribal Consultation, which is in progress.

In 2021, Montrose Environmental Solutions prepared a report authored by Charlane Gross, MA, RPA, titled *Cultural Memorandum: Jamul Land Transfer Project* (Appendix B) located at the JIV, outlining the proposed transfer of land owned by the CDFW to the JIV. The *Cultural Memorandum* was assessed by ASM for compliance with CEQA, NEPA/NHPA, NAGPRA, Section 106 and AB52 regulations. As part of research for the Disposal Property Cultural Memorandum, a record search was conducted at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) on October 25, 2021. The search found that four previous surveys intersected the area of potential effect (APE) but did not include the entirety of the Disposal Property. The SCIC reported 37 cultural resources, primarily prehistoric sites, which were identified within a 0.5-mile buffer, but not within the Disposal Property.

An archaeological survey of the Disposal Property was conducted in 2021 by Montrose. During the archaeological survey, parallel transects spaced 50 feet (ft.) apart were surveyed; ground surface visibility was good and averaged about 50 percent visibility. Several fragments of cobalt glass were noted immediately north of the property, in the area JIV's Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) previously noted historic artifacts. During the survey, no cultural resources or historic properties were identified on the property, and, therefore, a finding of No Historic Properties Affected was recommended in the cultural resources assessment for the property. With adequate survey coverage, lack of resources present, and no ground disturbance proposed for this undertaking, ASM recommends that the Proposed Action would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource and there would be no impact. Additionally, as there would be no ground disturbance associated with the Proposed Action, there would be no opportunity to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries and, thus, no impact. The Cultural Memorandum prepared by Montrose (Attachment B) was reviewed by ASM; ASM recommends that the study is adequate and supports compliance with federal, state, and local regulations.

In 2022, Helix Environmental prepared a report authored by Theodore Cooley, RPA, and Mary Robbin-Wade, RPA, titled *Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee)*. Helix conducted the due diligence/constraints analysis related to cultural resources, which included a records search, Sacred Lands Files (SLF) search, and a field survey of the property. The due diligence study was assessed by ASM for compliance with Section 106 and AB52 regulations. As part of research for the Exchange Property due diligence study, a record search was conducted at the SCIC of the CHRIS (no date provided). The records search found that 25 previous surveys had been performed within the one-mile records search area of the area of potential effect (APE). The SCIC records search results also revealed that 71 cultural resources have been previously identified within the one-mile radius surrounding the subject site, none of which are recorded within or immediately adjacent to the subject property. These resources consist of 47 prehistoric archaeological sites, four historic archaeological sites,

three multicomponent (containing a historic and a prehistoric component) archaeological sites, 12 precontact isolated artifact finds, four historic isolated artifact finds, and one isolated find containing both a prehistoric artifact and a historic artifact.

A review of historic maps showed no development within the Disposal Property, only roads. A pair of buildings were shown on nearby quadrangles, but they are likely associated with the Saint Francis Xavier Cemetery church. According to consultation undertaken with the THPO of the JIV in advance of the archaeological survey, it was noted there is a dense resource concentration of prehistoric resources in the vicinity, which is verified by the presence of an ethnographic village nearby, thus indicating a potential for prehistoric resources. JIV's THPO also indicated that she found historic artifacts immediately north of the APE (Montrose Environmental Solutions, 2021).

The removal of the ecological reserve protections resulting from the land transfer of the Disposal Property would enable the Tribe to develop the site; however, any activities associated with the future cemetery expansion are not part of the Proposed Action and would be subject to compliance with federal, state, and local regulations. No impact to cultural resources or historic properties will result at the Disposal Property from the proposed action.

The addition of ecological protections at the Exchange Property will further protect and enhance the natural and cultural landscape. Although one site is documented at the Disposal Property, no impact to cultural resources or historic properties will result from the proposed action.

Two project areas were investigated for this report: Disposal Property (APN 597-080-07) and Exchange Property (APNs 600-10-105 and 600-10-104). The Disposal Property and Exchange Property both lack development with the exception of roads and footpaths. All project areas are on the Dulzura USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle in the unincorporated community of Jamul in southeastern San Diego County.

ASM conducted an analysis of the previous cultural resource studies described above (Attachment B, and Attachment C) conducted for the Project by Montrose Environmental Solutions and Helix Environmental, in coordination with Ascent. ASM conducted field checks of the Disposal Property on November 13, 2024, and the Exchange Property on January 14, 2025.




Figure 1. USGS topographic map Project location of the Disposal Property.

The Disposal Property is an approximately 1.1-acre triangular-shaped property on the northern boundary of the RJER in unincorporated San Diego County. It is a small piece of a larger parcel (APN 597-080-07) owned by CDFW (Figure 4). The property is in Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute US Geological Survey (USGS) Quadrangle. The Property is zoned as A72 General Agriculture, currently undeveloped and vacant. The Disposal Property is approximately 1.1 acres and is bounded by privately owned undeveloped land to the north, the JIV's Saint Francis Xavier Cemetery to the east, and the conservation land within the RJER to the south and west. The Disposal Property is dominated by chamise chaparral and mixed non-native grasses.

The Exchange Property is owned by the Tribe and is located within Township 17 South, Range 2 East on Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle. The Property is zoned as A72 General Agricultural Use and designated Semi-Rural Residential in the County of San Diego's General Plan; it is undeveloped and vacant. The Exchange Property project area is approximately 4.0 acres and is bounded by residential development to the north and west, privately owned undeveloped land to the south, and the HCWA to the east. The Exchange Property is dominated by dense chamise chaparral and rocky outcrops.




Figure 2. USGS topographic map of the Exchange Property.



Figure 3. Overview aerial map of Disposal and Exchange Properties.




Figure 4. Overview aerial map of Disposal and Exchange Properties showing RJER and HCWA.

PROJECT AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT

A Project area of potential effect (APE) is "the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may cause changes to the cultural resources, as well as in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist" (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 800.2(c)). The Project's APE was delineated to ensure the identification of significant cultural resources and historic properties that may be directly or indirectly affected by the Project and that are listed in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

The APE was delineated in accordance with Section 106 guidelines. This project includes a direct and indirect APE in consideration of potential project-related effects to both archaeological and historic built environment resources. The direct APE includes areas that could be affected by the undertaking.

The survey area within the APE is undeveloped, and the natural landscape remains intact.

The following factors were used in determining the property selections for the land exchange:

- location of both properties in relation to ecological reserves and wildlife areas,
- location of the Disposal Property in relation to the Tribe's current property boundaries and existing cemetery,
- proximity of each property to the other, and
- presence of similar habitat types and environmental resources

The APE for the proposed Action includes the Disposal Property (1.1 acres), and the Exchange Property (4.0 acres), see Figures 1 and 2. Both the Disposal Property and the exchange Property have been adequately surveyed by Montrose and Helix, with additional field checks conducted by ASM Affiliates in 2024 and 2025 to confirm the findings of the two previous survey efforts. ASM's field check verified the survey efforts are adequate, and, therefore, the APE has been adequately surveyed.

PROJECT PERSONNEL

Rachel Ruston, ASM director, served as project manager and principal archaeologist; Brian Williams MMA RPA (Maritime Archaeology, Flinders University) served as the principal investigator. The effort consisted of research and data compilation from previous studies authored by Montrose and Helix Environmental, including records searches conducted at the SCIC and review of Archives at ASM's library, including literature, records, maps, and surveys. ASM provided support to the lead agencies in their Section 106 and AB52 consultation; information relating to these efforts is gathered and included in this report.

Additional qualified ASM staff and contributors who supported the preparation of this document include Holly Drake MA, RPA, associate archaeologist (MA in Anthropology, Washington State University), who meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology* (36 CFR 61), and Amanda Jokela BA (CSU Los Angeles), (editor), Jason Carr (editor), and Nick Doose, MA (GIS Manager). Without this team of experienced staff, this document would not be possible. The completion of this report was made possible by the authors, with invaluable support from Rid Hollands from Ascent in 2024 and 2025.

REGULATORY CONTEXT

The primary goals of this study were to identify cultural and historic resources that have the potential to be adversely affected by the proposed Action. This report is in support of the environmental assessment (EA) and associated initial study/negative declaration (IS/ND), hereafter referenced as EA/IS/ND. The EA/IS/ND was prepared to satisfy the requirements of NEPA and CEQA, respectively. The NEPA lead agency is USFWS, and the CEQA lead agency is CDFW. This report describes the cultural resources in the Proposed Action area and analyzes the effects of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative on the environment.

JAMUL LAND TRANSFER ACT

The *Jamul Indian Village Land Transfer Act* (Public Law 118–199), enacted on December 23, 2024, places approximately 172.10 acres of land in San Diego County, California, into trust for the Jamul Indian Village of California. The Act identifies four specific parcels and authorizes the U.S. Secretary of the Interior to accept an additional 1.1 acres into trust if conveyed by the tribe. All lands taken into trust become part of the tribe's reservation and are subject to federal laws governing trust lands. Importantly, the Act prohibits any Class II or Class III gaming activities on these lands under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (United States Congress, 2024).

National Environmental Policy Act

NEPA (42 United States Code [USC] 4321 et seq.) establishes the federal policy of protecting important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage during federal project planning. NEPA also obligates federal agencies to consider the environmental consequences and costs of their projects and programs as part of the planning process. All federal or federally assisted projects requiring action pursuant to Section 102 of NEPA must take into account the effects on cultural and historic resources (40 CFR §1508.8). According to the *Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing NEPA* (40 CFR §1500-1508), in considering whether an action may "significantly affect the quality of the human environment," an agency must consider, among other things, the context and intensity of the impact, including "unique characteristics of the geographic area, such as proximity to historic or cultural resources" (40 CFR §1508.27(b)(3)) and "the degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highway, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places" (40 CFR §1508.27(b)(8)).

National Historic Preservation Act Section 106

NHPA Section 106 is applicable to federal undertakings, including Projects financed or permitted by federal agencies regardless of whether the activities occur on federally managed or privately owned land. Section 106 of the NHPA is the primary directive for cultural resource preservation. Section 106 requires federal agencies with either direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed action to take into account the effect of their actions on historic properties. Section 110 also requires federal agencies to assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties under their jurisdiction or control.

Regulations revised in 1997 (36 CFR Part 800 et. seq.) set forth procedures to be followed for determining eligibility of properties for the NRHP. The eligibility criteria and process are used by federal, state, and local agencies in the evaluation of the significance of cultural resources. Recent revisions to Section 106 in 1999 emphasized the importance of Native American consultation.

36 CFR §800.16(I)(1) states:

> Historic property means any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the NRHP maintained by the Secretary of the Interior. This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization that meet the NRHP criteria. Section 106 of the NHPA also requires federal agencies, and those they fund or over which they have approval authority, to allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) the opportunity to comment on undertakings on historic properties, following 36 CFR Part 800. To determine whether an undertaking could affect NRHP-eligible properties, cultural resources (including archaeological, historical, and architectural properties) must be inventoried and evaluated for listing in the NRHP. Although compliance with Section 106 is the responsibility of the lead federal agency, others can undertake the work necessary to comply with Section 106.

The Section 106 process entails six primary steps:

1. Initiate consultation and public involvement.
2. Identify and evaluate historic properties within the APE.
3. Assess effects of the project on historic properties.
4. Consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding adverse effects on historic properties; if adverse effects are identified, the development of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) would result.
5. Submit the MOA to the ACHP.
6. Proceed in accordance with the MOA.

Lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate historical resources prior to making a finding as to a proposed project's impacts. Mitigation of adverse impacts is required if the proposed project will cause substantial adverse change. Substantial adverse change includes demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of a historical resource would be impaired. While demolition and destruction are obvious significant impacts, it is more difficult to assess when change, alteration, or relocation crosses the threshold of substantial adverse change. The CEQA Guidelines provide that a project that demolishes or alters those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance (i.e., its character-defining features) is considered to materially impair the resource's significance.

The purpose of NHPA Section 106 is to determine whether adverse effects will occur to significant cultural resources, defined as "historic properties" that are listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP. The criteria for NRHP eligibility are defined at 36 CFR § 60.4 as follows:

> The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and that:
>
> (A) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
>
> (B) are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
>
> (C) embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
>
> (D) have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

There are, however, restrictions on the kinds of historical properties that can be NRHP listed. These have been identified by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), as follows:

> Ordinarily cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for the National Register. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within the following categories:
>
> (a) A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or
>
> (b) A building or structure removed from its original location, but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or
>
> (c) A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building directly associated with his productive life.
>
> (d) A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
>
> (e) A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or
>
> (f) A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance; or
>
> (g) A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance. [ACHP n.d.]

National Register Criteria for Evaluation

A district, site, building, structure, or object must generally be at least 50 years old to be eligible for consideration as a historic property. That district, site, building, structure, or object must retain integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feelings, and association as well as meet one of the four criteria of eligibility defined above to demonstrate its historic associations in order to convey its significance. A property must be associated with one or more events important in history or prehistory to be considered for listing under Criterion A. Additionally, the specific association of the property itself must also be considered significant. Criterion B applies to properties associated with individuals whose specific contributions to history can be identified and documented. Properties significant for their physical design or construction under Criterion C must have features with characteristics that exemplify such elements as architecture, landscape architecture, engineering, and artwork. Criterion D most commonly applies to properties that have the potential to answer, in whole or in part, important research questions about human history that can be answered only by the actual physical materials of cultural resources. A property eligible under Criterion D must demonstrate the potential to contain information relevant to prehistory and history (*National Register Bulletin 15*).

A district, site, building, structure, or object may also be eligible for consideration as a historic property if that property meets the criteria considerations for properties generally less than 50 years old, in addition to possessing integrity and meeting the criteria for evaluation.

Integrity

In addition to meeting one or several of the above Evaluation Criteria and Criteria Considerations, a property must retain integrity to be considered eligible for listing on the NRHP. According to the *National Register Bulletin 15* (1997:44), "Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the National Register criteria, but it also must have integrity."

Seven aspects or qualities of cultural resources, in various combinations, define integrity. Significant cultural resources possess several, usually most, of these seven qualities. The seven qualities of integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and/or association. Which aspects of integrity are pertinent to the significance-determination of a specific resource depends on the criterion under which it may be eligible. For example, location would not be an important quality of integrity for a historic ship.

National Register Bulletin 15 (1997:46) then further specifies that:

> Archeological sites eligible under Criteria A and B must be in overall good condition with excellent preservation of features, artifacts, and spatial relationships to the extent that these remains are able to convey important associations with events or persons…Archeological sites eligible under Criterion C …[must have] remains [that] are able to illustrate a site type, time period, method of construction, or work of a master…under Criterion D, integrity is based upon the property's potential to yield specific data that addresses important research questions.

Note that, for archaeological sites, under Criterion D "only the *potential* to yield information is required," whereas for Criteria A, B and C, "the site must have demonstrated its ability to convey its significance" (National Register Bulletin, 1997:46; emphasis in original).

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA is applicable to discretionary actions by state or local lead agencies. Under CEQA, lead agencies must analyze impacts to cultural resources. Significant impacts under CEQA occur when "historically significant" or "unique" cultural resources are adversely affected, which occurs when such resources could be altered or destroyed through Project implementation. Historically significant cultural resources are defined by eligibility for or by listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). In practice, the federal NRHP criteria (below) for significance applied under Section 106 are generally (although not entirely) consistent with CRHR criteria (see PRC § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852 and § 15064.5(a)(3)).

Significant cultural resources are those archaeological resources and historical properties that:

(1) Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

(2) Are associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

(3) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic values; or

(4) Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Unique resources under CEQA, in slight contrast, are those that represent:

> An archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:
>
> (1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
>
> (2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
>
> (3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person (PRC § 21083.2(g)).

AB 52, signed into law in 2014, established a new category of resources in CEQA called "tribal cultural resources" that considers the tribal cultural values in addition to the scientific and archaeological values when determining impacts and mitigation. Pursuant to PRC, Division 13, Section 21074, tribal cultural resources can be either:

1. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either:
   a. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR; or
   b. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to the eligibility criteria for the CRHR (PRC § 5024.1(c)). In applying these criteria, the lead agency must consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area may have expertise concerning their tribal cultural resources. Considering this, AB 52 requires that, within 14 days of a decision to undertake a project or determination that a project application is complete, a lead agency shall provide written notification to California Native American tribes that have previously requested placement on the agency's notice list. Notice to tribes shall include a brief project description, location, lead agency contact information, and the statement that the tribe has 30 days to request consultation. The lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a tribe.

Discovery of Human Remains

If human remains or possible human remains are identified on either the Disposal or Exchange Properties, CDFW, USFWS or JIV will be contacted, as appropriate, to ensure compliance with the following State laws and regulations:

- California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Section 15064.5 (d) & (e) which outlines procedures and responsibilities for handling Native American human remains discovered during the environmental review or project implementation phases and to ensure respectful treatment in consultation with Native American representatives;
- Health and Safety Code Section §7050.5 which is a California state law that governs the treatment of human remains discovered during construction or other ground-disturbing

activities. This section ensures respectful handling, preservation, and consultation in cases where human remains are unexpectedly uncovered

  - Immediate Action Upon Discovery: If human remains are discovered, all ground-disturbing work must immediately cease in the area of the find. The site must be secured to prevent further disturbance.
  - Notification of Authorities: The county coroner must be notified immediately of the discovery. The coroner will determine whether the remains are part of a crime scene or otherwise require forensic investigation, or Native American in origin.
  - Discovery of Native American Remains: If the coroner determines that the remains are Native American, they must notify the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. The NAHC will then designate a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) from a relevant Native American Tribe.
  - Role of the MLD: The MLD provides recommendations for the treatment or disposition of the remains. Options include:
    - Preservation in place, considered the preferred approach.
    - Removal and respectful reburial elsewhere.
  - Developers are required to make a good faith effort to follow the MLD's recommendations.
  - Protection Against Unauthorized Removal: Unauthorized removal or disturbance of human remains is prohibited and can result in legal penalties.
  - Resumption of Work: Work in the area may only resume after the remains are handled in accordance with applicable laws and MLD recommendations and necessary permits and clearances are obtained; and

- Public Resources Code §5097.98 which outlines protocols for handling Native American human remains, including engagement with the MLD designated by the NAHC and development of appropriate agreements for handling remains.
  - Notification of the NAHC: If human remains are discovered that are determined to be Native American, the county coroner must notify the NAHC within 24 hours of the determination.
  - Designation of an MLD: The NAHC appoints an MLD, typically a representative of the culturally affiliated Tribe or family, within 48 hours of being notified.
- Responsibilities of the MLD: The MLD consults with the property owner or project developer to recommend appropriate treatment of the remains and associated artifacts. Recommended actions may include:
  - Preservation in place (preferred approach under the law).
  - Removal and reburial in a culturally appropriate manner.
  - Other culturally appropriate actions as agreed upon.
- Good Faith Efforts by the Property Owner/Developer: The property owner or project developer is required to work in good faith with the MLD to implement their recommendations. If no agreement is reached, the remains must be reburied in a nearby area that will not be subject to further disturbance.
  - Preservation in Place: Considered the preferred method of treatment to minimize disturbance and maintain the cultural and spiritual integrity of the remains.
  - Prohibition of Further Disturbance: Until an agreement is reached, and actions are taken, no further ground-disturbing activity can occur in the vicinity of the remains.
  - Unresolved Situations: If the NAHC is unable to identify an MLD or if the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the property owner must reinter the remains with dignity in a location not subject to further disturbance.
  - Protections and Enforcement: Violations of this section, including unauthorized removal or disturbance of Native American remains, can result in legal penalties.

This law works in tandem with Health and Safety Code §7050.5, which requires work stoppage upon discovery of human remains.

San Diego County Local Register of Historical Resources

The County requires that resource importance be assessed not only at the state level as required by CEQA, but at the local level as well. If a resource meets any one of the following criteria as outlined in the Local Register, it will be considered an important resource.

(1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of San Diego County's history and cultural heritage;
(2) Is associated with the lives of persons important to the history of San Diego County or its communities;
(3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, San Diego County region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
(4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Traditional Cultural Properties / Tribal Cultural Resources

Federal and state laws mandate that consideration be given to the concerns of contemporary Native Americans with regard to potentially ancestral human remains, associated funerary objects, and items of cultural patrimony. Consequently, an important element in assessing the significance of the study site has been to evaluate the likelihood that these classes of items are present in areas that would be affected by the proposed project.

Potentially relevant to prehistoric archaeological sites is the category termed Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) in discussions of cultural resource management (CRM) performed under federal auspices. According to Patricia L. Parker and Thomas F. King (1998), "Traditional" in this context refers to those beliefs, customs, and practices of a living community of people that have been passed down through the generations, usually orally or through practice. The traditional cultural significance of a historic property, then, is significance derived from the role the property plays in a community's historically rooted beliefs, customs, and practices.

The County of San Diego Guidelines (2007) identify that cultural resources can also include TCPs, such as gathering areas, landmarks, and ethnographic locations in addition to archaeological districts. These guidelines incorporate both state and federal definitions of TCPs. Generally, a TCP may consist of a single site, or group of associated archaeological sites (district; traditional cultural landscape), or an area of cultural/ethnographic importance.

The Traditional Tribal Cultural Places Bill of 2004 requires local governments to consult with Native American representatives during the project planning process. The intent of this legislation is to encourage consultation and assist in the preservation of "Native American places of prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, and ceremonial importance" (County of San Diego 2007). It further allows for tribal cultural places to be included in open space planning. State Assembly Bill (AB) 52, in effect as of July 1, 2015, introduces the Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) as a class of cultural resource and additional considerations relating to Native American consultation into CEQA. As a general concept, a TCR is similar to the federally defined TCP; however, it incorporates consideration of local and state significance and required mitigation under CEQA. A TCR may be considered significant if included in a local or state register of historical resources; or determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in PRC §5024.1; or is a geographically defined cultural landscape that meets one or more of these

criteria; or is a historical resource described in PRC §21084.1, a unique archaeological resource described in PRC §21083.2, or is a non-unique archaeological resource if it conforms with the above criteria.

In 1990, the NPS and Advisory Council for Historic Preservation introduced the term "TCP" through National Register Bulletin 38 (Parker and King 1998, NPS 2024). A TCP may be considered eligible based on "its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in that community's history, and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community" (Parker and King 1998:1). In 2024, the National Park Service published *National Register Bulletin 38 (Updated) Identifying, Evaluating, and documenting Traditional Cultural Places* (NPS 2024) to provide updated guidance for TCPs.

Strictly speaking, Traditional Cultural Properties are both tangible and intangible; they are anchored in space by cultural values related to community-based physically defined "property referents" (Parker and King 1998:3). On the other hand, TCPs are largely ideological, a characteristic that may present substantial problems in the process of delineating specific boundaries. Such a property's extent is based on community conceptions of how the surrounding physical landscape interacts with existing cultural values. By its nature, a TCP need only be important to community members, and not the general outside population as a whole. In this way, a TCP boundary, as described by Bulletin 38, may be defined based on viewscape, encompassing topographic features, extent of archaeological district or use area, or a community's sense of its own geographic limits. Regardless of why a TCP is of importance to a group of people, outsider acceptance or rejection of this understanding is made inherently irrelevant by the relativistic nature of this concept.

SOURCES CONSULTED

California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records searches for this study were conducted by Montrose and Helix Environmental on October 25, 2021 and May 23, 2022, respectively, at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC), San Diego State University. Site records on file at the SCIC indicate 59 previous archaeological projects have been conducted within a 1-mi. radius of the survey area. The records searches included a review of historic maps and aerial photographs.

Additional research was conducted using files and literature maintained at AES. The records search included a review of the National Register of Historic Places; the California Register of Historical Resources California Historical Landmarks; California Points of Historical Interest; historic maps; and Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility.

Intentionally blank

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The Disposal and Exchange properties are located in unincorporated San Diego County, California, within the broader Jamul region. Their locations both contain a rich natural and cultural environment. The existing environmental and cultural settings are described below.

The Disposal Property is a triangular-shaped, 1.1-acre parcel located on the northern boundary of the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER) in unincorporated San Diego County. It is owned by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and lies adjacent to the Jamul Indian Village's Saint Francis Xavier Cemetery and the Jamul Casino. The site is undeveloped and characterized by disturbed coastal sage scrub habitat, primarily composed of California sagebrush and laurel sumac, interspersed with nonnative grasses. It provides suitable habitat for several special-status species, including the coastal California gnatcatcher, Hermes copper butterfly, and Quino checkerspot butterfly, though no critical habitat is designated on-site. The property features rolling slopes with elevations ranging from 930 to 980 feet (ft.) above mean sea level and drains southeast into Willow Creek. It is not visible from nearby roads due to intervening topography and is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The site has no known hazardous materials or cultural resources and is zoned for general agricultural use with a General Plan designation of Open Space–Conservation.

The Exchange Property comprises two contiguous parcels totaling approximately 4.0 acres, located on Honey Springs Road in unincorporated San Diego County. Owned by the Jamul Indian Village, the site is adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) and surrounded by rural residential and undeveloped lands. The property is undeveloped and features a mix of coastal sage scrub and chamise chaparral habitats, with rock outcrops and a notably lower percentage of nonnative grasses compared to the Disposal Property. These habitats support a variety of special-status species, including the coastal California gnatcatcher and several bat species, although no critical habitat is designated on-site. The terrain is a northwest-facing slope with elevations between 1,305 and 1,470 ft. above mean sea level, draining into Dulzura Creek. The site is also within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and has no known hazardous materials or cultural resources. It is zoned for general agricultural use and designated as Semi-Rural Residential under the County's General Plan.

The Jamul region of unincorporated San Diego County, where both the Disposal and Exchange properties are located, experiences a Mediterranean climate. This means the area typically has warm, dry summers with daytime highs in the 80s °F and mild, wetter winters with temperatures in the 60s °F and occasional rainfall. Spring and fall are generally mild and pleasant, and the region sees little to no snowfall. The climate supports native vegetation within the natural and cultural landscape.

1.2 GEOGRAPHY

The Project Area features a rugged and varied geography, with rolling hills, rocky outcrops, and broad valleys. Elevations range from approximately 900 to 1,470 ft. (275 to 448 meters) above sea level. The landscape includes native vegetation such as coastal sage scrub and chamise chaparral and is interspersed with ephemeral drainages that flow into regional creeks and reservoirs. This rural setting supports a mix of conservation lands, tribal lands, and low-density residential areas, contributing to its ecological and scenic value. The Jamul area lies within the Otay River watershed, a significant hydrologic region in southern San Diego County. This watershed includes several tributaries and sub-drainages such as Dulzura Creek, Jamul Creek, and Willow Creek, which flow through or near the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER) and

HCWA. These creeks ultimately drain into the Lower Otay Reservoir, contributing to the region's water supply and ecological connectivity.

1.3 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Geologically, the project is within the Peninsular Ranges of Southern California and is underlain by ancient crystalline bedrock. The Disposal Property consists primarily of Las Posas fine sandy loam with 15–30% slopes and some Cieneba-rock outcrop complex, both of which are highly eroded. The underlying bedrock is composed of granitic and intrusive crystalline rocks—mainly tonalite and granodiorite, with lesser gabbro and metavolcanic rocks—dating back to the early Cretaceous period.

The Exchange Property features a mix of Cieneba rocky coarse sandy loam, Cieneba-rock outcrop complex, and Fallbrook sandy loam, with slopes ranging from 9% to 75%. Like the Disposal Property, it is underlain by granitic and intrusive rocks of similar age and composition. Overall, the area's geology is typical of the rugged foothills of eastern San Diego County, with rocky soils, and steep terrain (Web Soil Survey 2019).

1.4 BIOLOGY

The Jamul area in eastern San Diego County supports a biologically rich and ecologically significant landscape, shaped by its Mediterranean climate, rugged topography, and proximity to large conservation areas. The region features a mosaic of native vegetation communities, primarily coastal sage scrub and chamise chaparral, which provide high-quality habitat for a variety of special-status species. These include the federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher, the Hermes copper butterfly, and the Quino checkerspot butterfly, among others.

The Disposal Property, located at the edge of the RJER, is dominated by disturbed coastal sage scrub interspersed with nonnative grasses. It supports suitable habitat for sensitive species but has been previously impacted by grazing. In contrast, the Exchange Property, adjacent to the HCWA, contains more intact and diverse habitat, including dense chamise chaparral and mature coastal sage scrub with lower nonnative grass cover. This property also features rock outcrops and game trails, enhancing its ecological complexity.

Both properties are part of broader wildlife movement corridors and contribute to regional conservation goals under the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). While neither site contains aquatic resources, they are hydrologically connected to local drainages like Willow Creek and Dulzura Creek. The Exchange Property, in particular, offers a net gain in conserved habitat and is considered of higher biological value due to its undisturbed condition and adjacency to protected lands. More information regarding the biology of these areas can be found in the broader EA/IS/ND authored by Ascent (Hollands 2025).

1.5 CULTURAL SETTING

1.5.1 Prehistoric Period

Archaeological investigations in southern California have documented a diverse range of human adaptations extending from the late Pleistocene up to the time of European contact (e.g., Erlandson and Colten 1991; Erlandson and Glassow 1997; Erlandson and Jones 2002; Jones and Klar 2007; Moratto 1984). To describe and discuss this diversity, local investigators have proposed a variety of different chronologies and conceptual categories (periods, horizons, stages, phases, traditions, cultures, peoples, industries, complexes, and patterns), often with confusingly overlapping or vague terminology.

The prehistory of San Diego County is most frequently divided chronologically into three or four major periods. An Early Man stage, perhaps dating back tens of thousands of years, has been proposed. More generally accepted divisions include a Terminal Pleistocene/Early Holocene period (ca. 12,000–5000 B.C.) (Paleo-Indian stage; Clovis and San Dieguito patterns), a Middle/Late Holocene period (ca. 5000 B.C.–C.E.. 800) (Archaic stage; La Jolla, Millingstone, or Encinitas pattern), and a Late Prehistoric period (ca. C.E. 800–1769) (Archaic stage; Yuman, Cuyamaca, Patayan, or Hakataya pattern).

1.5.2 Early Prehistoric Period Complexes (pre c. 12,000 B.C.–5000 B.C.)

The antiquity of human occupation in the New World has been the subject of considerable interest and debate for more than a century. At present, the most widely accepted model is that humans first entered portions of the Western hemisphere lying to the south of Alaska between about 13,000 and 12,000 B.C., either along the Pacific coastline or through an ice-free corridor between the retreating Cordilleran and Laurentide segments of the continental glacier in Canada, or along both routes. While there is no generally accepted evidence of human occupation in coastal southern California prior to about 11,000 B.C., ages estimated at 48,000 years and even earlier sometimes have been reported (e.g., Bada et al. 1974; Carter 1980). However, intensive interest and a long history of research into the early occupation of North America has begun to reveal sites with widely accepted evidence dating prior to 13,000 B.C., such as Cooper's Ferry, ID (Davis et al. 2019) and White Sands, New Mexico (Bustos et al. 2018).

Local claims for Early Man discoveries have generally been based either on the apparent crudeness of the lithic assemblages that were encountered or on the finds' apparent Pleistocene geological contexts (Carter 1957, 1980; Minshall 1976, 1989; Reeves et al. 1986). The amino acid racemization technique was used in the 1970s and early 1980s to assign Pleistocene ages to several coastal San Diego sites (Bada et al. 1974), but the technique's findings have been discredited by more recent accelerator mass spectrometry (AMS) radiocarbon dating (Taylor et al. 1985).

1.5.3 Archaic Period Complexes (5000 B.C.–800 C.E.)

The earliest chronologically distinctive archaeological pattern recognized in mainland California is the Clovis pattern. Dated to around 11,500 B.C., Clovis assemblages are distinguished by fluted projectile points and other large bifaces, as well as extinct large mammal remains. At least three isolated fluted points have been reported within San Diego County, but their occurrence is very sparse, and their dating and contexts are uncertain (Davis and Shutler 1969; Kline and Kline 2007; Rondeau et al. 2007).

The most widely recognized archaeological pattern within this period is termed San Dieguito and has been dated from at least as early as 8500 B.C. to perhaps around 6000 B.C. (Rogers 1966; Warren 1966; Warren et al. 2008). Proposed characteristics to distinguish San Dieguito flaked lithic assemblages include large projectile points (Lake Mojave, Silver Lake, and other, less diagnostic forms), bifaces, crescents, scraper planes, scrapers, hammers, and choppers. The San Dieguito technology involved well-controlled percussion flaking and some pressure flaking.

Malcolm Rogers (1966) suggested that three successive phases of the San Dieguito pattern (San Dieguito I, II, and III) could be distinguished in southern California, based on evolving aspects of lithic technology. However, subsequent investigators have generally not been able to confirm such changes, and the phases are not now generally accepted.

A key issue has concerned ground stone, which was originally suggested as having been absent from San Dieguito components but has subsequently been recognized as occurring infrequently within them. It was initially suggested that San Dieguito components, like other Paleo-Indian manifestations, represented the

products of highly mobile groups that were organized as small bands and focused on the hunting of large game. However, in the absence of supporting faunal evidence, this interpretation has increasingly been called into question, and it has been suggested that the San Dieguito pattern represented a more generalized, Archaic-stage lifeway, rather than a true Paleo-Indian adaptation.

A vigorous debate has continued for several decades concerning the relationship between the San Dieguito pattern and the La Jolla pattern that succeeded it and that may have also been contemporaneous with or even antecedent to it (e.g., Gallegos 1987; Warren et al. 2008). The initial view was that San Dieguito and La Jolla represented the products of distinct ethnic groups and/or cultural traditions (e.g., Rogers 1945; Warren 1967, 1968). However, as early Holocene radiocarbon dates have been obtained for site components with apparent La Jolla characteristics (shell middens, milling tools, and simple cobble-based flaked lithic technology), an alternative interpretation has gained some favor: that the San Dieguito pattern represented a functional pose related in particular to the production of bifaces, and that it represents activities by same people who were responsible for the La Jolla pattern (e.g., Bull 1987; Hanna 1983).

1.5.4 Late Prehistoric Period Complexes (800 C.E.-1769)

A Late Prehistoric period in San Diego County has been distinguished, primarily on the basis of three major innovations: the use of small projectile points (Desert Side-notched, Cottonwood triangular, and Dos Cabezas forms), associated with the adoption of the bow and arrow in place of the atlatl as a primary hunting tool and weapon; brownware pottery, presumably supplementing the continued use of basketry and other containers; and the practice of human cremation in place of inhumation. Uncertainty remains concerning the exact timing of these innovations, and whether they appeared simultaneously or sequentially (e.g., Griset 1996; Yohe 1992).

Labels applied to the archaeological manifestations of this period include San Luis Rey, Palomar, and Peninsular (Meighan 1954; Sutton 2011; True 1970; True et al. 1974, 1991; Waugh 1986). These remains have generally been associated with the ethnohistorically known Luiseño, Cupeño, and Cahuilla and have been seen as perhaps marking the initial local appearance of those groups in a migration from the north. Traits characterizing the Late Prehistoric period include greater reliance on acorns as an abundant but labor-expensive food resource, a greater emphasis on hunting of both large and small game (particularly deer and rabbits), a greater amount of interregional exchange (seen notably in more use of obsidian), more elaboration of nonutilitarian culture (manifested in more frequent use of shell beads, decorated pottery, and rock art), and possibly denser regional populations. Settlement may have become more sedentary during this period, as compared with the preceding period.

1.5.5 Historic Period

The historic period in California began in the late 1500s with the claim of Spanish dominion over much of North and South America. California experienced colonial rule first by Spain, then Mexico, before being annexed by the United States. These periods are briefly described below.

1.5.6 Spanish Period

Spanish explorer Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo first saw California in 1542, claiming it for the King of Spain. The historic period proper did not begin until 1769, when multiple seaborne and overland expeditions under the leadership of the soldier Gaspar de Portolá and the Franciscan missionary Junípero Serra reached the region from Baja California and passed northward along the coastal plain to seek Monterey. In that year, a royal presidio and the Misión San Diego de Alcalá were founded, and the incorporation of local Kumeyaay into the mission system was begun. Shortly after the mission had been moved a short distance to the east from the presidio, a Kumeyaay uprising in 1775 resulted in the burning of the mission and the killing of

one of its Franciscan missionaries (Carrico 1997). However, the uprising was soon suppressed. An *asistencia* or satellite mission was established at Santa Ysabel in 1818.

Approximately 10 miles southeast of El Cajon, along the historic stage route connecting San Diego County—now State Route (SR) 94—to Yuma and Baja, lies the JIV or Rancheria within the Jamul Valley (Pinto 2024). In 1912, the San Diego Diocesan Office of Apostolic Ministry deeded back 2.34 acres of land for the use of a cemetery, an ancestral resting place for tribal ancestors dating back to the 1800s. This area is a small remnant of the more extensive ancestral village that existed prior to the arrival of the Spanish. The JIV received federal recognition in 1981. Since federal recognition, the JIV has grown to encompass 180 acres through the addition of various ancestral parcels in the surrounding region over the years.

1.5.7 Mexican Period

As Spanish attention was consumed by the Napoleonic wars in Europe, California and its government and missions were increasingly left to their own devices. In 1821, Mexico achieved its independence from Spain, and the region became more open to outside visitors and influences (Pourade 1961). The loyalty to Mexico of the European Franciscans was considered to be in doubt, and private secular interests clamored for a greater share of the region's resources. The missions were secularized by act of the Mexican Congress in 1833. Native Americans released from the San Diego mission returned to their native villages, moved east to areas lying beyond Mexican control, or sought work on ranchos or in the town of San Diego. Numerous large land grants were issued to private owners during the Mexican period, including Janal, Jamacha, Jamul, El Cajon, Cañada de San Vicente, San Bernardo, Santa María, Cuyamaca, Santa Ysabel, and San Felipe in inland southern and central San Diego County (Pourade 1963).

1.5.8 American Period

The conquest and annexation of California by the United States in the Mexican-American War between 1846 and 1848 ushered in many more changes (Pourade 1963, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1977; Pryde 2004). Faced with debts and difficulties in confirming land grants, many Californio families lost their lands to outsiders. Cultural patterns that were brought by immigrants from the eastern U.S. gradually supplanted old Californio customs. Native American reservations were established at Mesa Grando, Santa Ysabel, Inaja, Cosmit, Barona, Capitan Grande, Viejas, Cuyapaipe, Sycuan, Manzanita, La Posta, and Campo (Shipek 1978a).

The region experienced cycles of economic and demographic booms and busts, with notable periods of growth in the mid-1880s, during World Wars I and II, and on more sustained basis throughout the postwar decades. Aspects of development included the creation of transportation networks based on port facilities, railroads, highways, and airports; more elaborate systems of water supply and flood control; grazing livestock and growing a changing array of crops; supporting military facilities; limited amounts of manufacturing; and accommodating visitors and retirees. After false starts, San Diego grew into a substantial city, and then into a metropolis. Other cities were incorporated in the inland southern and central region of San Diego County, including El Cajon (1912), La Mesa (1912), Lemon Grove (1977), Santee (1980), and Poway (1980). Notable unincorporated communities include Spring Valley, Lakeside, Alpine, and Ramona (Pryde 2004).

After the Mexican-American War, land ownership in California became hotly contentious despite protection under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hildalgo of February 1848. Proof of rancho land ownership with the new government often meant years of effort to obtain a federal patent, and many rancheros had difficulty maneuvering through the process. Capitalizing on the uncertainty of those transitional years, Anglo settlers increasingly squatted on land that belonged to *Californios* and began challenging the validity of Spanish-Mexican claims through the Board of Land Commissioners (1851) (Garcia 1975:15-16, 22-24). Meanwhile,

William Heath Davis' 1850 experiment to restart San Diego as a coastal New Town failed after a short period of time. Alonzo E. Horton's second attempt at New Town in 1867 became the successful foundation for present-day downtown San Diego (MacPhail 1971; Mills 1968; Padilla-Corona 1997). An influx of Anglo squatters outside of New Town and new government taxes severely hindered *Californio* rancho owners, and by 1860, most did not retain their original land holdings. Unimproved farmland and substantial, often unconfirmed, ranchos characterized the largely uninhabited San Diego County (Garcia 1975:15-16, 22-24).

The confirmation of rancho boundaries in the late 1860s and early 1870s drew additional settlers as land became officially conveyable. Small farming communities were quickly established throughout San Diego County, and a completed transcontinental railroad in November 1885 helped to initiate an unprecedented real estate boom for New Town that spilled over the county. Settlers poured into San Diego, lured by real estate promotions offering a salubrious climate, cheap land, and the potential to realize great profits in agriculture and real estate. Speculators formed land companies and subdivided town sites throughout the county, and settlers took up homestead claims on government land for both speculation and permanent settlement (Pourade 1964:167-191).

In the mid-1850s, interest began to peak in the Jamul Valley region at the prospect of a railroad linking San Diego and Yuma through the mountains between the valleys of Jamul and Dulzura. The route was surveyed in 1855 for the San Diego and Gila Railroad. Henry Burton, the railroad director, hoped to connect Rancho Jamul with San Diego and the eastern regions; however, the railroad was never constructed. Surveyors for the Texas and Pacific Railroads utilized the same proposed route in 1872 for Tom Scott's transcontinental railroad, which also did not come to fruition.

In the late 1870s, farmers and business partners John S. Harbison and Daniel Dowling established apiaries and apicultural facilities in the Honey Springs area of Jamul Valley. As a result, beekeeping became a thriving economic industry in the backcountry of San Diego (Shoenherr 2019).

The first two decades of the twentieth century brought both continuity and change to San Diego, with a continued U.S. Navy and Army presence, and the trend of populating the burgeoning New Town continued (Heilbron 1936:370, 431; U.S. Census Bureau 1920:82). Automobiles became increasingly popular as they became affordable, prompting San Diego County to grade roads to open up the backcountry (Etulain and Malone 1989:40; Kyvig 2004:27). Glenn H. Curtiss flew the first seaplane from North Island (1911), initiating a growing interest in aviation technologies in San Diego that would later be heightened by Charles Lindbergh's historic flight on the Spirit of St. Louis from Rockwell Field in San Diego to St. Louis, Missouri (1927). Balboa Park and the San Diego Zoo remained after the Panama-California Exposition in 1915, leaving San Diegans with city-defining legacies. In 1917, the U.S. Army established Camp Kearney as part of the nationwide defense campaign for World War I (Engstrand 2005).

Flourishing agricultural communities existed across the county with federal and state water development projects, harbor improvements, and high levels of construction curbing some of the effects of the Great Depression. Construction projects for the Navy and Army helped sustain the area. Social changes such as the construction of San Diego State College (1931), the transition from coal-derived gas to natural gas, and the planning and hosting of the World's Fair (1935) also aided in sustaining the San Diego area (Engstrand 2005:147-155). A significant economic impact during the financial crisis was Reuben H. Fleet's decision to move Consolidated Aircraft from Buffalo, New York, to San Diego, a more suitable climate for testing planes. The company brought 800 employees and $9 million in orders (Consolidated Aircraft 2004; Engstrand 2005:151).

San Diego County's greatest numerical growth period in the first half of the twentieth century was between 1940 and 1950 when the county grew to 556,808 inhabitants (U.S. Census Bureau 1940, 1950). It is also a

period characterized by more people moving to rural areas instead of the city, as the rural population increased by 170.8 percent (U.S. Census Bureau 1950:5-12, 5-16, 5-21). At more than half a million people, San Diego had become a metropolis with attractive rural areas transitioning into new suburban communities.

Infrastructure improvements to both roadways and railroads in San Diego County became necessary to accommodate new residents, again primarily near defense centers (Oceanside Daily Blade-Tribune, 25 February 1941:1, 20 August 1941:1). In 1956, President Dwight Eisenhower authorized an interstate system with the Federal-Aid Highway Act, an act that further interconnected multiple state routes for increased interstate traffic flow. According to Iris Engstrand (2005:165), "the automobile affected almost every major decision regarding the direction taken by San Diego planners during the post-World War II decades." A new trend of constructing retail stores outside the city center provided suburban enclaves as more houses filled in the outskirts of the city (Engstrand 2005:165-166). By 1960, 1,033,011 people lived in the county and, between 1950 and 1970, bedroom communities such as El Cajon, Escondido, Chula Vista, and Oceanside experienced a tremendous growth rate (between 214 and 833 percent) (Engstrand 2005:166; U.S. Census Bureau 1960).

1.6 HISTORIC OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT AREA

Historic research for the project was conducted using the San Diego County DPR database, supplemented by online resources, including historic maps and aerial photographs. A general overview of the historic development of the area will be provided and a specific discussion of each project area will follow.

Historically, the project areas are within the boundaries of the 8,962-acre Rancho Jamul, granted to Pio Pico, Mexico's last governor of California, in 1829 and the Hollenbeck Homestead of 1894 (Exploring the California Spanish and Mexican Land Grants (Map of Spanish and Mexican Land Grants of California, n.d.) : San Diego Union-Tribune 2023; South Bay Historical Society 2019). In the first decades, major land disputes hindered the development of Rancho Jamul. The land was abandoned by Pico, and, in 1854, Lieutenant Colonel Henry Burton homesteaded Rancho Jamul. The Burton family raised cattle, cultivated various crops including hay and corn, and burned lime for the creation of limestone on the property, an early inception of the Jamul Portland Cement Manufacturing Company (San Diego Historical Society 1984). In 1869, Henry Burton died, and by 1906, Jamul Portland Cement had ceased operations. Shortly after the company's acquisition by J.F. Ramsey in 1893, many locals were left without jobs.

Upon Henry Burton's death, his wife, Maria, petitioned for the title to Rancho Jamul, which she would eventually acquire. In the 1870s, Maria, along with her son, Henry, and financial investors C.W. Lyke and Benjamin Macready, established the Jamul Portland Cement Factory. The factory site was located within the 986-acre petitioned homestead awarded to Maria from Henry Burton's estate, which was eventually settled in 1891 (San Diego Historical Society 1979). During Maria's oversight of Rancho Jamul, economic productivity significantly diversified. Crops such as barley and castor beans were grown. Castor beans and their leaves were sold for use as cattle feed and in the production of paint.San Diego Historical Society 1984. Maria planted wildflowers within the hills of the homestead, where beehives were rented, making way for another thriving industry in the Jamul Valley.

By the late 1870s, farmers and business partners John S. Harbison and Daniel Dowling established beekeeping operations and facilities in the Honey Springs area of Jamul Valley. This development helped beekeeping flourish as a significant economic activity in San Diego's backcountry (South Bay Historical Society 2019). The Dowling Ranch would continue honey production until it was sold to Garret and Fannie Eaton in 1894, after which the Eatons turned it into a "dude ranch": Honey Springs Ranch.

In the mid-1850s, excitement began to build in the Jamul Valley as the possibility of a railroad connecting San Diego and Yuma, Arizona, emerged. This prospective route would navigate the mountains nestled between the Jamul and Dulzura valleys. In 1855, a survey was conducted for the San Diego and Gila Railroad, led by director Henry Burton, who envisioned a link between Rancho Jamul and both San Diego and eastern territories. Unfortunately, the railroad project never progressed beyond the planning stage. Later, in 1872, surveyors for the Texas and Pacific Railroads revisited the same route for Tom Scott's proposed transcontinental railroad, which also failed to materialize.

During the mid-to-late 1800s, homesteaders began to flock to the region, with some labeling occupying Jamul Band members as "squatters" (South Bay Historical Society 2019). These so-called "squatters" would come to build their homes on what they believed to be public domain, living within the boundaries of Rancho Jamul. These "squatters" were members of the present-day Jamul Band who, in actuality, were residing on their ancestral land and now at constant threat of displacement from white settlers like the Burton family and other white homesteaders (Pinto 2024). Many white settlers arrived in the region to graze sheep and cattle, grow various crops, including wheat, corn, and olives, work at the Jamul Portland Cement Factory, tend to the local apiaries, or try their hand at the local gold rush within San Diego County. One such settler and early homesteader in the Jamul Valley was Daniel Geary, an Irish immigrant who grazed sheep and whose livestock foundations can still be seen today along Proctor Valley Road.

Charles "The Olive King" Gifford was responsible for the introduction and cultivation of olives within the valley; the first commercially processed canned olives were Gifford Olives. He completed his farmhouse, Jamul Haven, on Jamul Drive in 1890 to oversee the groves. Jamul Haven served as both an olive ranch and a boys' refuge for those ordered to work on farms by the court. In the early 1900s, the ranch served as a weekly stagecoach stop, transporting supplies and passengers between San Diego and Jamul.

As white settler families arrived in the area, the first school in Jamul was built in 1886, located across from the original site of the old Maxfield store, later the Branding Iron restaurant, and then Jalisco's.

Other notable homesteaders to the region include Alvin and Catherine Hollenbeck, whose 1894 homestead is now apart from the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area, managed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. From 1895 to 1927, Rancho Jamul was owned by John D. Spreckels and the Southern California Mountain Water Company. During this period, barns and coral reefs were developed, while various other improvements to the ranch were made under the management of Elisha Babcock and Superintendent Henry Fenton (South Bay Historical Society 2019).

In 1916, Rancho Jamul was purchased by Louis J. Wilde, a San Diego banker and mayor of San Diego. In 1929, George Daley acquired Rancho Jamul. Upon Daley's death, the Rancho Jamul was taken over by his two nephews until 2001, when it was sold to the Wildlife Conservation Board (South Bay Historical Society 2019).

1.6.1 General Kumeyaay Ethnographic Background

In ethnohistoric times, central and southern San Diego County was occupied by speakers of a Yuman language or languages, variously referred to as Kumeyaay, Diegueño, Tipai, and Ipai. Kumeyaay territory extended from south of Agua Hedionda Lagoon, Escondido, and Lake Henshaw to some distance south of Ensenada in northern Baja California, and east nearly as far as the lower Colorado River. Linguistic evidence (e.g., Golla 2007; Laylander 2010) suggests that the Yuman-Cochimí families of languages may have been affiliated with a widespread Hokan phylum, represented by scattered languages and families around the periphery of California and extending south into Mexico, and probably dating back at least as far as the early Holocene. Subsequent separations within the Yuman-Cochimí group may represent territorial expansions or migrations: the separation of Yuman and central Baja California's Cochimí (ca.

2000 B.C.?); the differentiation of Core Yuman from Kiliwa (ca. 1000 B.C.?); of Core Yuman into Delta-California, River, and Pai branches (ca. A.D. 1?); of Delta-California Yuman into Diegueño and Cocopa (ca. A.D. 500?); and of Diegueño into Kumeyaay proper, Ipai, Tipai, and Ku'ahl languages or dialects (ca. post-A.D. 1000?). The boundary between Ipai and Kumeyaay proper (or Tipai) languages or dialects on the San Diego coast has generally been put just south of the San Diego River (Luomala 1978).

While Kumeyaay cultural patterns, as recorded subsequent to European contact, cannot necessarily be equated with Late Prehistoric patterns, at a minimum they provide indispensable clues to cultural elements that would be difficult or impossible to extract unaided from the archaeological record alone. A few important ethnohistoric accounts are available from Hispanic-period explorers and travelers, Spanish administrators, and Franciscan missionaries, primarily in coastal areas (Fages 1937; Geiger and Meighan 1976; Laylander 2000). Many accounts by ethnographers, primarily recorded during the early twentieth century, are available (Almstedt 1982; Drucker 1937, 1941; Gifford 1918, 1931; Hicks 1963; Hohenthal 2001; Kroeber 1925; Laylander 2004; Luomala 1978; Shipek 1982, 1991; Spier 1923; Waterman 1910).

1.6.2 Kumeyaay Material Culture

Kumeyaay material culture was effective, but it was not highly elaborated. Structures included houses with excavated floors, ramadas, sweathouses, ceremonial enclosures, and acorn granaries. Hunting equipment included bows and arrows, curved throwing sticks, nets, and snares. Processing and storage equipment included a variety of flaked stone tools, milling implements, ceramic vessels, and baskets.

1.6.3 Kumeyaay Social Structure, Society, and Beliefs

Nonutilitarian culture was not neglected. A range of community ceremonies were performed, with particular emphases placed on marking individuals' coming of age and on death and mourning. Oral literature included, in particular, an elaborate creation myth that was shared with other Yuman groups as well as with Takic speakers (Luiseño, Cupeño, Cahuilla, and Serrano) to the north (Kroeber 1925; Laylander 2001; Waterman 1909).

1.6.4 Kumeyaay Subsistence and Settlement Pattern

The Kumeyaay inhabited a diverse environment that included littoral, valley, foothill, mountain, and desert resource zones. Because of the early incorporation of coastal Kumeyaay into the mission system, most of the available ethnographic information relates to inland groups that lived in the Peninsular Range or the Colorado Desert. There may have been considerable variability among the Kumeyaay in settlement and subsistence strategies and in social organization (Laylander 1991, 1997; Luomala 1978; Spier 1923; but cf. Shipek 1982). Acorns were a key resource, but a wide range of other minerals, plant, and animal resources were exploited (Hedges 1986; Shipek 1991; Wilken 2012). Pre-contact practices of land management and agriculture west of the Colorado Desert have been suggested but not confirmed (Shipek 1993; cf. Laylander 1995). Some degree of residential mobility seems to have been practiced, although its extent and nature (e.g., within patterns of community fission and fusion) may have varied considerably among different communities and settings. The fundamental Kumeyaay social unit above the family was the *šimuł* (patrilineage) and the residential community or band, to the extent that those two units were not identical. Leaders performed ceremonial, advisory, and diplomatic functions, rather than judicial, redistributive, or military ones. There seems to have been no national level of political unity and perhaps little sense of commonality within the language group (but cf. Shipek 1982).

1.7 PREVIOUS RESEARCH IN THE AREA

1.7.1 Prominent Studies in the Project Vicinity

Six studies have been conducted within the project areas, four within the Disposal Property project area and two within the Exchange Property project area. The most relevant studies conducted within the Disposal Property APE are related to cultural resource surveys and studies for the JIV and Rincon (Talley and Bull 1997; Pigniolo and Baksh 1998), an archeological study of the Saint Francis Xavier cemetery on the JIV (Caterino 2005) and an environmental impact study for the JIV (US Department of Interior 2003). Due to the sensitivity of the study conducted by Helix (2022) on the Exchange Property, site-specific information is not available for projects conducted within the APE. Helix notes that the two previous studies overlap, likely due to a mapping error.

1.8. RESEARCH CONTEXT

The criteria for determining potential eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (National Park Service 1982) pursuant to NHPA are the basis for evaluating significance. The significance, or scientific importance, of archaeological sites is assessed with respect to their potential contribution to regional issues pertaining to southwestern California. General issues pertinent to these assessments include determination of the extent and integrity of cultural deposits, age and probable cultural affiliation, site function and subsistence strategies, overall insight into settlement organization, and the presence of any artifacts or remains having special Native American heritage value.

2. RECORDS SEARCH RESULTS

Records searches of the two properties were conducted independently by Montrose Environmental (2021) and Helix Environmental (2022) at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC), San Diego, California, by SCIC staff. The purpose of the records search was to identify archaeological sites and built environment resources and previously conducted cultural resources studies within 0.5 or 1 mile of the project area

On October 25, 2021, Montrose Environmental conducted a records search at the SCIC for the Disposal Property. Additional research was conducted using files and literature maintained at AES. The record search included a review of the National Register of Historic Places; the California Register of Historical Resources California Historical Landmarks; California Points of Historical Interest; historic maps; and Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility.

On May 23, 2022, Helix Environmental conducted a records search at the SCIC for the Exchange Property. The records search included a review of historic maps and aerial photographs.

2.1 PREVIOUS STUDIES

Montrose Environmental identified 34 cultural resource studies that have been conducted within the project area of the Disposal Property or within 0.5 mile of the project area (Table 1 and Table 2). Of these, four occurred within the project area (Table 1). The earliest study was conducted in 1977 and the most recent in 2020.

Helix Environmental identified 25 cultural resource studies that have been conducted within the project area of the Exchange Property or 1 mile of the project area. These results are not provided within the report (Helix 2022); however, it is noted that two of the previous studies (Chace et al. 1980; Graves Engineering 1981) are mapped as slightly overlapping the Exchange Property. Helix determined that this was likely a mapping error and that the two studies, both related to the same project, "do not actually overlap, the subject property" along the eastern property border (Helix 2022)

Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies within Project Area (Disposal Property)

Report #	Year	Authors	Title	Agency/Company
SD-16580	1979	Talley, R. Paige and Bull, Charles S.	Final Report for Rincon et al. Cultural Resource Survey, Pala	RECON Environmental Consultants
SD-03705	1998	Pigniolo, Andrew R. and Michael Baksh	Cultural Resource Inventory And Evaluation for the Jamul Indian Reservation Fee-To-Trust Transfer And Associated Development, San Diego County, California	Tierra Environmental Services
SD-09516	2005	Caterino, David	The Cemeteries and Gravestones of San Diego County: An Archaeological Study	David Caterino
SD-12322	2003	U.S. Department of the Interior	Final Environmental Impact Statement Jamul Indian Village	U.S. Department of The Interior

Table 2. Cultural Resources Studies Conducted within 0.5 Mile of the Project Areas

Report #	Year	Authors	Title	Agency/Company
SD-01552	1980	Talley, Paige R.	Final Report for Rincon et. al. Cultural Resource Survey, Jamul	RECON
SD-02690	1993	Carrico, Richard, Theodore G. Cooley, and Andrew Pigniolo	Final Cultural Resources Evaluation of the 23,088-acre Otay Ranch, San Diego County	Ogden Environmental
SD-16580	1979	Talley, R. Paige and Bull, Charles S.	Final Report for Rincon et al. Cultural Resource Survey, Pala	RECON
SD-00563	1977	Chace, Paul G.	An Archaeological Survey of Proctor Valley Estates, Jamul, San Diego County.	Paul G. Chace & Associates
SD-01300	1980	Pettus, Roy E.	An Archaeological Survey for Proposed Utility Pole Relocation and Minor Roadway Realignment at Six Locations on Highway 94 in South San Diego County, California (11-SD-94 P.M. 20.85 to 54.25).	CALTRANS
SD-01552	1980	Talley, Paige R.	Final Report for Rincon et. al. Cultural Resource Survey, Jamul	RECON
SD-01947	1990	Chace, Paul G.	An Archaeological Survey of Johnson Property	Paul G. Chace & Associates
SD-01995	1988	Cook, John R.	Cultural Resource Survey Highway 94 Between Melody Road and St. Francis Xavier Cem. Rd.	ASM Affiliates
SD-03567	1998	Pigniolo, Andrew R., Michael Baksh, Philip De Barros, and Stephen Van Wormer	Archaeological Survey Report For The Jamul Creek and Dulzura Creek Biological Mitigation Site For State Route (Sr) 125, San Diego County, California	Wildlands, Inc.
SD-03667	1998	De Barros, Philip	An Inventory and Preliminary Evaluation Of Cultural Resources Located Within A 3,248-Acre Portion Of Rancho Jamul, San Diego County, California	The Trust for Public Land
SD-03705	1988	Pigniolo, Andrew R. and Michael Baksh	Cultural Resource Inventory And Evaluation for the Jamul Indian Reservation Fee-To-Trust Transfer and Associated Development, San Diego County, California	Tierra Environmental Services
SD-04381	2002	Hector, Susan	Hollenback Canyon Wildlife Area Archaeology Management Plan	Susan M. Hector
SD-04657	1992	Ogden Environmental and Energy Services Co., Inc.	Draft Program Environmental Impact Report. Otay Ranch	Ogden Environmental and Energy Services Co., Inc.
SD-05844	1998	Corum, Joyce	Sr94 Passing Lanes Historic Property Survey Report 11-Sd-94 P.M.21.1/24.4	CALTRANS
SD-05938	1998	CALTRANS and Joyce Corum	Historic Property Survey Report Sr 94 Passing Lanes P.M. 21.1-24.4	California Dept. of Transportation
SD-08855	1988	Pigniolo, Andrew R., Michael Baksh, Philip De Barros, and Stephen R. Van Wormer	Archaeological Survey Report for The Jamul Creek and Dulzura Creek Biological Mitigation Site For State Route 125, San Diego County, California	Tierra Environmental Services
SD-09340	2002	Nixon, Joseph M.	Report Of Archaeological Testing and Evaluation at Site Ca-Sdi-15763 San Diego County California	Tierra Environmental Services
SD-09693	2004	Smith, Brian F. and Shannon Gilbert	An Archaeological Survey of the Rural Fire Station Project	Brian F. Smith and Associates
SD-10574	1988	Cook, John R.	Cultural Resources Survey Report for Tpm19120	ASM Affiliates

Report #	Year	Authors	Title	Agency/Company
SD-11100	2006	Smith, Brian F. and Shannon Gilbert	Archaeological Investigations at the Peaceful Valley Ranch Project, San Diego County, California	Brian F. Smith and Associates
SD-12186	2009	Cooley, Theodore and Andrea Craft	Final Archaeological Survey Report (Asr) for the Sr 94 Operational Improvement Project San Diego County, California	ICF Jones & Stokes
SD-12315	2003	Berryman, Judy A. Recon and Joanne D. Gilmer	Cultural Resource Survey and Evaluation for CA-SDI-11792 Located on the Blanco Property Jamul, California	RECON
SD-12381	2008	Clowery-Moreno, Sara and Brian F. Smith	Archaeological Monitoring Report for the Jamul Rural Fire Station Project, San Diego County, California	Brian F. Smith & Associates
SD-12622	2010	Smith, Brian F. and Tracy Stropes	Archaeological Monitoring Report for the Jamul Rural Fire Station Auxiliary Access Road Project, San Diego County, California	Brian F. Smith and Associates
SD-13646	2011	Morgan, Nicole B.	ETS #21620, Cultural Resources Monitoring for the Wood Pole Inspections, 30 Poles, Jamul Project, San Diego, California	HDR
SD-16011	2015	Nancy E. Sikes	Cultural Resources Supplemental Letter Report, Temporary Offsite Construction Parking For Hollywood Casino, Jamul, San Diego County, Ca	RECON Environmental Consultants
SD-16668	2016	Roy, Julie	ETS 32169 - Cultural Resources Monitoring Report for C75 Relocation, Jamul Casino, Jamul, City of San Diego, California – Io 7074264	AECOM
SD-16677	2015	Crawford, Karen L.	ETS 28719 - Cultural Resources Monitoring for Potholing Associated with New Circuit C1090, Jamacha Substation to Jamul Casino, San Diego County, California - IO 7074264	ICF International
SD-18762	2020	Jordan, Amy	Archaeological Monitoring for the C75 Dug, Jamul (SDG&E ETS # 46081; ASM Project # 33360.61)	ASM Affiliates
SD-18953	2016	Hector, Susan	Archaeological Monitoring for Circuit 1090, Jamacha to Jamul Project, Caltrans District (11), San Diego County, California (SDG&E ETS #28719)	NWB Environmental Services, LLC

2.2 PREVIOUS RECORDED SITES WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO STUDY AREA

A total of one cultural resource has previously been recorded within the project area (Table 3). One resource (Temp ID- SL-S-001) was located on the west-facing slope of the Exchange Property, in the southern area of the parcel by Helix Environmental in 2022.

Montrose Environmental identified a total of 37 cultural resources that have been previously recorded within 0.5 mile of the Disposal Property project area (Table 4). Of these, all are within 0.5 mile of the project area.

Helix Environmental identified a total of 71 cultural resources that have been previously recorded within 1 mile of the Exchange Property project area. Of these, all are within 1 mile of the project area. Helix did not

provide results in the report (Helix 2022) and they do not appear in an accompanying table or SCIC records search.

Table 3. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Area (Exchange Property)

Primary Number/Temp ID	Trinomial	Time Period	Site Description	Year Recorded/ Updated	NRHP/ CRHR Evaluations
SL-S-001	-	Prehistoric	Sparse lithic and quartz scatter	2022	--

Table 4. Previously Recorded Archaeological Resources within 0.5 Mile of Project Areas

Primary Number	Trinomial	Time Period	Site Description	Year Recorded/ updated	NRHP/ CRHR Evaluations
P37-005150	CA-SDI-5150	Precontact	Rock features	1977	
P-37-018378	-	Historic	Farmstead	1999	Not eligible
P-37-011792	CA-SDI-011792	Precontact	Bedrock milling	1990	
P-37-011790	CA-SDI-011790	Precontact	Bedrock milling	1990	
P-37-011791	CA-SDI-011791	Precontact	Bedrock milling	1990	
P-37-025180	CA-SDI-16677	Precontact	Bedrock milling	2003	
P-37-025181	CA-SDI-16678	Precontact	Lithic scatter	2003	
P-37-025174	CA-SDI-16671	Precontact	Bedrock milling and lithic scatter	2008	
P-37-011051	CA-SDI-11051	Precontact	Lithic scatter	1988/2015	Not eligible
P-37-011052	CA-SDI-11052	Precontact	Bedrock milling	1988/2015	
P-37-030047	CA-SDI-19159	Precontact	Shell scatter	2007	
P-37-014674	-	Precontact	Artifact scatter	1996/2007	
P-37-014673	-	Historic	Refuse scatter	1996/2007	
P-37-016251	-	Historic	Water conveyance system	1998/2007	
P-37-023875	CA-SDI-013733	Precontact	Bedrock milling	1994	
P-37-014675	-				
P-37-014676	-	Precontact	Bedrock milling and rock feature	1996	
P-37-014677	-	Precontact	Bedrock milling feature	1996	
P-37-023876	CA-SDI-013735	Precontact	Bedrock milling feature	1994	
P-37-023877	CA-SDI-013736	Precontact	Bedrock milling	1994	
P-37-014680	-	Precontact	Bedrock milling	1996	
P-37-014678	-	Precontact	Lithic scatter	1996	
P-37-014681	-	Precontact	Bedrock milling and rock shelter	1996	
P-37-014679	-	Precontact	Lithic scatter	1996	

Primary Number	Trinomial	Time Period	Site Description	Year Recorded/ updated	NRHP/ CRHR Evaluations
P-37-016541	-	Precontact	Bedrock milling and lithic scatter	2008	
P-37-006981	CA-SDI-6981H	Historic	State Route (SR)-94	1978/2019	Not eligible
P-37-011050	CA-SDI-11050	Precontact	Habitation debris and lithic scatter	2008/2010	
P-37-019031	CA-SDI-13734	Precontact	Bedrock milling	1994	
P-37-007966	CA-SDI-7966	Multicomponent	Lithic and ceramic scatter and bedrock milling; historic refuse scatter	1998/2000/2007	
P-37-011410	CA-SDI-011410	Precontact	Lithic scatter	1989/2000	
P-37-028622	CA-SDI-18403	Precontact	Bedrock milling	2007	
P-37-018931	CA-SDI-15763	Historic	Historic Lakeland Resort	2009/2014	
P-37-034141	-	Precontact	Lithic isolate	2013	
P-37-007685	CA-SDI-007685				
P-37-028621	CA-18402	Precontact	Lithic scatter	2007	
P-37-030046	-	Precontact	Shell isolate	2007	
P-37-034142	-	Precontact	Lithic isolate	2013	

Intentionally blank

3. FIELD METHODS

The field survey methods for the two previous studies are described in Appendices B and C. Additional field checks were conducted by ASM in 2024 and 2025 to confirm the absence or presence of resources identified during the previous surveys.

Intentionally blank

4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ASM archaeologist Rachel Ruston relocated one previously recorded resource (Temp ID-SL-S-001) within the Exchange Property project area. No other previously recorded resources were noted in either project areas, the Exchange or Disposal Properties. Mapping of the location of the resource within the Project Area is not provided. Helix prepared a DPR 523 site record for the site and submitted it to SCIC in 2022. Given the property is owned by JIV, the DPR is considered a restricted resource and is not provided in the Confidential Appendix C.

4.1 PREHISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

One previously unrecorded prehistoric cultural resource was identified during pedestrian survey efforts conducted by Helix Environmental (see below) and confirmed during a field visit by ASM.

4.1.1 Temp ID-SL-S-001

TEMP ID-SL-S-001 is within the Exchange Property project area, located on the west facing slope on the southern parcel region of the property. The site was recorded on May 27, 2022, by Mary Villalobos of Helix Environmental and Erica Gonzales of Jamul Indian Village. The site consists of a small sparse lithic scatter and quartz scatter, including one quartz core and seven pieces of quartz debitage. The site is within an area of dense vegetation and boulder outcrops.

The site was relocated on January 14, 2025, by R. Ruston of ASM Affiliates and found to be in the same condition.

4.2 HISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

No previously recorded historic cultural resources were in the project areas. No newly identified historic cultural resources were identified in the project areas

4.3 PREHISTORIC ISOLATES

No previously recorded prehistoric isolates were in the project areas. No newly identified prehistoric isolates were in the project areas.

4.4 RESOURCES OF UNKNOWN AGE

No previously recorded cultural resources of unknown age were in the project areas. No newly identified cultural resources of unknown age were in the project areas

4.5 PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC MULTI-COMPONENT SITES

No previously recorded multi-component cultural resources were in the project areas. No newly identified multi-component cultural resources were in the project areas

4.6 OTHER LOCATIONS OF HISTORIC ACTIVITIES, OBJECTS, OR INFRASTRUCTURE

No previously recorded locations of historic activities, objects, or infrastructure were in the project areas. No newly identified locations of historic activities, objects, or infrastructure were in the project areas

4.7 PREHISTORIC SYNTHESIS

The chronology of prehistoric activity within the project areas remains fairly undefined, based on the confidential nature of the study and the positive results of the Sacred Lands File search conducted by the NAHC on behalf of Helix Environmental (2022)

It is widely accepted that the occupation of prehistoric habitation sites or multiple activities took place within and adjacent to the project areas but that they were unidentifiable during the previous surveys because of poor visibility (<50 percent visibility due to dense vegetation), and steep terrain. Multiple ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts relay the existence of numerous significant Kumeyaay villages within the proximity of both project areas (Carrico 2008, Shipek 1978a and 1978b). Multiple prehistoric habitation sites and resource gathering or processing areas are adjacent to the project areas.

5. NATIVE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION/ CONSULTATION

In November 2021, Montrose Environmental Solutions sent a letter to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on behalf of the JIV to request review of its Sacred Lands Files (SLF) with regard to the Disposal Property. The NAHC responded on December 3, 2021, stating that the search was positive, and that the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians should be contacted for more information. It should be noted that this SLF search request was not included within the Disposal Property's cultural memorandum prepared by Montrose Environmental Solutions (Appendix B).

On May 18, 2022, Helix Environmental sent a letter to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on behalf of the JIV to request review of its Sacred Lands Files (SLF). The NAHC responded on June 20, 2022, stating that the search was positive, and that the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians should be contacted for more information. Helix notes that due to the confidential nature of the study, "no outreach was conducted." Helix also summarized that the SLF search was positive for the project site; it is assumed that JIV is aware of sensitive cultural resources in this area (Appendix C).

In June 2025, CDFW Region 5 requested an additional SLF to receive an updated tribal consultation list for the Exchange property. The NAHC responded on June 18, 2025 stating that the search was positive, and that the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians should be contacted for more information. This SLF search request provided a list of 19 contacts at 12 Native American Tribes.

Under the provisions of AB 52, and in keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the CDFW and the USFWS collaborated to prepare a joint consultation letter to 19 contacts at 12 Native American Tribes on the list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) which were indicated as having traditional and cultural affiliation with the project site. The letters were sent out on July 16, 2025. The 30-day period for Native American tribes to request consultation via the AB 52 and Section 106 process ends on August 20, 2025; however, consultation under Section 106 and AB 52 at the time of writing this report is ongoing. The letters are included in Appendix A. To date, Barona Band of Mission Indians responded and indicated it will defer to and support the Jamul Indian Village.

Intentionally blank

6. IMPACTS, SIGNIFICANCE, AND MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 INTERPRETATION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT IDENTIFICATION

6.1.1 Resource Significance

One cultural resource was identified within the project areas. Additional investigations would be necessary to formally evaluate the resource for CRHR or NRHP eligibility.

6.1.2 Impact Identification

No Action Alternative

No impact. Under the No Action Alternative, the disposal/exchange properties would remain under the current land ownership status. The Disposal Property would remain in CDFW ownership and would continue to be conserved for biological resources and managed consistent with the RJER. Although it is possible that the Exchange Property could be developed in the future, there are no current plans for development, and the property would remain as vacant land. Thus, there would be no cultural resource changes in the foreseeable future. In addition, any future development of either property would require independent environmental review. There would be no impact on cultural resources. Under the No Action Alternative, any existing cultural resources that may be present on-site would continue to be afforded protection by the RJER designation, and, thus, the No Action Alternative would avoid potential future impacts on cultural resources that may be present on-site.

Proposed Action

Disposal Property

No impact. As part of research for the Disposal Property's cultural memorandum prepared by Montrose Environmental Solutions (Appendix B), a record search was conducted at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System on October 25, 2021. The search found that four previous surveys intersected the area of potential effect (APE) but did not include the entirety of the Disposal Property. The SCIC reported 37 cultural resources, primarily prehistoric sites, which were identified within a 0.5-mile radius, but not in the Disposal Property.

A review of historic maps showed no development in the Disposal Property and only roads. A pair of buildings were shown on nearby quadrangles, but they are likely associated with the Saint Francis Xavier Cemetery church. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and there would be no impact.

According to consultation with the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) of the JIV, in advance of the archaeological survey in support of the cultural memorandum, there is a dense concentration of prehistoric resources in the vicinity, which is verified by the presence of an ethnographic village nearby, thus indicating a potential for prehistoric resources. JIV's THPO also indicated that historic artifacts have been found immediately north of the APE. To ensure adequate survey coverage for the Disposal Property, an archaeological survey was conducted in 2021 (see Appendix B). During the archaeological survey, parallel transects spaced 50 ft. apart were surveyed, and ground visibility was good, averaging about 50 percent. Several fragments of cobalt glass were noted immediately north of the property, in the area JIV's THPO previously noted historic artifacts. During the survey, no cultural resources or historic properties

were identified on the property; therefore, a finding of "no historic properties affected" was recommended in the cultural resources assessment for the property. Because of the adequate survey coverage, lack of resources, no ground disturbance proposed/associated with the disposal/exchange, and the Proposed Action being a legal transfer of ownership which does not entail any development, the Proposed Action would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. Therefore, there would be no impact. Additionally, because there would be no ground disturbance associated with the Proposed Action, there would be no opportunity to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries, and thus no impact.

The removal of the ecological reserve protections would enable the Tribe to develop the site. However, following the land disposal/exchange, any activities associated with the Tribe's future use of the Disposal Property would be subject to compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including the County Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, there would be no impact on cultural resources or historic properties associated with the Proposed Action.

Exchange Property

No impact. A background record search was conducted at SCIC on May 23, 2022, of files and literature covering the Exchange Property and a 1-mile radius (see Appendix C). The search found that 25 previous surveys have been performed within the 1-mile radius. Two of the studies slightly overlapped the Exchange Property but were then ruled out due to mapping errors. The SCIC reported that 71 cultural resources have been previously identified within the 1-mile radius surrounding the Exchange Property, none of which are in the property. The reported cultural resources consist of 47 prehistoric archaeological sites, four historic archaeological sites, three multicomponent archaeological sites, 12 prehistoric isolated artifact finds, four historic isolated artifact finds, and one isolated find containing both a prehistoric and historic artifact.

A review of historic maps and aerials covering the Exchange Property showed unnamed tributaries, improved roads, structures, and cleared and actively farmed areas in areas adjacent to the Exchange Property, but not directly in the boundary of the site. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and there would be no impact.

The May 27, 2022, archaeological survey was conducted using parallel transects spaced 5 meters apart, and ground visibility was low (from 0–30 percent on the north parcel and 10–60 percent on the south parcel). The survey identified one previously unrecorded cultural resource: a prehistoric site (temporary designation SL-S-001) consisting of a sparse scatter of flaked stone lithic artifacts, including a quartz core and seven pieces of quartz debitage. This find was verified by Ascent's subcontractor, ASM Affiliates, during the January 14, 2025, site visit. Ground visibility was good (50–70 percent) during the site visit. Because the property would be provided with the same ecological protection as the existing Disposal Property, with no planned development, the Proposed Action would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, and there would be no impact. Furthermore, through the addition of the Exchange Property to the HCWA, the Exchange Property would be protected against future development, protection that is not currently afforded by its existing land use/zoning; thus, the Proposed Action Alternative would avoid potential future impacts on cultural resources that may be present on-site. Additionally, because there would be no ground disturbance associated with the Proposed Action, there would be no opportunity to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside dedicated cemeteries; thus, there would be no impact.

6.1.3 TEMP ID-SL-S-001

TEMP ID-SL-S-001 is within the Exchange Property project area, located on the west-facing slope on the southern parcel region of the property. The site is within an area of dense vegetation and boulder outcrops.

Avoidance is the recommended mitigation measure for this resource. Currently, the site is protected by dense vegetation. Protective measures, such as fencing, are recommended for this resource if ground-disturbing activities are proposed within 50 ft. of the resource. Archaeological and Native American Monitors should be present during ground-disturbing and habitat restoration or enhancement activities within 100 ft. of this resource.

It is recommended that after the proposed action is concluded, that CDFW and USFWS conduct a records search at the SCIC to obtain information regarding the location of the resource.

Intentionally blank

REFERENCES

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
1980 Treatment of Archaeological Properties, A Handbook. Washington, D.C.

Almstedt, Ruth Farrell
1982 Kumeyaay and Ipay. In APS/SDG&E Interconnection Native American Cultural Resources, edited by Clyde Woods, pp. 6-20. Wirth Associates, San Diego.

Bada, Jeffrey, Roy Schroeder, and George Carter
1974 New Evidence for the Antiquity of Man in North America Deduced from Aspartic Acid Racemization. *Science* 184:791-793.

Bull, C. S.
1987 A New Proposal: Some Suggestions for San Diego Prehistory. In San Dieguito – La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy, edited by Dennis R. Gallegos, pp. 35-42. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper No. 1.

Bustos, David, Jackson Jakeway, Tommy M. Urban, Vance T. Holliday, Brendan Fenerty, David A. Raichlen, Marcin Budka, Sally C. Reynolds, Bruce D. Allen, David W. Love, Vincent L. Santucci, Daniel Odess, Patrick Willey, H. Gregory McDonald, and Matthew R. Bennett
2018 Footprints preserve terminal Pleistocene hunt? Human-sloth interactions in North America. *Science Advances* 4:7621.

California Office of Historic Preservation
2001 How to Nominate a Resource to the California Register of Historical Resources. Technical Assistance Series #7.

Carrico, Richard
1997 Sociopolitical Aspects of the 1775 Revolt at Mission San Diego de Alcala: An Ethnohistorical Approach. *Journal of San Diego History* 43:143-157.
2008 *Strangers in a Stolen Land: Indians of San Diego County from Prehistory to the New Deal.* Copyright 1987 by Richard Carrico.

Carter, George F.
1957 *Pleistocene Man at San Diego*. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.
1980 *Earlier Than You Think: A Personal View of Man in the Americas*. Texas A&M University, College Station.

Chace, Paul G. with Burkenroad, David C. Hightower, Janet, Laylander, Don
1980 A Cultural Resources Assessment of Jacumba, San Diego County.

Caterino, David
2005 The Cemeteries and Gravestones of San Diego County: An Archaeological Study. San Diego State University.

Consolidated Aircraft
2004 Consolidated Aircraft History. Electronic document, http:// www.consolidatedaircraft.org/history.htm, accessed April 30, 2009.

County of San Diego
2007 Guidelines for Determining Significance, Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources. Land Use and Environment Group, Department of Planning and Land Use, Department of Public Works, San Diego County, California.

Davis, Emma Lou, and Richard Shutler, Jr.
1969 Recent Discoveries of Fluted Points in California and Nevada. Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers 14:154-169. Carson City.

Davis, Loren G., David B. Madsen, Lorena Becerra-Valdivia, Thomas Higham, David A Sisson, Sarah M. Skinner, Daniel Sueber, Alexander J. Nyers, Amanda Keen-Zebert, Christina Neudorf, Melissa Cheyney, Masami Izuho, Fumie Iizuka, Samuel R. Burns, Clinton W. Epps, Samuel C. Willis, and Ian Buvit
2019 Late Upper Paleolthic occupation at Cooper's Ferry, Idaho, USA, ~16,000 years ago. Science 365:891-97.

Drucker, Philip
1937 Culture Element Distributions: V, Southern California. Anthropological Records 1:1-52. University of California, Berkeley.
1941 Culture Element Distributions: XVII, Yuman-Piman. Anthropological Records 6:91-230. University of California, Berkeley.

Engstand, Iris
2005 San Diego: California's Cornerstone. Sunbelt, San Diego.

Erlandson, Jon M., and Roger H. Colten (editors)
1991 Hunter Gatherers of Early Holocene Coastal California. *Perspectives in California Archaeology* No. 1. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Erlandson, Jon M., and Michael Glassow (editors)
1997 Archaeology of the California Coast during the Middle Holocene. *Perspectives in California Archaeology* No. 4. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Erlandson, Jon M., and Terry L. Jones
2002 Catalysts to Complexity: Late Holocene Societies on the California Coast. *Perspectives in California Archaeology* No. 6. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Etulain, Richard W., and Michael P. Malone
1989 *The American West: A Modern History, 1900 to the Present*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Fages, Pedro
1937 *A Historical, Political, and Natural Description of California (1775)*. Translated by Herbert Ingram Priestly. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Gallegos, Dennis R.
1987 A Review and Synthesis of Environmental and Cultural Material for the Batiquitos Lagoon Region. In San Dieguito – La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy, edited by Dennis R. Gallegos, pp. 23-34. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper No. 1.

Garcia, Mario T.
1975 Merchants and Dons San Diego's Attempt at Modernization, 1850-1860. *Journal of San Diego History* 21(1):53-80.

Geiger, Maynard, and Clement W. Meighan
1976 *As the Padres Saw Them: California Indian Life and Customs As Reported by the Franciscan Missionaries, 1813-1815*. Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, Santa Barbara, California.

Gifford, Edward W.
1918 *Clans and Moieties in Southern California*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 14:155-219. Berkeley.
1931 The Kamia of Imperial Valley. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 98

Golla, Victor
2007 California Archaeology and Prehistory after Moratto: Linguistic Prehistory. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 71-82. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

Graves Engineering
1981 Environmental Impact Report Honey Springs Specific Plan EAD LOG #81-19-24 San Diego County, California. Document on file at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC), San Diego State University.

Griset, Suzanne
1996 Southern California Brown Ware. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

Hanna, David C.
1983 A Major Challenge to "San Dieguito" and "La Jolla." Cultural Resource Management Casual Papers 1(3):76-102. Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

Hedges, Ken, and Christina Beresford
1986 Santa Ysabel Ethnobotany. San Diego Museum of Man.

Heilbron, Carl H.
1936 History of San Diego County, San Diego Press Club, San Diego.

Hicks, Frederic Noble
1963 Ecological Aspects of Aboriginal Culture in the Western Yuman Area. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Hohenthal, William D., Jr.
2001 Tipai Ethnographic Notes: A Baja California Indian Community at Mid-Century. Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 48. Novato, California.

Hollands, Rid
2025 *Environmental Assessment/Initial Study/Negative Declaration: Jamul Indian Village Land Disposal and Exchange.* Ascent Environmental, Inc. Prepared for the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, South Coast Region 5. July 2025.

HELIX Environmental Planning.
2022 *Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee).* Prepared for the Jamul Indian Village of California. T. Cooley and M. Robbins Wade, June 23, 2022.

Jones, Terry L., and Kathryn A. Klar (editors)
2007 *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

Kline, George E., and Victoria L. Kline
2007 Fluted Point Recovered from San Diego County Excavation. Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology 20:55-59.

Kroeber, A. L.
1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Kyvig, David E.
2004 Daily Life in the United States, 1920-1940. Ivan R. Dee, Chicago.

Laylander, Don
1992 Phase II and Extended Phase I Tests at Seven Prehistoric Archaeological Sites (CA-SDI-10,991, -10,992, -10,993, -10,995, -10,996, -10,998, AND -11,001) in the Spring Valley – Lemon Grove Area, San Diego County, California. Caltrans 11, San Diego.
1997 The Last Days of Lake Cahuilla: The Elmore Site. Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly 33(1&2):1-138.
2000 Early Ethnography of the Californias, 1533-1825. Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory No. 47. Salinas, California.
2001 The Creation and Flute Lure Myths: Regional Patterns in Southern California Traditions. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 23:155-178.
2003 Archaeological Survey Report for the State Route 76 Widening and Realignment Project near Bonsall, San Diego County, California. Report prepared by ASM Affiliates and on file at the South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University, San Diego, California.
2004 Listening to the Raven: The Southern California Ethnography of Constance Goddard DuBois. Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory No. 51. Salinas, California.
2010 Linguistic Prehistory and the Archaic-Late Transition in the Colorado Desert. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 30:141-155.

Luomala, Katherine
1978 Tipai and Ipai. In California, edited by R. Heizer, pp. 592-609. *Handbook of North American Indians,* Vol. 8, W. C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Map of Spanish and Mexican Land Grants of California
n.d. University of California, Berkley. https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/79dced5171284ff2a8fe0156370f0e61/page/Page. Accessed July 2025

Meighan, Clement W.
1954 A Late Complex in Southern California Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10(2):215–227.

Mills, James
1968 San Diego…Where California Began. Journal of San Diego History 14(1):1-73.

Minshall, Herbert L.
1976 *The Broken Stones*. Copley Books, San Diego.
1989 *Buchanan Canyon: Ancient Human Presence in the Americas*. Slawson Communications, San Marcos, California.

Montrose Environmental Solutions
2021 *Cultural Technical Memorandum: Jamul Land Transfer Project.* Prepared for the Jamul Indian Village of California. C. Gross, November 2021.

Moratto, Michael J.
1984 California Archaeology. Academic Press, Orlando, Florida.

National Park Service
1982 *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.* National Register Bulletin No. 15. USDI National Park Service Interagency Resources Division, San Francisco.
2024 *National Register Bulletin 38* (Update) Identifying, Evaluating, and documenting Traditional Cultural Places. Update to Parker King 1990, updated 1998). December 6, 2024. https://irma.nps.gov/DataStore/DownloadFile/713057 Accessed 1/15/2025.

NPS and ACHP (National Park Service and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation)
1998 *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Federal Agency Historic Preservation Programs Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act.* Published jointly by the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Oceanside Daily Blade-Tribune
1941 Population of County, 289,348. 25 February:1. Oceanside, California. Oceanside Public Library.
1941 Population of San Diego County Jumps 20 P.C. 20 August:1. Oceanside, California. Oceanside Public Library.

Padilla-Corona, Antonio
1997 The Urban Layout of Old Town San Diego. *Journal of San Diego History*, 43(3):176-187.

Parker, Patricia L. and Tom King
1998 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties. *National Register Bulletin* 38.

Pigniolo, Andrew and Michael Baksh
1998 Cultural Resource Inventory and Evaluation For the Jamul Indian Reservation Fee-To-Trust Transfer and Associated Development, San Diego County, California

Pinto, E.M.
2024 *Testimony of Chairwoman Erica M. Pinto, Jamul Indian Village of California: U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, S. 3857 — Jamul Indian Village Land Transfer Act.* JIV - S 3857 Testimony - US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs - July 10, 2024; Kumeyaay People History - Jamul Indian Village

Pourade, Richard F.
1960 *The Explorers. The History of San Diego Vol. 1*. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1961 *Time of the Bells. The History of San Diego Vol. 2*. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1963 *The Silver Dons. The History of San Diego Vol. 3*. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1964 *The Glory Years. The History of San Diego Vol. 4*. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1965 *Gold in the Sun. The History of San Diego Vol. 5*. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1967 *The Rising Tide. The History of San Diego Vol. 6*. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1977 *City of the Dream. The History of San Diego Vol. 7*. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.

Pryde, Philip R.
2004 *San Diego: An Introduction to the Region*. Sunbelt Publications, San Diego.

Reeves, Brian, John M. D. Pohl, and Jason W. Smith
1986 The Mission Ridge Site and the Texas Street Question. In New Evidence for the Pleistocene Peopling of the Americas, edited by Alan Lyle Bryan, pp. 65-80. Center for the Study of Early Man, University of Maine, Orono.

Rogers, Malcolm J.
1945 An Outline of Yuman Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1(2):167-198.
1966 *Ancient Hunters of the Far West*, edited by R.F. Pourade, pp. 21–108. Copley Press, La Jolla, CA.

Rondeau, Michael F., Jim Cassidy, and Terry L. Jones
2007 Colonization Technologies: Fluted Projectile Points and the San Clemente Island Woodworking/Microblade Complex. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 63-70. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

San Diego Historical Society
1979 Jamul Cement: Speculation in the San Diego Hinterland. *The Journal of San Diego History*. San Diego Historical Society Quarterly. Thomas L. Scharf, Editor. Vol. 25, No. 4
1984 María Amparo Ruiz Burton. *The Journal of San Diego History*. San Diego Historical Society Quarterly. Thomas L. Scharf, Editor. Vol. 30, No. 3

San Diego Union-Tribune
2023 "Jamul and Rancho San Diego" Oct. 4, 2023

Shipek, Florence C.
1978a History of Southern California Mission Indians. In California, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 610-618. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
1978b *Delfina Cuero: Her Autobiography, An Account of Her Last Years and Her Ethnobotanic Contributions* by Florence Connolly Shipek.
1982 Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 4:296-303.
1991 *Delfina Cuero: Her Autobiography*. Ballena Press, Menlo Park, California.
1993 Kumeyaay Plant Husbandry: Fire, Water, and Erosion Management Systems. In *Before the Wilderness: Native American Environmental Management*, edited by Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson, pp. 378-388. Ballena Press, Menlo Park, California.

Shoenherr, Steven
2019 South Bay Historical Society Bulletin: Issue No. 24. South Bay Historical Society.

South Bay Historical Society
2019 South Bay Historical Society Bulletin. July 2019. Issue No. 23

Spier, Leslie
1923 *Southern Diegueño Customs*. University of California Publication in American Archaeology and Ethnology 26(1):1-358.

Sutton, Mark Q.
2011 The Palomar Tradition and Its Place in the Prehistory of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 44(4):1-74.

Talley, R. Paige, and Charles Bull
1979 Final Report for Rincon et al. Cultural Resource Survey, Pala.

Taylor, R., L. Payen, C. Prior, P. Slota, R. Gillespie, J. Gowlett, R. Hedges, A. Hull, T. Zabel, D. Donahue, and R. Berger
1985 Major Revisions in the Pleistocene Age Assignments for North American Human Skeletons by C14 Accelerator Mass Spectrometry: None Older Than 11,000 C14 Years B.P. *American Antiquity* 50:136-140.

True, D. L.
1970 Investigation of a Late Prehistoric Complex in Cuyamaca Rancho State Park, San Diego County, California. Archaeological Survey Monograph, University of California, Los Angeles, CA.

True, Delbert L., Clement W. Meighan, and Harvey Crew
1974 Archaeological Investigations at Molpa, San Diego County, California. *University of California Publications in Anthropology* 11. University of California Press, Berkeley.

True, Delbert L., Rosemary Pankey, and Claude N. Warren
1991 Tom-Kav, a Late Village Site in Northern San Diego County, California, and Its Place in the San Luis Rey Complex. Anthropological Records 30. University of California, Berkeley.

U.S. Census Bureau
1920 The Fourteenth Census of the United States, San Diego County. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Microfilm, San Diego Historical Society Archives.
1940 The Sixteenth Census of the United States, San Diego County. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Microfilm, San Diego Historical Society Archives.
1950 The Seventeenth Census of the United States, San Diego County. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Microfilm, San Diego Historical Society Archives.
1960 The Seventeenth Census of the United States, San Diego County. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Microfilm, San Diego Historical Society Archives.

United States Congress
2024 *Jamul Indian Village Land Transfer Act. Public Law 118–199*, 118th Cong., 23 Dec. 2024, 138 Stat. 2684. Congress.gov, https://www.congress.gov/118/plaws/publ199/PLAW-118publ199.pdf.

US Department of Interior
2003 Final Environmental Impact Statement Jamul Indian Village

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)
1901 San Luis Rey 30-Minute Quadrangle.
1946 Bonsall 7.5-Minute Quadrangle.
1968 Bonsall 7.5-Minute Quadrangle.

Warren, Claude N.
1966 The San Dieguito Type Site: M. J. Rogers' 1938 Excavation on the San Dieguito River. San Diego Museum Papers No. 5. San Diego.
1967 The San Dieguito Complex: Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity* 32:168-185.
1968 Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. In *Archaic Prehistory in the Western United States*, edited by Cynthia Irwin-Williams, pp. 1-14. Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology No. 1. Portales.

Warren, Claude, Gretchen Siegler, and Frank Dittner
2008 Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic Periods. In Prehistoric and Historic Archaeology of Metropolitan San Diego: A Historic Properties Background Study, pp. 13-107. ASM Affiliates, Carlsbad, California.

Waterman, Thomas T.
1909 Analysis of the Mission Indian Creation Story. *American Anthropologist* 11:41-55.
1910 *The Religious Practices of the Diegueno Indians*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 8:271-358.

Waugh, M. Georgie
1986 Intensification and Land-Use: Archaeological Indications of Transition and Transformation in a Late Prehistoric Complex in Southern California. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

Web Soil Survey
2019 Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey. Electronic document, http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx, accessed August 15, 2019.

Wilken, Michael Alan
2012 An Ethnobotany of Baja California's Kumeyaay Indians. Unpublished Masters of Anthropology Thesis for the San Diego State University.

Yohe, Robert M., II
1992 A Reevaluation of Western Great Basin Cultural Chronology and Evidence for the Timing of the Introduction of the Bow and Arrow to Eastern California Based on New Excavations at the Rose Spring Site (CA-INY-372). Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Riverside.

APPENDICES

Intentionally blank

APPENDIX A

AB 52/Section 106 Letters

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Allen Lawson, Chairperson
San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
P.O. Box 365
Valley Center, CA, 92082

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Allen Lawson:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Art Bunce, Attorney
Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA, 92040
buncelaw@aol.com

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Art Bunce:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Ben Dyche, Vice Chairperson
36190 Church Road, Suite 1
Campo, CA, 91906
Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
bdyche@campo-nsn.gov

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Ben Dyche:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Bernice Paipa, Cultural Resource Specialist
Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Sycuan Cultural Center: 910 Willow Glen Drive
El Cajon, CA, 92019
bpaipa2@sycuan-nsn.gov

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Bernice Paipa:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank


Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Copyright © 2013 National Geographic Society, i-cubed

Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Clint Linton, Director of Cultural Resources
Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
P.O. Box 507
Santa Ysabel, CA, 92070
clint@redtailenvironmental.com

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Clint Linton:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Cody Martinez, Chairman
Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Sycuan Tribal Office: 1 Kwaaypaay Court
El Cajon, CA, 92019
cmartinez@sycuan-nsn.gov

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Cody Martinez:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Daniel Tsosie, THPO
Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
36190 Church Road, Suite 1
Campo, CA, 91906
dtsosie@campo-nsn.gov

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Daniel Tsosie:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Eric La Chappa, Chairman
La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
8 Crestwood Road
Boulevard, CA, 91905
ELaChappa@lptribe.net

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Eric La Chappa:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Erica Pinto, Chairperson
Jamul Indian Village
P.O. Box 612
Jamul, CA, 91935
epinto@jiv-nsn.gov

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Erica Pinto:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Ernest Pingleton, THPO
Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
1 Viejas Grade Road
Alpine, CA, 91901
epingleton@viejas-nsn.gov

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Ernest Pingleton:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

John Flores, Environmental Coordinator
San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
P. O. Box 365
Valley Center, CA, 92082
johnf@sanpasqualtribe.org

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear John Flores:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Lisa Cumper, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Jamul Indian Village
P.O. Box 612
Jamul, CA, 91935
lcumper@jiv-nsn.gov

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Lisa Cumper:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Marcus Cuero, Chairperson
Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
36190 Church Road, Suite 1
Campo, CA, 91906
marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Marcus Cuero:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Michael Garcia, Vice Chairperson
Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians
4054 Willows Road
Alpine, CA, 91901
michaelg@leaningrock.net

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Michael Garcia:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Ray Teran, Resource Management Director
Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
1 Viejas Grade Road
Alpine, CA, 91901
rteran@viejas-nsn.gov

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Ray Teran:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Rebecca Osuna, Chairperson
Inaja-Cosmit Band of Indians
2005 S. Escondido Blvd.
Escondido, CA, 92025

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Rebecca Osuna:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, California 92123

In Reply Refer to:

July 16, 2025

Robert Pinto, Chairperson
Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians
4054 Willows Road
Alpine, CA, 91901
ceo@ebki-nsn.gov

SUBJECT: FORMAL NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 52 AND SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT FOR THE PROPOSED FUTURE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE CEMETERY EXPANSION- LAND DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE PROJECT IN UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Robert Pinto:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are jointly considering a proposed land disposal and exchange for the proposed future Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion - Land Disposal and Exchange Project (Project) in unincorporated San Diego County. The Jamul Indian Village of California (JIV) is proposing to transfer the 4.0-acre Slee property (Exchange Property) owned by the JIV adjacent to the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area (HCWA) to CDFW in exchange for a 1.1-acre property (Disposal Property) that is owned by CDFW and located within the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve (RJER).

Undertaking

The Undertaking is defined as the removal of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property from the RJER, including the Federal interest in the property, and transfer to JIV. In addition, the Undertaking includes the transfer of the 4.0-acre Exchange Property to CDFW for conservation purposes and incorporation of this property into the HCWA. A Notice will be recorded on title of the Exchange Property indicating the Federal interest and restrictions on the property. The Disposal Property is anticipated to be used for future expansion of the JIV's adjacent cemetery, but the future cemetery expansion is not part of the current Undertaking.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

CDFW's approval of the proposed land disposal and exchange involves transfer of replacement land as well as the disposal of land from State government ownership which is a discretionary action subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); therefore, CDFW is inviting your Tribe to consult under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1. While the RJER is owned and managed exclusively by CDFW, there is also a Federal nexus for the proposed disposal and exchange due to the contribution of USFWS grant funding pursuant to section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, which was used to support the original acquisition of the RJER, including the Disposal Property. Therefore, the proposed disposal and transfer of the 1.1-acre Disposal Property to JIV is subject to approval from the USFWS, which requires review in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, including Section 106 (36 CFR 800).

Area of Potential Effect

Regional and aerial maps of the proposed Disposal Property and Exchange Property are attached (Figures 1 and 2, respectively). For the purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the 1.1-acre Disposal Property adjacent to the existing JIV cemetery and the disjunct 4.0-acre Exchange Property that is adjacent to the HCWA.

The Disposal Property is a triangular 1.1-acre property located within the northern boundary of the RJER. The property is within Section 10, Township 17 South, Range 1 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

The Exchange Property consists of two contiguous parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 600-101-04 and 600-101-05) totaling 4.0 acres on Honey Springs Road. The property is bordered on the east by CDFW-owned HCWA. The property is located within Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 2 East on the Dulzura, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Historic Property Identification Effort

Two cultural resources studies were contracted by the JIV for the proposed land disposal and exchange. Since the two properties (Disposal and Exchange) are non-contiguous, the cultural resource reports were based on the individual properties being proposed for the land disposal/exchange rather than including both properties in a combined APE.

Disposal Property: Montrose Environmental Solutions conducted a cultural resource assessment for the Disposal Property. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey effort, no cultural materials were identified. While the density of prehistoric resources in the general vicinity and the presence of an ethnographic village nearby all indicate an elevated potential for prehistoric resources, the potential for surface finds is minimal given the gradient of the property within the APE. A letter report

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

was prepared and submitted to JIV (Gross 2021) summarizing these findings. A copy of this report is available upon request.

Exchange Property: HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a due diligence/constraints analysis for the Exchange Property (Cooley and Robbins-Wade, 2022). The Sacred Lands File search was positive for the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. As a result of background research and the archaeological survey, one archaeological site, consisting of a scatter of flaked stone material, was identified within the Exchange Property boundaries. A letter report was prepared and submitted to JIV (Cooley and Robbins 2022). A copy of this report is available upon request.

Request for Consultation

Under the provisions of AB 52, CDFW is extending an invitation to participate as a consulting party for the Undertaking, described above.

In keeping with the USFWS's trust responsibility under Executive Order 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and the USFWS's Native American Policy, the USFWS is providing this letter as an invitation for formal Section 106 government-to-government consultation. We want to ensure that you have the opportunity to participate in the process associated with this proposed Undertaking to ensure the protection of ancestral homelands, natural and cultural resources, and Tribal rights.

Furthermore, the USFWS will protect, to the maximum extent practicable, Tribal information that you may disclose to us or that we may collect. However, please be aware that any information in our files is subject to public disclosure under specific circumstances (e.g., through a Freedom of Information Act request). Please let us know if you have any other considerations for safeguarding sensitive Tribal information. If the Tribe prefers to maintain certain information exclusively in your files, we are willing to explore options for reviewing and referencing that information. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code Section 6254.10.

Pursuant to AB 52, PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), please notify the undersigned, in writing, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this formal notice. It should be noted that this timeframe does not apply to the NHPA Section 106 consultation. However, we would appreciate expeditious responses to ensure comments can be fully considered, addressed and included in the upcoming CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act reviews.

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873

If you have any questions about this letter, or would like to request a copy of the cultural resources reports, please feel free to contact Mr. Glen M. Lubcke[1] or Ms. Jessie Lane[2] from CDFW or Ms. Becky Miller[3] or Ms. Mary Beth Woulfe[4] from USFWS.

Respectfully,

Signed by:
Jonathan Snyder
725A1393DA3A4DE...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder
Acting Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

Cooley, T. and M. Robbins-Wade. 2022. Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property (Martha Slee). Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California, June 23, 2022.

Gross, C. 2021. Jamul Land Transfer Project Cultural Memorandum. Submitted to Jamul Indian Village of California November 3, 2021.

[1] glen.lubcke@wildlife.ca.gov
[2] jessie.lane@wildlife.ca.gov
[3] becky_miller@fws.gov
[4] marybeth_woulfe@fws.gov

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873



Figure 1. Disposal Property.

Intentionally blank

Docusign Envelope ID: FEF6040C-7298-4F5E-8ECD-2555E568A873




Figure 2. Exchange Property.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

CHAIRPERSON
Reginald Pagaling
Chumash

VICE-CHAIRPERSON
Buffy McQuillen
Yokayo Pomo, Yuki, Nomlaki

SECRETARY
Sara Dutschke
Miwok

PARLIAMENTARIAN
Wayne Nelson
Luiseño

COMMISSIONER
Isaac Bojorquez
Ohlone-Costanoan

COMMISSIONER
Stanley Rodriguez
Kumeyaay

COMMISSIONER
Reid Milanovich
Cahuilla

COMMISSIONER
Bennae Calac
Pauma-Yuima Band of Luiseño Indians

COMMISSIONER
Vacant

ACTING EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Steven Quinn

NAHC HEADQUARTERS
1550 Harbor Boulevard
Suite 100
West Sacramento,
California 95691
(916) 373-3710
nahc@nahc.ca.gov

June 18, 2025

Tim Dillingham
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Via Email to: Tim.Dillingham@wildlife.ca.gov

Re: Jamul Indian Village Cemetery Expansion – Land Exchange Project, San Diego County

To Whom It May Concern:

As requested, a record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed based on information submitted for the above referenced project. The results were positive. Please contact the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians on the attached list for more information. Please note that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the SLF, nor are they required to do so. As such, a SLF search is not a substitute for consultation with all tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with a project's geographic area.

Attached is a list of Native American tribes who may also have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. Please contact all of those listed; if they cannot supply information, they may recommend others with specific knowledge. If within two weeks of notification, a response has not been received, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call or email to ensure that the project information was received.

If you receive notification of a change of address or phone number from a tribe, please notify the NAHC so that we can assure that our lists contain current information.

In addition to engaging in tribal consultation, you should consult the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) archaeological Information Center to determine whether it has information regarding the presence of recorded archaeological sites within the project area.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at Andrew.Green@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Andrew Green

Andrew Green
Cultural Resources Analyst

Attachment

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

CHAIRPERSON
Laura Miranda
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON
Reginald Pagaling
Chumash

SECRETARY
Sara Dutschke
Miwok

COMMISSIONER
Isaac Bojorquez
Ohlone-Costanoan

COMMISSIONER
Buffy McQuillen
Yokayo Pomo, Yuki, Nomlaki

COMMISSIONER
Wayne Nelson
Luiseño

COMMISSIONER
Stanley Rodriguez
Kumeyaay

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Raymond C.
Hitchcock
Miwok/Nisenan

NAHC HEADQUARTERS
1550 Harbor Boulevard
Suite 100
West Sacramento,
California 95691
(916) 373-3710
nahc@nahc.ca.gov
NAHC.ca.gov

December 23, 2022

Jennifer Wade
Acorn Environmental

Via Email to: jwade@acorn-env.com

Re: Cemetery-Slee Land Exchange Project, San Diego County

Dear Ms. Wade:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information submitted for the above referenced project. The results were positive. Please contact the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians on the attached list for information. Please note that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the SLF, nor are they required to do so. A SLF search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with a project's geographic area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites, such as the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) archaeological Information Center for the presence of recorded archaeological sites.

Attached is a list of Native American tribes who may also have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. Please contact all of those listed; if they cannot supply information, they may recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call or email to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify the NAHC. With your assistance, we can assure that our lists contain current information.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: Cody.Campagne@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Cody Campagne

Cody Campagne
Cultural Resources Analyst

Attachment

Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
San Diego County
12/23/2022

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
Raymond Welch, Chairperson
1095 Barona Road Diegueno
Lakeside, CA, 92040
Phone: (619) 443 - 6612
Fax: (619) 443-0681
counciloffice@barona-nsn.gov

Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
Ralph Goff, Chairperson
36190 Church Road, Suite 1 Diegueno
Campo, CA, 91906
Phone: (619) 478 - 9046
Fax: (619) 478-5818
rgoff@campo-nsn.gov

Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Robert Pinto, Chairperson
4054 Willows Road Diegueno
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 368 - 4382
Fax: (619) 445-9126
ceo@ebki-nsn.gov

Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Michael Garcia, Vice Chairperson
4054 Willows Road Diegueno
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 933 - 2200
Fax: (619) 445-9126
michaelg@leaningrock.net

Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
Clint Linton, Director of Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 507 Diegueno
Santa Ysabel, CA, 92070
Phone: (760) 803 - 5694
clint@redtailenvironmental.com

Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
Virgil Perez, Chairperson
P.O. Box 130 Diegueno
Santa Ysabel, CA, 92070
Phone: (760) 765 - 0845
Fax: (760) 765-0320

Inaja-Cosmit Band of Indians
Rebecca Osuna, Chairperson
2005 S. Escondido Blvd. Diegueno
Escondido, CA, 92025
Phone: (760) 737 - 7628
Fax: (760) 747-8568

Jamul Indian Village
Lisa Cumper, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
P.O. Box 612 Diegueno
Jamul, CA, 91935
Phone: (619) 669 - 4855
lcumper@jiv-nsn.gov

Jamul Indian Village
Erica Pinto, Chairperson
P.O. Box 612 Diegueno
Jamul, CA, 91935
Phone: (619) 669 - 4785
Fax: (619) 669-4817
epinto@jiv-nsn.gov

Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians
Carmen Lucas,
P.O. Box 775 Kwaaymii
Pine Valley, CA, 91962 Diegueno
Phone: (619) 709 - 4207

La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson
8 Crestwood Road Diegueno
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 478 - 2113
Fax: (619) 478-2125
LP13boots@aol.com

La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
Javaughn Miller, Tribal Administrator
8 Crestwood Road Diegueno
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 478 - 2113
Fax: (619) 478-2125
jmiller@LPtribe.net

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Cemetery-Slee Land Exchange Project, San Diego County.

Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
San Diego County
12/23/2022

Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation
Angela Elliott Santos, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1302 Diegueno
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 766 - 4930
Fax: (619) 766-4957

Mesa Grande Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
Michael Linton, Chairperson
P.O Box 270 Diegueno
Santa Ysabel, CA, 92070
Phone: (760) 782 - 3818
Fax: (760) 782-9092
mesagrandeband@msn.com

San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
Allen Lawson, Chairperson
P.O. Box 365 Diegueno
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 749 - 3200
Fax: (760) 749-3876
allenl@sanpasqualtribe.org

San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
John Flores, Environmental Coordinator
P. O. Box 365 Diegueno
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 749 - 3200
Fax: (760) 749-3876
johnf@sanpasqualtribe.org

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Kristie Orosco, Kumeyaay Resource Specialist
1 Kwaaypaay Court Kumeyaay
El Cajon, CA, 92019
Phone: (619) 445 - 6917

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Cody Martinez, Chairperson
1 Kwaaypaay Court Kumeyaay
El Cajon, CA, 92019
Phone: (619) 445 - 2613
Fax: (619) 445-1927
ssilva@sycuan-nsn.gov

Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Ernest Pingleton, Tribal Historic Officer, Resource Management
1 Viejas Grade Road Diegueno
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 659 - 2314
epingleton@viejas-nsn.gov

Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
John Christman, Chairperson
1 Viejas Grade Road Diegueno
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 445 - 3810
Fax: (619) 445-5337

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Cemetery-Slee Land Exchange Project, San Diego County.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

CHAIRPERSON
Laura Miranda
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON
Reginald Pagaling
Chumash

PARLIAMENTARIAN
Russell Attebery
Karuk

COMMISSIONER
William Mungary
Paiute/White Mountain Apache

COMMISSIONER
Isaac Bojorquez
Ohlone-Costanoan

COMMISSIONER
Sara Dutschke
Miwok

COMMISSIONER
Buffy McQuillen
Yokayo Pomo, Yuki, Nomlaki

COMMISSIONER
Wayne Nelson
Luiseño

COMMISSIONER
Stanley Rodriguez
Kumeyaay

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Christina Snider
Pomo

NAHC HEADQUARTERS
1550 Harbor Boulevard
Suite 100
West Sacramento,
California 95691
(916) 373-3710
nahc@nahc.ca.gov
NAHC.ca.gov

December 3, 2021

Charlane Gross
AES

Via Email to: cgross@analyticalcorp.com

Re: Jamul CDFW Project, San Diego County

Dear Ms. Gross:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information submitted for the above referenced project. The results were positive. Please contact the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Jamul Indian Village, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians on the attached list for information. Please note that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the SLF, nor are they required to do so. A SLF search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with a project's geographic area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites, such as the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) archaeological Information Center for the presence of recorded archaeological sites.

Attached is a list of Native American tribes who may also have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. Please contact all of those listed; if they cannot supply information, they may recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call or email to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify the NAHC. With your assistance, we can assure that our lists contain current information.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: Andrew.Green@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Andrew Green

Andrew Green
Cultural Resources Analyst

Attachment

Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
San Diego County
12/3/2021

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
Edwin Romero, Chairperson
1095 Barona Road Diegueno
Lakeside, CA, 92040
Phone: (619) 443 - 6612
Fax: (619) 443-0681
cloyd@barona-nsn.gov

Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
Ralph Goff, Chairperson
36190 Church Road, Suite 1 Diegueno
Campo, CA, 91906
Phone: (619) 478 - 9046
Fax: (619) 478-5818
rgoff@campo-nsn.gov

Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Robert Pinto, Chairperson
4054 Willows Road Diegueno
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 368 - 4382
Fax: (619) 445-9126
ceo@ebki-nsn.gov

Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Michael Garcia, Vice Chairperson
4054 Willows Road Diegueno
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 933 - 2200
Fax: (619) 445-9126
michaelg@leaningrock.net

Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
Virgil Perez, Chairperson
P.O. Box 130 Diegueno
Santa Ysabel, CA, 92070
Phone: (760) 765 - 0845
Fax: (760) 765-0320

Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
Clint Linton, Director of Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 507 Diegueno
Santa Ysabel, CA, 92070
Phone: (760) 803 - 5694
cjlinton73@aol.com

Inaja-Cosmit Band of Indians
Rebecca Osuna, Chairperson
2005 S. Escondido Blvd. Diegueno
Escondido, CA, 92025
Phone: (760) 737 - 7628
Fax: (760) 747-8568

Jamul Indian Village
Lisa Cumper, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
P.O. Box 612 Diegueno
Jamul, CA, 91935
Phone: (619) 669 - 4855
lcumper@jiv-nsn.gov

Jamul Indian Village
Erica Pinto, Chairperson
P.O. Box 612 Diegueno
Jamul, CA, 91935
Phone: (619) 669 - 4785
Fax: (619) 669-4817
epinto@jiv-nsn.gov

Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians
Carmen Lucas,
P.O. Box 775 Kwaaymii
Pine Valley, CA, 91962 Diegueno
Phone: (619) 709 - 4207

La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson
8 Crestwood Road Diegueno
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 478 - 2113
Fax: (619) 478-2125
LP13boots@aol.com

La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
Javaughn Miller, Tribal Administrator
8 Crestwood Road Diegueno
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 478 - 2113
Fax: (619) 478-2125
jmiller@LPtribe.net

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Jamul CDFW Project, San Diego County.

Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
San Diego County
12/3/2021

Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation
Angela Elliott Santos, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1302 Diegueno
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 766 - 4930
Fax: (619) 766-4957

Mesa Grande Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
Michael Linton, Chairperson
P.O Box 270 Diegueno
Santa Ysabel, CA, 92070
Phone: (760) 782 - 3818
Fax: (760) 782-9092
mesagrandeband@msn.com

San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
John Flores, Environmental Coordinator
P. O. Box 365 Diegueno
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 749 - 3200
Fax: (760) 749-3876
johnf@sanpasqualtribe.org

San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians
Allen Lawson, Chairperson
P.O. Box 365 Diegueno
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 749 - 3200
Fax: (760) 749-3876
allenl@sanpasqualtribe.org

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Cody Martinez, Chairperson
1 Kwaaypaay Court Kumeyaay
El Cajon, CA, 92019
Phone: (619) 445 - 2613
Fax: (619) 445-1927
ssilva@sycuan-nsn.gov

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Kristie Orosco, Kumeyaay Resource Specialist
1 Kwaaypaay Court Kumeyaay
El Cajon, CA, 92019
Phone: (619) 445 - 6917

Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
John Christman, Chairperson
1 Viejas Grade Road Diegueno
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 445 - 3810
Fax: (619) 445-5337

Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Ernest Pingleton, Tribal Historic Officer, Resource Management
1 Viejas Grade Road Diegueno
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 659 - 2314
epingleton@viejas-nsn.gov

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Jamul CDFW Project, San Diego County.

APPENDIX B

CONFIDENTIAL Cultural Memorandum: Jamul Land Transfer Project (2021)

Intentionally blank

APPENDIX C

CONFIDENTIAL Cultural Resources Due Diligence Constraints Assessment Study for the Campo Road Property

(Martha Slee) (2022)

Intentionally blank

Appendix F

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment



Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

APN's 600-101-04 and -05
Slee Properties, Jamul, California

June 16, 2022

Prepared for:

Jamul Indian Village of California
c/o Procopio
525 B Street, Ste. 2200
San Diego, CA 92101

Prepared by:

1042 Skylark Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037
(858) 945-7029
www.cyaforensics.com

1042 Skylark Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037
(858) 945-7029
www.cyaforensics.com

June 16, 2022

Jamul Indian Village of California
c/o Procopio
525 B Street, Ste. 2200
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
APN's 600-101-04 and -05
Slee Properties, Jamul, California

To Whom It May Concern:

C Young Associates has completed the contracted environmental consulting services for the above referenced project. The services were performed in accordance with our proposal and agreement dated May 18, 2022. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment has been performed in accordance with ASTM International (ASTM) Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, ASTM Designation E1527-13 and Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR) Part 312. We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you on this project. Please contact us if you have any questions or comments regarding this report or if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

C Young Associates

Colin P. Young, CIH
Principal

Daniel Weis, R.E.H.S.
Associate Environmental Scientist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Purpose 1
1.2 Scope of the Assessment 1
1.3 Limitations and Exceptions 2
1.4 Special Terms and Conditions 3
1.5 Limiting Conditions and Deviations 3
1.6 Data Failure and Data Gaps 3
1.7 Reliance 3

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION 5

2.1 Location and Legal Description 5
2.2 Site and Vicinity Characteristics 5
2.3 Current Use of the Site 5
2.4 Description of Site Improvements 5
2.5 Utilities 5
2.6 Description of Adjoining Properties 5
2.7 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns 6

3.0 PHYSICAL SETTING 7

3.1 Topography 7
3.2 Hydrology 7
3.3 Geology 7
3.4 Hydrogeology 7
3.5 Oil and Gas Exploration 8
3.6 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns 8

4.0 USER PROVIDED INFORMATION 9

4.1 Title Records 9
4.2 Environmental Liens 9
4.3 Activity and Use Limitations 9
4.4 Specialized or Actual Knowledge or Experience 9
4.5 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information 9
4.6 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues 10
4.7 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information 10
4.8 Reason for Performing Phase I ESA 10
4.9 Proceedings Involving the Site 10
4.10 Other Provided Documents 10
4.11 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns 10

5.0 REGULATORY RECORDS REVIEW 11

5.1 Standard ASTM Regulatory Database Search 11
5.2 Non-ASTM Regulatory Database Search 13
5.3 Regulatory Agency File Reviews 14
5.4 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns 15

6.0 HISTORICAL RESOURCE REVIEW 16
6.1 Aerial Photographs 16
6.2 Historic Topographic Maps 16
6.3 Other Historical Sources 16
6.4 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns 16
7.0 SITE RECONAISSANCE 18
7.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions 18
7.2 Current General Site and Vicinity Characteristics 18
7.3 Indications of Past Site and Vicinity Uses 18
7.4 Site-Specific Observations 18
7.5 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns 19
8.0 INTERVIEWS 20
8.1 Site Owner 20
8.2 Key Site Manager 20
8.3 Current Occupants 20
8.4 Local Government Official 20
8.5 Other Parties 20
8.6 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns 20
9.0 ADDITIONAL SERVICES – NON-SCOPE ASTM CONSIDERATIONS 21
10.0 FINDINGS AND OPINIONS 22
11.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 23
12.0 ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL STATEMENT 24
13.0 ASSUMPTIONS 25
14.0 DEFINITIONS 27
15.0 REFERENCES 29
15.1 Documents, Plans and Reports 29
15.2 Personal Communications 29
15.3 Agencies Consulted 29

FIGURES

Figure 1 Vicinity Map
Figure 2 Site Plan
Figure 3 Topographic Map

APPENDICES

Appendix A Title Report
Appendix B Regulatory Database Report
Appendix C Regulatory Agency Records
Appendix D Photographs
Appendix E Interview Questionnaire
Appendix F Qualifications

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the methods and findings of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) of the property known as the Slee Properties and is located south of Honey Springs Road in the community of Jamul, San Diego County, California (i.e., the Site). This Phase I ESA was performed in conformance with the contract/agreement for this assignment and the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (AAI) as published in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 312 (40 CFR 312). EPA promulgated the AAI rule that became effective in November 2006 and has indicated that the ASTM E1527 practice is consistent with the requirements of AAI and may be used to comply with the provisions of the AAI rule.

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the ASTM E1527 practice (framework for this Phase I ESA) is to define good commercial and customary practice in the U.S. for conducting a Phase I ESA of a parcel of real estate with respect to the range of contaminants within the scope of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA, Title 42 U.S. Code [42 U.S.C.] Section 9601) and petroleum products. As such, this practice is intended to permit a user to satisfy one of the requirements to qualify for the innocent landowner, contiguous property owner, or bona fide prospective purchaser limitations on CERCLA liability (hereinafter, the "landowner liability protections," or "LLPs"); i.e., the practice that constitutes AAI's into the previous ownership and uses of the Site consistent with good commercial and customary practice as defined in 42 U.S.C. Section 9601(35)(B).

In defining a standard of good commercial and customary practice for conducting this Phase I ESA, the goal of the processes established by the ASTM E1527 practice is to identify, to the extent feasible, *recognized environmental conditions*. The term "recognized environmental conditions" is defined as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment, or; (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. In addition, *controlled recognized environmental conditions*, *historical recognized environmental conditions* and/or *de minimis conditions*, if identified during the completion of the assessment, are discussed herein. Definitions of these terms and other key terminology relevant to the practice are included in Section 14.0 of this report.

1.2 Scope of the Assessment

In general terms, this Phase I ESA included the acquisition of readily available/accessible and practically reviewable regulatory records and historical information, a site reconnaissance, interviews and preparation of this written report of findings. A more

detailed description of the four primary components of the Phase I ESA is presented below.

Records Review - A review of Federal, State, Tribal, and local standard ASTM and non-ASTM regulatory databases for a myriad of environmental identifiers including, but not limited to: properties with underground storage tanks (USTs); properties with leaking USTs; properties that have reported spills/releases that did not occur from a leaking UST, and; businesses that utilize hazardous materials and/or generate hazardous waste and hazardous waste disposal locations. The regulatory review may also include public records requests with one or more Federal, State, Tribal and/or local agencies. A review of historical sources is also completed to help ascertain previous land uses of the property in question and in the surrounding area.

Site Reconnaissance - A property inspection and viewing of adjacent and surrounding properties for conditions that could be "recognized environmental conditions."

Interviews - Interviews with present and past owners, operators and/or occupants of a property and local government officials.

Reporting - Evaluation of the information gathered during the completion of the Phase I ESA and the subsequent preparation of a written report.

1.3 Limitations and Exceptions

Concerns regarding liability under the CERCLA and analogous State laws have been a primary driver for Phase I ESA assignments in commercial real estate transactions. While the ASTM E1527 practice can be used in many contexts, a familiarity with CERCLA and its potential LLPs is critical in understanding and applying the ASTM E1527 practice. We advise consultation with legal counsel if further inquiry or information is desired.

AAI represents the minimum level of inquiry necessary to support the LLPs. However, it is important to understand that additional inquiry ultimately may be necessary or desirable for legal as well as business reasons depending upon the outcome of this inquiry and the particular risk tolerances of a given user. For example, additional inquiry may assist a user of a Phase I ESA in determining whether he or she would have continuing obligations in the event he or she acquires a given property and may also assist the user in defining the scope of future steps to be taken to satisfy such obligations. In addition, a user may be concerned about business environmental risks or non-scope ASTM considerations that do not fall within the definition of a "recognized environmental condition." In addition, this Phase I ESA did not include subsurface or other invasive exploration. Users are also cautioned that Federal, State, Tribal and local laws may impose environmental assessment obligations that are beyond the scope of the ASTM E1527 practice.

The evaluation, opinion and conclusions presented herein are based solely on visual observations and regulatory, historical and personal knowledge related information that existed at the time our assessment was completed. The use of the gathered information

is exclusively for the purposes outlined in this report and only for the Site. Our firm can make no warranty, express or implied, except that the services conducted were performed in accordance with generally accepted environmental assessment practices applicable at the time and location of the assessment and that the conclusions of the assessment have been based in part on professional judgment/experience, an interpretation of readily available data and the standard of care normally followed by similar professionals practicing in a similar locale and under similar circumstances. Any opinions presented cannot apply to Site changes of which our firm is unaware and has not had the opportunity to evaluate. In addition, this report cannot feasibly include any evaluation of undocumented activities at the Site or on adjacent or nearby properties. Lastly, a Phase I ESA meeting or exceeding this practice and completed less than 180 days prior to the date of an acquisition or completed transaction is presumed to be valid.

1.4 Special Terms and Conditions

This Phase I ESA was prepared in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract/agreement for the work as executed between our firm and the client. There are no other special terms and conditions established between our firm and the client pertinent to the findings of this Phase I ESA or methodology used to complete this Phase I ESA. In addition, our firm has no final or other vested interest in the Site or adjacent/surrounding properties, or in any entity that owns or occupies the Site or adjacent/surrounding properties.

1.5 Limiting Conditions and Deviations

There were no significant limiting conditions that would inhibit our ability to identify “recognized environmental conditions” noted during the completion of this Phase I ESA. In addition, there were no deviations from the ASTM E1527 standard noted during the completion of this Phase I ESA. Any limiting conditions that are not considered to be ones that would inhibit our ability to identify “recognized environmental conditions” at the Site are referenced in applicable sections of this report.

1.6 Data Failure and Data Gaps

No instances of data failure were encountered during the completion of this Phase I ESA. In addition, no data gaps of significance (i.e., those that would inhibit our ability to identify “recognized environmental conditions”) were identified during the completion of this Phase I ESA. Any data gaps that are not considered to be ones that would inhibit our ability to identify “recognized environmental conditions” at the Site are referenced in applicable sections of this report.

1.7 Reliance

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the client to which our firm has contracted with to complete this Phase I ESA. This report may not be relied upon by any other person or entity without the written consent of both our firm and our client. The

scope of services performed for this Phase I ESA may not be appropriate to satisfy the specific needs of other users, and any use or reuse of this document would be at the sole risk of said users. Any other party seeking liability protection under CERCLA must take independent action to accomplish its objective.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 Location and Legal Description

The Site is known as the Slee Properties and is located on the south side of Honey Springs Road in the community of Jamul, San Diego County, California. The Site is a reported four acres. The Site is further identified by San Diego County Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 600-101-04 and 600-101-05. A Vicinity Map is included as Figure 1. A Site Plan is included as Figure 2.

2.2 Site and Vicinity Characteristics

The Site and the surrounding vicinity are situated in the community of Jamul in an area primarily consisting of public roadways, vacant land and residential properties. Additional details pertaining to the Site and its adjoining properties are provided in the sections below.

2.3 Current Use of the Site

The Site is vacant and undeveloped land.

2.4 Description of Site Improvements

There are no known improvements.

2.5 Utilities

Utilities that provide service in the surrounding area, are noted below along with their municipal provider, where applicable. If certain utility systems are not provided by public agencies or entities, they are noted as privately maintained.

Utility	Provider (Where Applicable)
Potable Water	Otay Water District. Private water supply wells are also likely prevalent in the area.
Sewage Maintenance	Otay Water District. Private septic systems are also likely prevalent in the area.
Electrical	San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E)
Natural Gas	SDG&E. Private natural gas/propane tanks are also likely prevalent in the area.
Solid Waste Disposal	Waste Management

2.6 Description of Adjoining Properties

Adjoining properties are defined as any real property or properties, the border of which is contiguous or partially contiguous with that of the subject property of a Phase I ESA, or that would be contiguous or partially contiguous with that of a subject property but for a

street, road, or other public thoroughfare separating them. To the extent feasible, our firm performed a visual inspection of adjoining properties from the Site boundaries and along public right of ways. We did not encroach onto adjoining private property during the completion of this Phase I ESA. The following table identifies the adjoining property uses:

General Direction	Adjoining Property Use
North	Residential properties
South	Residential properties and open space
East	Open space
West	Residential properties

2.7 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns

No “recognized environmental conditions” in connection with the land use of, and improvements at, the Site are noted. In addition, the land uses of adjoining properties and properties in the vicinity of the Site do not represent “recognized environmental conditions” that are of direct environmental concern to the Site. Please refer to Section 5.1 for additional information pertaining to adjacent properties.

3.0 PHYSICAL SETTING

3.1 Topography

The Site is depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic map of the Dulzura, California 7.5 minute quadrangle (2018). Regional topography is variable. The Site is depicted on the topographic map at an average elevation of approximately 1,200 feet above mean sea level and slopes generally to the west. A Topographic Map is included as Figure 3.

3.2 Hydrology

According to the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Region 9), published by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Site is situated within the Jamul Hydrologic Subarea of the Dulzura Hydrologic Area of the Otay Hydrologic Unit. Various drainages are present at the Site. Infiltration of precipitation at the Site can be expected due to its primarily unimproved nature. Any excess water would appear to flow as surface runoff to streets/roadways and surrounding areas of lower elevation. The Site does not appear to receive significant drainage from off-Site properties.

3.3 Geology

General geologic information pertaining to the Site is presented in the table below.

Geologic Consideration	Details
California Geomorphic Province	Peninsular Ranges
Mapped Soils or Formation	Mesozoic Granite Rocks
Description of Soils or Formation	Granitic and other intrusive crystalline rocks of various ages.
Distance/Direction to Mapped Faults	No known faults are mapped on the Site

3.4 Hydrogeology

General hydrogeologic information pertaining to the Site is presented in the table below.

Hydrogeologic Consideration	Details
Groundwater Basin or Unit	Jamul Hydrologic Subarea
Beneficial Uses	Municipal, agricultural and industrial
Estimated Depth to Groundwater	Anticipated to be greater than 20 feet
Estimated Flow of Groundwater	Northwest
Known Site or Regional Groundwater Contamination Issues	None

3.5 Oil and Gas Exploration

According to online resources provided by the California Department of Conservation, Geologic Energy Management Division, there are no oil, gas or geothermal wells located on the Site or its adjacent properties.

3.6 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns

No “recognized environmental conditions” associated with Site *Physical Setting* considerations are noted.

4.0 USER PROVIDED INFORMATION

The client was interviewed during the completion of this Phase I ESA. The questions posed during the interview are defined by the ASTM E1527 practice. The client also provided our firm with any land title records and judicial records that may be available for the Site as part of the required evaluation for environmental liens and activity and use limitations (AULs) in connection with the subject property of a Phase I ESA. As stated in the ASTM E1527 practice, it is the responsibility of the user of the report to provide any available records pertaining to environmental liens and AULs that may exist in connection with a given property. Any land title and judicial recorded provided to our firm are discussed below. If such information is not discussed in the sections below, it was not provided by the user of the report.

In addition to the contact information obtained, the user of the report was also asked if they are aware of other useful documents that may exist and if so whether copies can be provided to the environmental professional within reasonable time and cost constraints. A list of typical useful documents is included in Section 10.8.1 of the ASTM E1527 practice and include but are not limited to environmental assessment reports, compliance audits and permits, registrations for tank and other aboveground or underground systems, safety plans, spill prevention and other facility related plans and geological/geotechnical studies and environmental governmental agency notices and/or correspondence.

4.1 Title Records

Our firm was provided a preliminary title report pertaining to the Site dated February 11, 2022 and prepared by Fidelity National Title. No environmentally related liens, deed restrictions or activity and use limitations pertaining to the Site are referenced in the report. A copy of the title report is included in Appendix A.

4.2 Environmental Liens

The client is unaware of environmental liens in connection with the Site.

4.3 Activity and Use Limitations

The client is unaware of AULs in connection with the Site.

4.4 Specialized or Actual Knowledge or Experience

The client is unaware of specialized knowledge, actual knowledge or experience that is material to “recognized environmental conditions” in connection with the Site.

4.5 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information

The client is unaware of commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information within the local community that is material to “recognized environmental conditions” in connection with the Site.

4.6 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues

The client is unaware of information pertaining to an undervalued purchase price of the Site relative to the estimated fair market value of the Site due to the presence of contamination.

4.7 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information

The Site is currently owned and managed by Martha Slee. The Site is vacant with no known occupants.

4.8 Reason for Performing Phase I ESA

The client has commissioned this Phase I ESA as part of a potential acquisition of the Site. The Phase I ESA is also being completed to assist the client in complying with 40 CFR 312.

4.9 Proceedings Involving the Site

The client is unaware of pending, threatened, or past litigation and administrative proceedings relevant to hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or from the Site. The client is also unaware of notices from any governmental entity regarding any possible violation of environmental laws or possible liability relating to hazardous substances or petroleum products in connection with the Site.

4.10 Other Provided Documents

We were not provided with prior environmental documents pertaining to the Site.

4.11 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns

No “recognized environmental conditions” associated with the *User Provided Information* are noted.

5.0 REGULATORY RECORDS REVIEW

Our firm commissioned the preparation of a regulatory database report from Environmental Risk Information Services (ERIS) as part of the regulatory records review. ERIS searches a myriad of Federal, State and local government environmental databases during the preparation of their deliverables. Certain databases are specifically required by the ASTM E1527 practice and are referenced as “standard ASTM regulatory databases.” Such databases are searched to at least the minimum search distance around a given property as defined in the practice. Other regulatory databases are also searched that are not specifically referenced in ASTM E1527. Such databases are referenced as “non-ASTM regulatory databases” and are searched as varying radii around a given property as selected by ERIS.

Descriptions of each database searched and the dates that the regulatory databases were last updated by the applicable agencies are included in the ERIS report. The extent of historical information varies with each database and current information is determined by what is publicly available to ERIS at the time of an updates. ERIS updates databases in accordance with ASTM E1527 which states that government information from non-governmental sources may be considered current if the source updates the information at least every 90 days, or, for information that is updated less frequently than quarterly by the government agency, within 90 days of the date the government agency makes the information available to the public.

Our firm also reviewed unplottable sites listed in the database report by cross-referencing reasonably ascertainable information pertaining to such properties that may include facility names, street names, zip codes or other information. Unplottable sites are ones that cannot be formally mapped or geocoded due to various reasons, including limited geographic information. Any unplottable sites that we identify within the specified search radii have been evaluated as part of the preparation of this report. A copy of the regulatory database report is included in Appendix B.

5.1 Standard ASTM Regulatory Database Search

The tables below present the standard Federal, State, Tribal and local ASTM databases that were searched by ERIS including the search distances from the Site. Below the tables are descriptions of any listings for the Site that may appear in the databases. In addition, a discussion of adjoining properties or properties in the Site vicinity that are listed in one or more regulatory databases that in our professional judgment and opinion have the potential to adversely impact the Site due to current or former releases of hazardous substances and/or petroleum products that occurred at said properties is presented. This practice of discussing only properties of potential environmental concern to the Site is noted in ASTM E1527 which states that the environmental professional may make statements applicable to multiple properties listed in regulatory databases that are not likely to have current or former releases of hazardous substances and/or petroleum products with the potential to migrate to the a given subject property. Our professional judgment and opinions discussed herein are based on several factors including the nature

of the regulatory database listings, distance of the off-Site listed properties from the Site, orientation of the listed properties relative to the Site, interpreted the direction of groundwater flow and/or regulatory case status information for the various properties as described in the databases.

The following Federal standard ASTM databases were searched:

Standard Environmental Record Source Name	ERIS Regulatory Database Identification	Search Distance From Site (Miles)
National Priorities List (NPL) Site List	NPL – Proposed NPL – Superfund Record of Decision (ROD)	1.0
Delisted NPL Site List	Deleted NPL	0.5
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) List	CERCLIS – SEMS – SEMS Archive – ODI – IODI – CERCLIS LIENS – SEMS LIENS	0.5
CERCLIS List	CERCLIS LIENS – SEMS LIENS	Site
CERCLIS No Further Remedial Action Planned (NFRAP) Site List	CERCLIS NFRAP	0.5
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action Sites (CORRACTS) Facilities List	RCRA CORRACTS	1.0
RCRA Non-CORRACTS Treatment, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities List	RCRA TSD	0.5
RCRA Generators List	RCRA LQG – RCRA SQG – RCRA CESQG – RCRA NON-GEN – BULK TERMINAL – REFN – FEMA Underground Storage Tank (UST)	0.25
Institutional Control/Engineering Control Registries	FED ENG – FED INST – FED Brownfields	0.5
Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS) List	ERNS – ERNS 1982 to 1986 – ERNS 1987 to 1989	Site

Site – The Site is not listed on any of the standard Federal ASTM regulatory databases

Adjoining Properties – No adjoining properties are listed on the standard Federal ASTM regulatory databases.

Other Properties – No other properties in the surrounding area are listed on the standard Federal ASTM regulatory databases

The following State, Tribal and local standard ASTM databases were searched:

Standard Environmental Record Sources Name	ERIS Regulatory Database Identification	Search Distance From Site (Miles)
Equivalent NPL	RESPONSE – HWP	1.0
Equivalent CERCLIS	ENVIROSTOR – DELISTED ENVS	0.5
Landfill and/or Solid Waste Disposal Site Lists	SWF/LF – SWAT – LDS – SWRCB SWF – LA SWF	0.5
Leaking Storage Tank Lists	LUST – DELISTED LST – CLEANUP SITES – INDIAN LUST – DELISTED ILST –SAN DIEGO SAM	0.5
Registered Storage Tank Lists	UST – AST – UST CLOSURE – HHSS – TANK OIL GAS – DELISTED TNK – CERS TANK – DELISTED COUNTY – DELISTED CTNK – HIST TANK – INDIAN UST – DELISTED IUST – UST SWEEPS	Site and Adjoining Properties
Institutional Control/Engineering Control Registries	DEED – LUR – HLUR	Site
Voluntary Cleanup Sites	VCP – CLEANUP SITEs	0.5
Brownfield Sites	Not Applicable – No Database Exists	0.5

Site – The Site is not listed on any of the State, Tribal, and local standard ASTM regulatory databases.

Adjoining Properties – No adjoining properties are listed on the standard State, Tribal and local standard ASTM databases.

Other Properties – There is one listing on the State, Tribal and local standard ASTM regulatory databases in the surrounding area. The property is identified as Honey Springs Ranch at 1850 Honey Springs Road. The property is listed on the HAZ SAN DIEGO database with no violations or releases reported. This property is not considered to have the potential to adversely impact the Site.

5.2 Non-ASTM Regulatory Database Search

A myriad of non-ASTM regulatory databases was searched by ERIS as noted in the regulatory database report.

Site – The Site is not listed on any of the non-ASTM regulatory databases.

Adjoining Properties – No adjoining properties are listed on the non-ASTM regulatory databases.

Other Properties – No other properties in the surrounding area are listed on the non-ASTM regulatory databases.

5.3 Regulatory Agency File Reviews

If a property being assessed under a Phase I ESA or any of the adjoining properties are identified on one or more of the above referenced standard environmental record sources, pertinent regulatory files and/or records associated with such listings should be reviewed to assist the environmental professional in evaluating if "recognized environmental conditions" existing at a given subject property in connection with any listings. However, if in the environmental professional's opinion, such a review is not warranted, file reviews need not be conducted if the environmental professional provides justification for not doing so.

Agency file reviews for the Site completed during this Phase I ESA are noted below. No file reviews for adjoining properties or properties in the surrounding area were deemed warranted. The agency inquiries were performed by way of on-line searches/queries of published databases and/or direct inquiries with public records clerks at one or more agencies. Daniel Weis of C Young Associates conducted the agency file reviews during the completion of this Phase I ESA. Regulatory agency file review information is included in Appendix C.

Regulatory Agency	Jurisdiction	Date of Inquiry or Request	Contact	Response or Information From Agency
United States EPA	Federal	6/4/2022	Online https://enviro.epa.gov/	No Records Identified
California Department of Toxic Substances Control	State	6/4/2022	Online https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/ https://hwts.dtsc.ca.gov/report_list.cfm	No Records Identified
State Water Resources Control Board/Regional Water Quality Control Board	State	6/4/2022	Online https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/ https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/historical_ust_facilities	No Records Identified
County of San Diego DEH	Local	6/4/2022	Public Records Clerk	No Records Identified

5.4 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns

No “recognized environmental conditions” associated with regulatory records searches are noted. In addition, regulatory resources related to the adjoining properties and properties in the vicinity of the Site do not represent “recognized environmental conditions” that are of direct environmental concern to the Site.

6.0 HISTORICAL RESOURCE REVIEW

The objective of consulting historical sources is to develop a history of the previous uses of a property and surrounding area in order to help identify the likelihood of past uses having led to "recognized environmental conditions" in connection with a given property. The goal of the historical research is to identify all obvious uses of a subject property from the present, back to the property's first developed use, or back to 1940, whichever is earlier. The environmental professional exercises professional judgment in reviewing only as many of the standard historical sources referenced in ASTM E1527 that are deemed necessary, are reasonably ascertainable and are likely to be useful. Historical resources reviewed during the completion of this Phase I ESA are referenced below. Copies of aerial photographs are not appended due to copyright considerations but are available online for viewing.

6.1 Aerial Photographs

CYA reviewed historical aerial photographs from the years 1953, 1971, 1978, 1981, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1989, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1997, 1998,1999, 2000, 2002, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016 and 2019 via online resources (historicaerials.com). The Site appears to be vacant and undeveloped land in all of the aerial photographs. Adjoining properties are primarily vacant and undeveloped land in the 1953 to 2019 aerial photographs with some scattered residential structures. Adjoining properties appear similar to their configurations in the most recent photographs.

6.2 Historic Topographic Maps

CYA reviewed historical topographic maps dated ranging in date from 1903 to 2021 provided by online resources (historicaerials.com). On the 1904 through 1996 maps, the Site and adjacent properties are depicted as undeveloped. Nearby roadways are visible.

6.3 Other Historical Sources

Other historical sources are referenced in the ASTM E1527 practice as any source or sources other than the standard historical sources referenced in the practice that are credible to a reasonable person and that identify past uses of a subject property. This category includes, but is not limited to miscellaneous maps, newspaper archives, internet sites, community organizations, local libraries, historical societies, current owners or occupants of neighboring properties, or records in the files and/or personal knowledge of the property owner and/or occupants. No historical sources other than the standard sources described above were deemed necessary and useful to assist in identifying "recognized environmental conditions."

6.4 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns

No "recognized environmental conditions" associated with *Historical Resources* reviewed are noted. In addition, *Historical Resources* related to the adjoining properties and

properties in the vicinity of the Site do not represent “recognized environmental conditions” that are of direct environmental concern to the Site.

7.0 SITE RECONAISSANCE

The objective of the Site reconnaissance is to obtain information indicating the likelihood of identifying "recognized environmental conditions" in connection with a subject property. The Site visit for our assessment was completed by Colin Young on June 3, 2022. Mr. Young was unescorted during the inspection.

7.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions

The Site reconnaissance consisted of observing visible areas of the Site and walking publicly accessible areas surrounding the Site. No significant limiting conditions were noted during the reconnaissance. Select photographs of the Site obtained during the Site reconnaissance are included in Appendix D.

7.2 Current General Site and Vicinity Characteristics

The Site and the surrounding vicinity are situated in the community of Jamul in an area primarily consisting of public roadways, vacant land and residential properties. The Site is vacant and undeveloped land. The current use of the Site and its adjoining properties are not indicative of the use, treatment, storage, disposal or generation of significant quantities of hazardous substances or petroleum products that have adversely impacted the Site.

7.3 Indications of Past Site and Vicinity Uses

There are no material differences between the current and past uses of the Site, adjoining properties and the surrounding area that were visually and/or physically observed during the Site reconnaissance that pertain to "recognized environmental conditions."

7.4 Site-Specific Observations

We examined visible and accessible areas of the Site for the features and conditions noted in the table below.

Feature or Condition	Details
General Description of Structures	None observed.
Drains and Sumps	None observed.
Heating/Cooling Systems	None observed.
Potable Water Supply	Municipal (Otay Water District) in the area along with private water supply wells.
Roads	Access to the Site is via an easement off of a driveway off of Honey Springs Road to the North. Various unimproved trails and roads exist onsite.
Septic Systems / Sewage Disposal System	Otay Water District. Private septic systems are also likely prevalent in the area.

Feature or Condition	Details
Wastewater and Stormwater Discharges	None observed.
Wells	None observed.
Drums	None observed.
Electrical or Hydraulic Equipment Known to Contain PCBs or Likely to Contain PCBs	None observed.
Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Products in Connection with Identified Uses	None observed.
Hazardous Substance and Petroleum Products Not Necessarily in Connection With Identified Uses	None observed.
Odors	None noted.
Pits, Ponds or Lagoons	None observed.
Pools of Liquid	None observed.
Solid Waste (Including Fill Material)	None observed.
Stained Soil or Pavement	None observed.
Stains or Corrosion	None observed.
Storage Tanks	None observed.
Stressed Vegetation	None observed.
Unidentified Substance Containers	None observed.

7.5 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns

No “recognized environmental conditions” associated with the current use of the Site were noted during the *Site Reconnaissance*. In addition, no current uses of the adjoining properties or properties in the surrounding area that were visually and/or physically observed during the *Site Reconnaissance* were noted as being relevant to “recognized environmental conditions” that are of direct environmental concern to the Site.

8.0 INTERVIEWS

8.1 Site Owner

The designated Site owner representative (Simi Rush of Willis Allen Real Estate) completed an environmental questionnaire pertaining to the Site, a copy of which is included in Appendix E. No environmental concerns in connection with the Site were reported.

8.2 Key Site Manager

The Site owner is also considered to be the Key Site Manager. Please refer to Section 8.1 above.

8.3 Current Occupants

The Site is currently vacant with no known occupants.

8.4 Local Government Official

During the preparation of this Phase I ESA, a public records clerk with the County of San Diego DEH was contacted by our firm regarding the Site. A representative of this agency indicated that a public records request should be conducted in order to obtain information known by this agency regarding the Site. Public records requests were completed by our firm as described in Section 5.3.

8.5 Other Parties

Interviews with other persons were not conducted during the preparation of this Phase I ESA. As stated in the ASTM E1527 practice, interviews with past owners, operators, and occupants of a subject property who are likely to have material information regarding the potential for contamination at a given property shall be conducted to the extent that they have been identified and that the information likely to be obtained is not duplicative of information already obtained from other sources. Interviews with persons with past association with the Site were not deemed warranted during the completion of this Phase I ESA.

8.6 Summary Relative to Environmental Concerns

No “recognized environmental conditions” associated with the *Interviews* completed during the assessment are noted.

9.0 ADDITIONAL SERVICES – NON-SCOPE ASTM CONSIDERATIONS

No additional services were completed by our firm during the preparation of this Phase I ESA. Several non-scope ASTM considerations referenced in Section 13 of the ASTM E1527 practice were considered but deemed not relevant or substantive to the objectives of this assessment. Listed considerations in the practice include asbestos-containing building materials, biological agents, cultural and historic resources, ecological resources, endangered species, health and safety, indoor air quality (unrelated to releases of hazardous substances or petroleum products into the environment), industrial hygiene, lead-based paint, lead in drinking water, mold, radon, regulatory compliance and wetlands. No implication is intended by the practice as to the relative importance of inquiry into such non-scope considerations, and the list of considerations is not intended to be all-inclusive.

An evaluation of one or more of the non-scope considerations was not requested of our firm as part of the scope of services for the assessment. Therefore, no findings, opinions and conclusions of this Phase I ESA are based on said non-scope ASTM considerations.

10.0 FINDINGS AND OPINIONS


No features and/or conditions indicating the presence or likely presence of hazardous substances and/or petroleum products that have adversely impacted the Site were identified during the completion of this assessment.

11.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This assessment has revealed no evidence of “recognized environmental conditions,” “controlled recognized environmental conditions” or “historical recognized environmental conditions” in connection with the Site. Further assessment of the Site is not considered warranted at this time.

12.0 ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL STATEMENT

We declare that, to the best of my professional knowledge and belief, we meet the definition of environmental professional as defined in Section 312.10 of 40 CFR. We have the specific qualifications based on education, training, and experience to assess a property of the nature, history, and setting of the Site. We have developed and performed the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312. Qualifications of personnel involved with the completion of this report are included in Appendix F.



Colin P. Young, CIH
Principal



Daniel Weis, R.E.H.S.
Associates Environmental Scientist

13.0 ASSUMPTIONS

No Phase I ESA effort can eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for “recognized environmental conditions” to exist in connection with a given property. Performance of the ASTM E1527 practice may reduce such uncertainty but in no way should the findings and report be misconstrued as insurance or a guarantee regarding the potential for “recognized environmental conditions” in connection with a given property. The ASTM E1527 practice recognizes reasonable limits of time and cost relative to the completion of a Phase I ESA.

During the completion of this ESA, our firm relied on certain information obtained from secondary sources, including but not limited to the user of the report, government agencies, historical research business entities, environmental databases and interviews with one or more persons. The sources obtained and/or consulted are assumed to be reliable. However, our firm cannot warranty or guarantee that the information provided by these other sources is wholly accurate or complete. Our firm is not responsible for any misrepresentations or false statements that may be provided by others or the lack of pertinent/relevant information that should have been provided/disclosed by others and we assume no responsibility for any consequence as a result of such omissions or withheld information.

Accuracy and completeness of records varies among information sources, including from governmental agencies. As a result, there is a possibility that even with the proper application of the methodologies presented in ASTM E1527, conditions may exist that could not be identified within the scope of this Phase I ESA or which were not reasonably identifiable from the available information. In addition, any responses received from Federal, State, Tribal, and local regulatory agency secondary sources of information after the issuance of this report may change certain findings and conclusions of this report.

Estimations and opinions regarding the potential for off-Site properties to adversely impact a given subject property is one of the key components of a Phase I ESA. In most cases, recent property-specific or adjacent-property specific measured groundwater data or other hydrogeological information is not reasonably ascertainable. In the absence of such data, reasonable assumptions regarding the depth and flow of groundwater are made based on various sources including comparisons to surface elevations, land topography and available hydrogeological on the State of California Geotracker database. In addition, estimations and opinions regarding potential impacts from off-Site locations may be based on certain assumptions that a hazardous substance or petroleum product may not migrate laterally within unsaturated soil for a substantial distance and that contaminants that have reached saturated soil and groundwater may attenuate over time and/or may decrease in concentration relative to distance from its source. While any interpretations presented herein may be effective in reducing uncertainty regarding potential impacts to a subject property from off-Site locations, in no way should the findings and report be misconstrued as insurance or a guarantee regarding the potential for such impacts to occur. Greater certainty regarding subsurface conditions at a given

property can only be achieved by way of a subsurface sampling effort of one or more media.

14.0 DEFINITIONS

Definitions of key terminology relevant to the ASTM E1527 practice are presented below.

Recognized Environmental Condition - The presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment.

Controlled Recognized Environmental Condition - A recognized environmental condition resulting from a past release of hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority (for example, as evidenced by the issuance of a no further action letter or equivalent, or meeting risk-based criteria established by regulatory authority), with hazardous substances or petroleum products allowed to remain in place subject to the implementation of required controls (for example, property use restrictions, activity and use limitations, institutional controls, or engineering controls).

Data Failure - A failure to achieve the historical research objectives as outlined in the ASTM E1527 practice even after reviewing the standard historical sources that are reasonably ascertainable and likely to be useful. Data failure is one type of data gap.

Data Gap - A lack of or inability to obtain information required by this practice despite good faith efforts by the environmental professional to gather such information. Data gaps may result from incompleteness in any of the activities required by the ASTM E1527 practice, including, but not limited to site reconnaissance (for example, an inability to conduct the site visit), and interviews (for example, an inability to interview the key site manager, regulatory officials, etc.). Data gaps are only considered to be significant if they affect the ability of the environmental professional to identify recognized environmental conditions.

***De Minimis* Condition** - A condition that generally does not present a threat to human health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies. Conditions determined to be *de minimis* conditions are not “recognized environmental conditions” nor “controlled recognized environmental conditions.”

Environment - (A) the navigable waters, the waters of the contiguous zone, and the ocean waters of which the natural resources are under the exclusive management authority of the United States under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act [16 U.S.C. §§ 1801 et seq.], and (B) any other surface water, groundwater, drinking water supply, land surface or subsurface strata, or ambient air within the United States or under the jurisdiction of the United States.

Good Faith - The absence of any intention to seek an unfair advantage or to defraud another party; an honest and sincere intention to fulfill one's obligations in the conduct or transaction concerned.

Hazardous Substance - Includes hazardous substances designated under section 311 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) or Section 102 of CERCLA, any toxic pollutant listed under Section 307(a) of the CWA, any waste that has been listed as a RCRA hazardous waste or possesses a RCRA hazardous waste characteristic, any substance that is identified as a hazardous pollutant under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (CAA), and any imminently hazardous chemical that EPA has taken action pursuant to Section 7 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).

Historical Recognized Environmental Condition - A past release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority or meeting unrestricted use criteria established by a regulatory authority, without subjecting the property in question to any required controls (for example, property use restrictions, activity and use limitations, institutional controls, or engineering controls).

Petroleum Exclusion – While the definition of a CERCLA hazardous substance specifically excludes petroleum products and crude oil, the EPA has determined that the petroleum exclusion applies to petroleum products such as gasoline and other fuels containing lead, benzene or other hazardous substances that are normally added during the refining process. Notwithstanding the existence of the petroleum exclusion, petroleum products are included within the scope of the ASTM E1527 practice for multiple reasons. Petroleum products have historically been widely used at commercial properties. In addition, other federal and state laws may impose liability for releases or spills of petroleum products.

Reasonably Ascertainable Information - Information that is (1) publicly available, (2) obtainable from its source within reasonable time and cost constraints and (3) practically reviewable.

Release or Threatened Release - Spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, discharging, injecting, escaping, leaching, dumping or disposing into the environment (including the abandonment or discarding of barrels, containers and other closed receptacles containing any hazardous substance, or pollutant or contaminant).

15.0 REFERENCES

Sources of information consulted during the completion of our Phase I ESA are noted in the sections below.

15.1 Documents, Plans and Reports

- "All Appropriate Inquiry" as necessary to satisfy the defenses available under 42 USC §§ 9607(b)(3), 9607(r)(1), and 9607(q), relying on definitions provided at 42 USC §§ 9601(35)(B); and as further explained in 40 CFR §§ 312.1 – 312.31.
- ASTM International, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, ASTM Designation E1527-13, Published November 2013.
- California Geological Survey (CGS), 2002, Regional Geologic Map No. 2
- California State Water Resources Control Board, GeoTracker online database: http://www.geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov.
- California State Water Resources Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego River Basin (9), California, Published 2008.
- ERIS Database Report dated May 20, 2022.
- USGS Topographic Map, Dulzura, California Quadrangle (2018).

15.2 Personal Communications

- Public Records Clerk – County of San Diego DEH
- Site Owner and Key Site Manager – Simi Rush

15.3 Agencies Consulted

- California Department of Conservation, Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM)
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- California State Water Resources Control Board
- County of San Diego
- United States EPA

FIGURES

FIGURE 1
VICINITY MAP



Figure 1 - Vicinity Map

Slee Properties
Jamul, California

N

Prepared by:

C Young Associates
1042 Skylark Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037

FIGURE 2
SITE PLAN



Figure 2 - Site Plan

Slee Properties
Jamul, California

N

Prepared by:

C Young Associates
1042 Skylark Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037

FIGURE 3
TOPOGRAPHIC MAP




Figure 3 - Topographic Map

Slee Properties
Jamul, California

N

Prepared by:

C Young Associates
1042 Skylark Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
TITLE REPORT

Fidelity National Title
BUILDER SERVICES

4210 Riverwalk Parkway, Suite 100
Riverside, CA 92505
Phone: (951) 710-5900
Fax: (951) 710-5955

Issuing Policies of Fidelity National Title Insurance Company

Title Officer: Lori Duhart (BS/IE)
Escrow Officer: Builder Services OAC

Order No.: 989-**30081580**-LD1

TO:

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP
525 B Street, Suite 2200
San Diego, CA 92101

ATTN: **Todd Leigh**
YOUR REFERENCE:

PROPERTY ADDRESS: Vacant Land, Jamul, CA

PRELIMINARY REPORT

In response to the application for a policy of title insurance referenced herein, ***Fidelity National Title Company*** *hereby reports that it is prepared to issue, or cause to be issued, as of the date hereof, a policy or policies of title insurance describing the land and the estate or interest therein hereinafter set forth, insuring against loss which may be sustained by reason of any defect, lien or encumbrance not shown or referred to as an exception herein or not excluded from coverage pursuant to the printed Schedules, Conditions and Stipulations or Conditions of said policy forms.*

The printed Exceptions and Exclusions from the coverage and Limitations on Covered Risks of said policy or policies are set forth in Attachment One. The policy to be issued may contain an arbitration clause. When the Amount of Insurance is less than that set forth in the arbitration clause, all arbitrable matters shall be arbitrated at the option of either the Company or the Insured as the exclusive remedy of the parties. Limitations on Covered Risks applicable to the CLTA and ALTA Homeowner's Policies of Title Insurance which establish a Deductible Amount and a Maximum Dollar Limit of Liability for certain coverages are also set forth in Attachment One. Copies of the policy forms should be read. They are available from the office which issued this report.

This report (and any supplements or amendments hereto) is issued solely for the purpose of facilitating the issuance of a policy of title insurance and no liability is assumed hereby. If it is desired that liability be assumed prior to the issuance of a policy of title insurance, a Binder or Commitment should be requested.

The policy(s) of title insurance to be issued hereunder will be policy(s) of Fidelity National Title Insurance Company, a Florida Corporation.

Please read the exceptions shown or referred to herein and the exceptions and exclusions set forth in Attachment One of this report carefully. The exceptions and exclusions are meant to provide you with notice of matters which are not covered under the terms of the title insurance policy and should be carefully considered.

It is important to note that this preliminary report is not a written representation as to the condition of title and may not list all liens, defects and encumbrances affecting title to the land.

Countersigned by:

Authorized Signature

Fidelity National Title
BUILDER SERVICES

4210 Riverwalk Parkway, Suite 100
Riverside, CA 92505
Phone: (951) 710-5900
Fax: (951) 710-5955

PRELIMINARY REPORT

EFFECTIVE DATE: **February 11, 2022 at 7:30 a.m.**

ORDER NO.: 989-30081580-LD1

The form of policy or policies of title insurance contemplated by this report is:

CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (04-08-14)
ALTA Extended Loan Policy (7-1-21)

1. THE ESTATE OR INTEREST IN THE LAND HEREINAFTER DESCRIBED OR REFERRED TO COVERED BY THIS REPORT IS:

   Fee as to Parcels 1 and 4 and Easement as to Parcels 2, 3, 5 and 6

2. TITLE TO SAID ESTATE OR INTEREST AT THE DATE HEREOF IS VESTED IN:

   Martha A. Slee, an unmarried woman as to Parcels 1, 2 and 3; Martha A. Slee as to Parcels 4, 5 and 6

3. THE LAND REFERRED TO IN THIS REPORT IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

   See Exhibit A attached hereto and made a part hereof.

EXHIBIT A

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THE LAND REFERRED TO HEREIN BELOW IS SITUATED JAMUL IN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

PARCEL NO.1:

THE NORTH 264 FEET OF THE EAST 330.00 FEET OF THAT PORTION OF THE WEST ONE-HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 28, IN TOWNSHIP 17 SOUTH, RANGE 2 EAST, SAN BERNARDINO BASE AND MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION 28, DISTANT THEREON 429.00 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 28, SAID POINT OF BEGINNING BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THAT CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND CONVEYED TO EDWARD L. HUGHES ET UX BY DEED DATED MARCH 16, 1937 AND RECORDED IN BOOK 842, PAGE 164 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS;

THENCE SOUTH ALONG SAID WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION, 891.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER;

THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID WEST ONE-HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER, 660.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER THEREOF;

THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID WEST ONE-HALF, 891.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE AFOREMENTIONED LAND CONVEYED TO HUGHES;

THENCE WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LAND, 660.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

PARCEL NO. 2:

AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS, EGRESS, PUBLIC UTILITIES AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES ALONG THE NORTH 16 ½ FEET OF THE WEST 330.00 FEET OF THAT PORTION OF THE WEST ONE-HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 28, IN TOWNSHIP 17 SOUTH, RANGE 2 EAST, SAN BERNARDINO BASE AND MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION 28, DISTANT THEREON 429.00 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 28, SAID POINT OF BEGINNING BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THAT CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND CONVEYED TO EDWARD L. HUGHES ET UX BY DEED DATED MARCH 16, 1937 AND RECORDED IN BOOK 842, PAGE 164 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS;

THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION, 891.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER;

THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID WEST ONE-HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER, 660.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER THEREOF;

THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID WEST ONE-HALF, 891.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE AFOREMENTIONED LAND CONVEYED TO HUGHES;

THENCE WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LAND, 660.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

EXHIBIT A
(Continued)

PARCEL NO. 3:

AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS, EGRESS AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES ALONG THAT PORTION OF SECTION 29, IN TOWNSHIP 17 SOUTH, RANGE 2 EAST, SAN BERNARDINO BASE AND MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, INCLUDED WITHIN THE LINES OF A STRIP OF LAND 10.00 FEET IN WIDTH, THE CENTER LINE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT 5.00 FEET WEST OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THAT CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND DESCRIBED AS PARCEL 2 ABOVE;

THENCE FROM SAID POINT OF BEGINNING NORTH TO AN INTERSECTION WITH THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF ROAD SURVEY NO. 974:

THE MAP OF SAID ROAD SURVEY BEING ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY SURVEYOR OF SAID SAN DIEGO COUNTY.

PARCEL NO. 4:

THE SOUTH 264.00 FEET OF THE NORTH 528.00 FEET OF THE EAST 330 FEET OF THAT PORTION OF THE WEST ONE-HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 28, IN TOWNSHIP 17 SOUTH, RANGE 2 EAST, SAN BERNARDINO BASE AND MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION 28, DISTANT THEREON 429.00 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 28, SAID POINT OF BEGINNING BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THAT CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND CONVEYED TO EDWARD L. HUGHES ET UX BY DEED DATED MARCH 16, 1937 AND RECORDED IN BOOK 842, PAGE 164 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS;

THENCE SOUTH ALONG SAID WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION, 891.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER;

THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID WEST ONE-HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER, 660.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER THEREOF;

THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID WEST ONE-HALF, 891.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE AFOREMENTIONED LAND CONVEYED TO HUGHES;

THENCE WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LAND, 660.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

PARCEL NO. 5:

AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS AND EGRESS, PUBLIC UTILITIES AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES ALONG THE EAST 16 ½ FEET OF THE NORTH 264.00 FEET OF THE WEST 330 FEET, AND A FURTHER EASEMENT FOR INGRESS AND EGRESS, PUBLIC UTILITIES AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES ALONG THE NORTH 16 ½ FEET OF THE WEST 330 FEET OF THAT PORTION OF THE WEST ONE-HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 28, IN TOWNSHIP 17 SOUTH, RANGE 2 EAST, SAN BERNARDINO BASE AND MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION 28, DISTANT THEREON 429.00 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 28, SAID POINT OF BEGINNING BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF

EXHIBIT A
(Continued)

THAT CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND CONVEYED TO EDWARD L. HUGHES ET UX BY DEED DATED MARCH 16, 1937 AND RECORDED IN BOOK 842, PAGE 164 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS;

THENCE SOUTH ALONG SAID WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION, 891.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER;

THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID WEST ONE-HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER, 660.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER THEREOF;

THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID WEST ONE-HALF, 891.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE AFOREMENTIONED LAND CONVEYED TO HUGHES;

THENCE WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LAND, 660.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

PARCEL NO. 6:

AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS, EGRESS AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES ALONG THAT PORTION OF SECTION 29, IN TOWNSHIP 17 SOUTH, RANGE 2 EAST, SAN BERNARDINO BASE AND MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, INCLUDED WITHIN THE LINES OF A STRIP OF LAND 10.00 FEET IN WIDTH, THE CENTER LINE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT 5.00 FEET WEST OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THAT CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND DESCRIBED AS PARCEL 5 ABOVE;

THENCE FROM SAID POINT OF BEGINNING NORTH TO A POINT 5.00 FEET WEST OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 29;

THENCE NORTHWESTERLY IN A DIRECT LINE A DISTANCE OF 200.00 FEET TO A POINT ON COUNTY ROAD SURVEY NO. 974, SAID POINT BEING DESIGNATED “R. P. P. I. 21°” ON THE MAP OF SAID ROAD SURVEY ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY SURVEYOR OF SAID SAN DIEGO COUNTY.

APN: **600-101-05-00**, **600-101-04-00**

EXCEPTIONS

AT THE DATE HEREOF, ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED AND EXCEPTIONS TO COVERAGE IN ADDITION TO THE PRINTED EXCEPTIONS AND EXCLUSIONS IN SAID POLICY FORM WOULD BE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Property taxes, which are a lien not yet due and payable, including any assessments collected with taxes to be levied for the fiscal year 2022.

2. The lien of supplemental or escaped assessments of property taxes, if any, made pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 75) or Part 2, Chapter 3, Articles 3 and 4, respectively, of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California as a result of the transfer of title to the vestee named in Schedule A or as a result of changes in ownership or new construction occurring prior to Date of Policy.

3. Any liens or other assessments, bonds, or special district liens including without limitation, Community Facility Districts, that arise by reason of any local, City, Municipal or County Project or Special District.

4. Water rights, claims or title to water, whether or not disclosed by the public records.

5. Easement(s) or right(s) of way for the purpose(s) shown below and rights incidental thereto, as granted and/or reserved in various deeds of record:

Purpose:	Ingress and egress, pipelines, drainage and/or public utilities and incidental purposes thereto over, under, along and across the easement parcel(s) herein described
Affects:	Parcels 2, 3, 5 and 6

6. Easement(s) in favor of the public over any existing roads lying within said Land.

7. Easement(s) for the purpose(s) shown below and rights incidental thereto, as granted in a document:

Granted to:	San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Purpose:	poles, wires
Recording Date:	March 19, 1947
Recording No:	30122, Book 2371 Page 50, Of Official Records
Affects:	said land more particularly described therein

8. Please be advised that our search did not disclose any open Deeds of Trust of record. If you should have knowledge of any outstanding obligation, please contact the Title Department immediately for further review prior to closing.

9. Any rights of the parties in possession of a portion of, or all of, said Land, which rights are not disclosed by the public records.

   The Company will require, for review, a full and complete copy of any unrecorded agreement, contract, license and/or lease, together with all supplements, assignments and amendments thereto, before issuing any policy of title insurance without excepting this item from coverage.

   The Company reserves the right to except additional items and/or make additional requirements after reviewing said documents.

PLEASE REFER TO THE "INFORMATIONAL NOTES" AND "REQUIREMENTS" SECTIONS WHICH FOLLOW FOR INFORMATION NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THIS TRANSACTION.

END OF EXCEPTIONS

REQUIREMENTS SECTION

1. In order to complete this report, the Company requires a Statement of Information to be completed by the following party(s),

   Party(s): All Parties

   The Company reserves the right to add additional items or make further requirements after review of the requested Statement of Information.

   NOTE: The Statement of Information is necessary to complete the search and examination of title under this order. Any title search includes matters that are indexed by name only, and having a completed Statement of Information assists the Company in the elimination of certain matters which appear to involve the parties but in fact affect another party with the same or similar name. Be assured that the Statement of Information is essential and will be kept strictly confidential to this file.

END OF REQUIREMENTS

INFORMATIONAL NOTES SECTION

1. Note: There are NO conveyances affecting said Land recorded within 24 months of the date of this report.

2. Note: Property taxes, including any personal property taxes and any assessments collected with taxes, are paid. For proration purposes the amounts were:

Tax Identification No.:	600-101-05-00
Fiscal Year:	2021-2022
1st Installment:	$44.82
2nd Installment:	$44.82
Exemption:	0
Code Area:	79002

3. Note: Property taxes, including any personal property taxes and any assessments collected with taxes, are paid. For proration purposes the amounts were:

Tax Identification No.:	600101-04-00
Fiscal Year:	2021-2022
1st Installment:	$205.06
2nd Installment:	$205.06
Exemption:	0
Code Area:	79002

4. The Company and its policy issuing agents are required by Federal law to collect additional information about certain transactions in specified geographic areas in accordance with the Bank Secrecy Act. If this transaction is required to be reported under a Geographic Targeting Order issued by FinCEN, the Company or its policy issuing agent must be supplied with a completed ALTA Information Collection Form ("ICF") prior to closing the transaction contemplated herein.

   To protect the private information contained in the attached form and photo ID, please return via a secured method.

5. None of the items shown in this report will cause the Company to decline to attach CLTA Endorsement Form 100 to an Extended Coverage Loan Policy, when issued.

6. The Company is not aware of any matters which would cause it to decline to attach CLTA Endorsement Form 116 indicating that there is located on said Land Single Family Residential properties, known as Vacant Land, located within the city of Jamul, California, 91935, to an Extended Coverage Loan Policy.

7. Note: Please contact your Title Officer to obtain the current recording fees. Fidelity National Title Company will pay Fidelity National Title Insurance Company 12% of the title premium, as disclosed on lines 1107 and 1108 of the HUD-1.

8. Note: The policy of title insurance will include an arbitration provision. The Company or the insured may demand arbitration. Arbitrable matters may include, but are not limited to, any controversy or claim between the Company and the insured arising out of or relating to this policy, any service of the Company in connection with its issuance or the breach of a policy provision or other obligation. Please ask your escrow or title officer for a sample copy of the policy to be issued if you wish to review the arbitration provisions and any other provisions pertaining to your Title Insurance coverage.

9. Notice: Please be aware that due to the conflict between federal and state laws concerning the cultivation, distribution, manufacture or sale of marijuana, the Company is not able to close or insure any transaction involving Land that is associated with these activities.

10. Pursuant to Government Code Section 27388.1, as amended and effective as of 1-1-2018, a Documentary Transfer Tax (DTT) Affidavit may be required to be completed and submitted with each

INFORMATIONAL NOTES
(Continued)

document when DTT is being paid or when an exemption is being claimed from paying the tax. If a governmental agency is a party to the document, the form will not be required. DTT Affidavits may be available at a Tax Assessor-County Clerk-Recorder.

END OF INFORMATIONAL NOTES

Lori Duhart (BS/IE)/ct

Wire Fraud Alert

This Notice is not intended to provide legal or professional advice. If you have any questions, please consult with a lawyer.

All parties to a real estate transaction are targets for wire fraud and many have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars because they simply relied on the wire instructions received via email, without further verification. **If funds are to be wired in conjunction with this real estate transaction, we strongly recommend verbal verification of wire instructions through a known, trusted phone number prior to sending funds.**

In addition, the following non-exclusive self-protection strategies are recommended to minimize exposure to possible wire fraud.

- **NEVER RELY** on emails purporting to change wire instructions. Parties to a transaction rarely change wire instructions in the course of a transaction.
- **ALWAYS VERIFY** wire instructions, specifically the ABA routing number and account number, by calling the party who sent the instructions to you. DO NOT use the phone number provided in the email containing the instructions, use phone numbers you have called before or can otherwise verify. **Obtain the phone number of relevant parties to the transaction as soon as an escrow account is opened**. DO NOT send an email to verify as the email address may be incorrect or the email may be intercepted by the fraudster.
- **USE COMPLEX EMAIL PASSWORDS** that employ a combination of mixed case, numbers, and symbols. Make your passwords greater than eight (8) characters. Also, change your password often and do NOT reuse the same password for other online accounts.
- **USE MULTI-FACTOR AUTHENTICATION** for email accounts. Your email provider or IT staff may have specific instructions on how to implement this feature.

For more information on wire-fraud scams or to report an incident, please refer to the following links:

Federal Bureau of Investigation:
http://www.fbi.gov

Internet Crime Complaint Center:
http://www.ic3.gov

TM and © Fidelity National Financial, Inc. and/or an affiliate. All rights reserved

Fidelity National Title
BUILDER SERVICES

4210 Riverwalk Parkway, Suite 100
Riverside, CA 92505
Phone: (951) 710-5900
Fax: (951) 710-5955

Notice of Available Discounts

Pursuant to Section 2355.3 in Title 10 of the California Code of Regulations Fidelity National Financial, Inc. and its subsidiaries ("FNF") must deliver a notice of each discount available under our current rate filing along with the delivery of escrow instructions, a preliminary report or commitment. Please be aware that the provision of this notice does not constitute a waiver of the consumer's right to be charged the filed rate. As such, your transaction may not qualify for the below discounts.

You are encouraged to discuss the applicability of one or more of the below discounts with a Company representative. These discounts are generally described below; consult the rate manual for a full description of the terms, conditions and requirements for such discount. These discounts only apply to transactions involving services rendered by the FNF Family of Companies. This notice only applies to transactions involving property improved with a one-to-four family residential dwelling.

Not all discounts are offered by every FNF Company. The discount will only be applicable to the FNF Company as indicated by the named discount.

FNF Underwritten Title Company	**Underwritten by FNF Underwriters**
CTC – Chicago Title company	CTIC – Chicago Title Insurance Company
CLTC – Commonwealth Land Title Company	CLTIC - Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Company
FNTC – Fidelity National Title Company of California	FNTIC – Fidelity National Title Insurance Company
FNTCCA - Fidelity National Title Company of California	FNTIC - Fidelity National Title Insurance Company
TICOR – Ticor Title Company of California	CTIC – Chicago Title Insurance Company
LTC – Lawyer's Title Company	CLTIC – Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Company
SLTC – ServiceLink Title Company	CTIC – Chicago Title Insurance Company

Available Discounts

DISASTER LOANS (CTIC, CLTIC, FNTIC)
The charge for a Lender's Policy (Standard or Extended coverage) covering the financing or refinancing by an owner of record, within twenty-four (24) months of the date of a declaration of a disaster area by the government of the United States or the State of California on any land located in said area, which was partially or totally destroyed in the disaster, will be fifty percent (50%) of the appropriate title insurance rate.

CHURCHES OR CHARITABLE NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS (CTIC, FNTIC)
On properties used as a church or for charitable purposes within the scope of the normal activities of such entities, provided said charge is normally the church's obligation the charge for an owner's policy shall be fifty percent (50%) to seventy percent (70%) of the appropriate title insurance rate, depending on the type of coverage selected. The charge for a lender's policy shall be forty (40%) to fifty percent (50%) of the appropriate title insurance rate, depending on the type of coverage selected.

FIDELITY NATIONAL FINANCIAL, INC.
PRIVACY NOTICE

Effective August 1, 2021

Fidelity National Financial, Inc. and its majority-owned subsidiary companies (collectively, "FNF," "our," or "we") respect and are committed to protecting your privacy. This Privacy Notice explains how we collect, use, and protect personal information, when and to whom we disclose such information, and the choices you have about the use and disclosure of that information.

A limited number of FNF subsidiaries have their own privacy notices. If a subsidiary has its own privacy notice, the privacy notice will be available on the subsidiary's website and this Privacy Notice does not apply.

Collection of Personal Information

FNF may collect the following categories of Personal Information:

- contact information (*e.g.*, name, address, phone number, email address);
- demographic information (*e.g.*, date of birth, gender, marital status);
- identity information (*e.g.* Social Security Number, driver's license, passport, or other government ID number);
- financial account information (*e.g.* loan or bank account information); and
- other personal information necessary to provide products or services to you.

We may collect Personal Information about you from:

- information we receive from you or your agent;
- information about your transactions with FNF, our affiliates, or others; and
- information we receive from consumer reporting agencies and/or governmental entities, either directly from these entities or through others.

Collection of Browsing Information

FNF automatically collects the following types of Browsing Information when you access an FNF website, online service, or application (each an "FNF Website") from your Internet browser, computer, and/or device:

- Internet Protocol (IP) address and operating system;
- browser version, language, and type;
- domain name system requests; and
- browsing history on the FNF Website, such as date and time of your visit to the FNF Website and visits to the pages within the FNF Website.

Like most websites, our servers automatically log each visitor to the FNF Website and may collect the Browsing Information described above. We use Browsing Information for system administration, troubleshooting, fraud investigation, and to improve our websites. Browsing Information generally does not reveal anything personal about you, though if you have created a user account for an FNF Website and are logged into that account, the FNF Website may be able to link certain browsing activity to your user account.

Other Online Specifics

Cookies. When you visit an FNF Website, a "cookie" may be sent to your computer. A cookie is a small piece of data that is sent to your Internet browser from a web server and stored on your computer's hard drive. Information gathered using cookies helps us improve your user experience. For example, a cookie can help the website load properly or can customize the display page based on your browser type and user preferences. You can choose whether or not to accept cookies by changing your Internet browser settings. Be aware that doing so may impair or limit some functionality of the FNF Website.

Web Beacons. We use web beacons to determine when and how many times a page has been viewed. This information is used to improve our websites.

Do Not Track. Currently our FNF Websites do not respond to "Do Not Track" features enabled through your browser.

Links to Other Sites. FNF Websites may contain links to unaffiliated third-party websites. FNF is not responsible for the privacy practices or content of those websites. We recommend that you read the privacy policy of every website you visit.

Use of Personal Information

FNF uses Personal Information for three main purposes:

- To provide products and services to you or in connection with a transaction involving you.
- To improve our products and services.
- To communicate with you about our, our affiliates', and others' products and services, jointly or independently.

When Information Is Disclosed

We may disclose your Personal Information and Browsing Information in the following circumstances:

- to enable us to detect or prevent criminal activity, fraud, material misrepresentation, or nondisclosure;
- to nonaffiliated service providers who provide or perform services or functions on our behalf and who agree to use the information only to provide such services or functions;

Copyright © 2021. Fidelity National Financial, Inc. All Rights Reserved

- to nonaffiliated third party service providers with whom we perform joint marketing, pursuant to an agreement with them to jointly market financial products or services to you;
- to law enforcement or authorities in connection with an investigation, or in response to a subpoena or court order; or
- in the good-faith belief that such disclosure is necessary to comply with legal process or applicable laws, or to protect the rights, property, or safety of FNF, its customers, or the public.

The law does not require your prior authorization and does not allow you to restrict the disclosures described above. Additionally, we may disclose your information to third parties for whom you have given us authorization or consent to make such disclosure. We do not otherwise share your Personal Information or Browsing Information with nonaffiliated third parties, except as required or permitted by law. We may share your Personal Information with affiliates (other companies owned by FNF) to directly market to you. Please see "Choices with Your Information" to learn how to restrict that sharing.

We reserve the right to transfer your Personal Information, Browsing Information, and any other information, in connection with the sale or other disposition of all or part of the FNF business and/or assets, or in the event of bankruptcy, reorganization, insolvency, receivership, or an assignment for the benefit of creditors. By submitting Personal Information and/or Browsing Information to FNF, you expressly agree and consent to the use and/or transfer of the foregoing information in connection with any of the above described proceedings.

Security of Your Information
We maintain physical, electronic, and procedural safeguards to protect your Personal Information.

Choices With Your Information
If you do not want FNF to share your information among our affiliates to directly market to you, you may send an "opt out" request as directed at the end of this Privacy Notice. We do not share your Personal Information with nonaffiliates for their use to direct market to you without your consent.

Whether you submit Personal Information or Browsing Information to FNF is entirely up to you. If you decide not to submit Personal Information or Browsing Information, FNF may not be able to provide certain services or products to you.

For California Residents: We will not share your Personal Information or Browsing Information with nonaffiliated third parties, except as permitted by California law. For additional information about your California privacy rights, please visit the "California Privacy" link on our website (https://fnf.com/pages/californiaprivacy.aspx) or call (888) 413-1748.

For Nevada Residents: You may be placed on our internal Do Not Call List by calling (888) 714-2710 or by contacting us via the information set forth at the end of this Privacy Notice. Nevada law requires that we also provide you with the following contact information: Bureau of Consumer Protection, Office of the Nevada Attorney General, 555 E. Washington St., Suite 3900, Las Vegas, NV 89101; Phone number: (702) 486-3132; email: BCPINFO@ag.state.nv.us.
For Oregon Residents: We will not share your Personal Information or Browsing Information with nonaffiliated third parties for marketing purposes, except after you have been informed by us of such sharing and had an opportunity to indicate that you do not want a disclosure made for marketing purposes.

For Vermont Residents: We will not disclose information about your creditworthiness to our affiliates and will not disclose your personal information, financial information, credit report, or health information to nonaffiliated third parties to market to you, other than as permitted by Vermont law, unless you authorize us to make those disclosures.

Information From Children
The FNF Websites are not intended or designed to attract persons under the age of eighteen (18).We do not collect Personal Information from any person that we know to be under the age of thirteen (13) without permission from a parent or guardian.

International Users
FNF's headquarters is located within the United States. If you reside outside the United States and choose to provide Personal Information or Browsing Information to us, please note that we may transfer that information outside of your country of residence. By providing FNF with your Personal Information and/or Browsing Information, you consent to our collection, transfer, and use of such information in accordance with this Privacy Notice.

FNF Website Services for Mortgage Loans
Certain FNF companies provide services to mortgage loan servicers, including hosting websites that collect customer information on behalf of mortgage loan servicers (the "Service Websites"). The Service Websites may contain links to both this Privacy Notice and the mortgage loan servicer or lender's privacy notice. The sections of this Privacy Notice titled When Information is Disclosed, Choices with Your Information, and Accessing and Correcting Information do not apply to the Service Websites. The mortgage loan servicer or lender's privacy notice governs use, disclosure, and access to your Personal Information. FNF does not share Personal Information collected through the Service Websites, except as required or authorized by contract with the mortgage loan servicer or lender, or as required by law or in the good-faith belief that such disclosure is necessary: to comply with a legal process or applicable law, to enforce this Privacy Notice, or to protect the rights, property, or safety of FNF or the public.

Copyright © 2021. Fidelity National Financial, Inc. All Rights Reserved

Your Consent To This Privacy Notice; Notice Changes

By submitting Personal Information and/or Browsing Information to FNF, you consent to the collection and use of the information in accordance with this Privacy Notice. We may change this Privacy Notice at any time. The Privacy Notice's effective date will show the last date changes were made. If you provide information to us following any change of the Privacy Notice, that signifies your assent to and acceptance of the changes to the Privacy Notice.

Accessing and Correcting Information; Contact Us

If you have questions, would like to correct your Personal Information, or want to opt-out of information sharing for affiliate marketing, visit FNF's Opt Out Page or contact us by phone at (888) 714-2710 or by mail to:

Fidelity National Financial, Inc.
601 Riverside Avenue,
Jacksonville, Florida 32204
Attn: Chief Privacy Officer

Copyright © 2021. Fidelity National Financial, Inc. All Rights Reserved

ATTACHMENT ONE (Revised 05-06-16)

CALIFORNIA LAND TITLE ASSOCIATION
STANDARD COVERAGE POLICY – 1990

EXCLUSIONS FROM COVERAGE

The following matters are expressly excluded from the coverage of this policy and the Company will not pay loss or damage, costs, attorneys' fees or expenses which arise by reason of:

1. (a) Any law, ordinance or governmental regulation (including but not limited to building or zoning laws, ordinances, or regulations) restricting, regulating, prohibiting or relating (i) the occupancy, use, or enjoyment of the land; (ii) the character, dimensions or location of any improvement now or hereafter erected on the land; (iii) a separation in ownership or a change in the dimensions or area of the land or any parcel of which the land is or was a part; or (iv) environmental protection, or the effect of any violation of these laws, ordinances or governmental regulations, except to the extent that a notice of the enforcement thereof or a notice of a defect, lien, or encumbrance resulting from a violation or alleged violation affecting the land has been recorded in the public records at Date of Policy.
   (b) Any governmental police power not excluded by (a) above, except to the extent that a notice of the exercise thereof or notice of a defect, lien or encumbrance resulting from a violation or alleged violation affecting the land has been recorded in the public records at Date of Policy.
2. Rights of eminent domain unless notice of the exercise thereof has been recorded in the public records at Date of Policy, but not excluding from coverage any taking which has occurred prior to Date of Policy which would be binding on the rights of a purchaser for value without knowledge.
3. Defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims or other matters:
   (a) whether or not recorded in the public records at Date of Policy, but created, suffered, assumed or agreed to by the insured claimant;
   (b) not known to the Company, not recorded in the public records at Date of Policy, but known to the insured claimant and not disclosed in writing to the Company by the insured claimant prior to the date the insured claimant became an insured under this policy;
   (c) resulting in no loss or damage to the insured claimant;
   (d) attaching or created subsequent to Date of Policy; or
   (e) resulting in loss or damage which would not have been sustained if the insured claimant had paid value for the insured mortgage or for the estate or interest insured by this policy.
4. Unenforceability of the lien of the insured mortgage because of the inability or failure of the insured at Date of Policy, or the inability or failure of any subsequent owner of the indebtedness, to comply with the applicable doing business laws of the state in which the land is situated.
5. Invalidity or unenforceability of the lien of the insured mortgage, or claim thereof, which arises out of the transaction evidenced by the insured mortgage and is based upon usury or any consumer credit protection or truth in lending law.
6. Any claim, which arises out of the transaction vesting in the insured the estate of interest insured by this policy or the transaction creating the interest of the insured lender, by reason of the operation of federal bankruptcy, state insolvency or similar creditors' rights laws.

EXCEPTIONS FROM COVERAGE - SCHEDULE B, PART I

This policy does not insure against loss or damage (and the Company will not pay costs, attorneys' fees or expenses) which arise by reason of:

1. Taxes or assessments which are not shown as existing liens by the records of any taxing authority that levies taxes or assessments on real property or by the public records.
   Proceedings by a public agency which may result in taxes or assessments, or notices of such proceedings, whether or not shown by the records of such agency or by the public records.
2. Any facts, rights, interests, or claims which are not shown by the public records but which could be ascertained by an inspection of the land or which may be asserted by persons in possession thereof.
3. Easements, liens or encumbrances, or claims thereof, not shown by the public records.
4. Discrepancies, conflicts in boundary lines, shortage in area, encroachments, or any other facts which a correct survey would disclose, and which are not shown by the public records.
5. (a) Unpatented mining claims; (b) reservations or exceptions in patents or in Acts authorizing the issuance thereof; (c) water rights, claims or title to water, whether or not the matters excepted under (a), (b) or (c) are shown by the public records.
6. Any lien or right to a lien for services, labor or material not shown by the public records.

CLTA HOMEOWNER'S POLICY OF TITLE INSURANCE (12-02-13)
ALTA HOMEOWNER'S POLICY OF TITLE INSURANCE

EXCLUSIONS

In addition to the Exceptions in Schedule B, You are not insured against loss, costs, attorneys' fees, and expenses resulting from:

1. Governmental police power, and the existence or violation of those portions of any law or government regulation concerning:
   a. building;
   b. zoning;
   c. land use;
   d. improvements on the Land;
   e. land division; and
   f. environmental protection.
   This Exclusion does not limit the coverage described in Covered Risk 8.a., 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23 or 27.
2. The failure of Your existing structures, or any part of them, to be constructed in accordance with applicable building codes. This Exclusion does not limit the coverage described in Covered Risk 14 or 15.
3. The right to take the Land by condemning it. This Exclusion does not limit the coverage described in Covered Risk 17.
4. Risks:
   a. that are created, allowed, or agreed to by You, whether or not they are recorded in the Public Records;
   b. that are Known to You at the Policy Date, but not to Us, unless they are recorded in the Public Records at the Policy Date;

© California Land Title Association. All rights reserved.
The use of this Form is restricted to CLTA subscribers in good standing as of the date of use. All other uses are prohibited. Reprinted under license or express permission from the California Land Title Association.

c. that result in no loss to You; or
d. that first occur after the Policy Date - this does not limit the coverage described in Covered Risk 7, 8.e., 25, 26, 27 or 28.

5. Failure to pay value for Your Title.
6. Lack of a right:
   a. to any land outside the area specifically described and referred to in paragraph 3 of Schedule A; and
   b. in streets, alleys, or waterways that touch the Land.
   This Exclusion does not limit the coverage described in Covered Risk 11 or 21.
7. The transfer of the Title to You is invalid as a preferential transfer or as a fraudulent transfer or conveyance under federal bankruptcy, state insolvency, or similar creditors' rights laws.
8. Contamination, explosion, fire, flooding, vibration, fracturing, earthquake, or subsidence.
9. Negligence by a person or an Entity exercising a right to extract or develop minerals, water, or any other substances.

LIMITATIONS ON COVERED RISKS

Your insurance for the following Covered Risks is limited on the Owner's Coverage Statement as follows:

- For Covered Risk 16, 18, 19, and 21 Your Deductible Amount and Our Maximum Dollar Limit of Liability shown in Schedule A.

The deductible amounts and maximum dollar limits shown on Schedule A are as follows:

	Your Deductible Amount	Our Maximum Dollar Limit of Liability
Covered Risk 16:	1.00% of Policy Amount Shown in Schedule A or $2,500.00 (whichever is less)	$ 10,000.00
Covered Risk 18:	1.00% of Policy Amount Shown in Schedule A or $5,000.00 (whichever is less)	$ 25,000.00
Covered Risk 19:	1.00% of Policy Amount Shown in Schedule A or $5,000.00 (whichever is less)	$ 25,000.00
Covered Risk 21:	1.00% of Policy Amount Shown in Schedule A or $2,500.00 (whichever is less)	$ 5,000.00

2006 ALTA LOAN POLICY (06-17-06)

EXCLUSIONS FROM COVERAGE

The following matters are expressly excluded from the coverage of this policy, and the Company will not pay loss or damage, costs, attorneys' fees, or expenses that arise by reason of:

1. (a) Any law, ordinance, permit, or governmental regulation (including those relating to building and zoning) restricting, regulating, prohibiting, or relating to
   (i) the occupancy, use, or enjoyment of the Land;
   (ii) the character, dimensions, or location of any improvement erected on the Land;
   (iii) the subdivision of land; or
   (iv) environmental protection;
   or the effect of any violation of these laws, ordinances, or governmental regulations. This Exclusion 1(a) does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 5.
   (b) Any governmental police power. This Exclusion 1(b) does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 6.
2. Rights of eminent domain. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 7 or 8.
3. Defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters
   (a) created, suffered, assumed, or agreed to by the Insured Claimant;
   (b) not Known to the Company, not recorded in the Public Records at Date of Policy, but Known to the Insured Claimant and not disclosed in writing to the Company by the Insured Claimant prior to the date the Insured Claimant became an Insured under this policy;
   (c) resulting in no loss or damage to the Insured Claimant;
   (d) attaching or created subsequent to Date of Policy (however, this does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 11, 13 or 14); or
   (e) resulting in loss or damage that would not have been sustained if the Insured Claimant had paid value for the Insured Mortgage.
4. Unenforceability of the lien of the Insured Mortgage because of the inability or failure of an Insured to comply with applicable doing-business laws of the state where the Land is situated.
5. Invalidity or unenforceability in whole or in part of the lien of the Insured Mortgage that arises out of the transaction evidenced by the Insured Mortgage and is based upon usury or any consumer credit protection or truth-in-lending law.
6. Any claim, by reason of the operation of federal bankruptcy, state insolvency, or similar creditors' rights laws, that the transaction creating the lien of the Insured Mortgage, is
   (a) a fraudulent conveyance or fraudulent transfer, or
   (b) a preferential transfer for any reason not stated in Covered Risk 13(b) of this policy.
7. Any lien on the Title for real estate taxes or assessments imposed by governmental authority and created or attaching between Date of Policy and the date of recording of the Insured Mortgage in the Public Records. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 11(b).

The above policy form may be issued to afford either Standard Coverage or Extended Coverage. In addition to the above Exclusions from Coverage, the Exceptions from Coverage in a Standard Coverage policy will also include the following Exceptions from Coverage:

EXCEPTIONS FROM COVERAGE

{Except as provided in Schedule B - Part II,{ t{or T}his policy does not insure against loss or damage, and the Company will not pay costs, attorneys' fees or expenses, that arise by reason of:

© California Land Title Association. All rights reserved.
The use of this Form is restricted to CLTA subscribers in good standing as of the date of use. All other uses are prohibited. Reprinted under license or express permission from the California Land Title Association.

{PART I

{The above policy form may be issued to afford either Standard Coverage or Extended Coverage. In addition to the above Exclusions from Coverage, the Exceptions from Coverage in a Standard Coverage policy will also include the following Exceptions from Coverage:

1. (a) Taxes or assessments that are not shown as existing liens by the records of any taxing authority that levies taxes or assessments on real property or by the Public Records; (b) proceedings by a public agency that may result in taxes or assessments, or notices of such proceedings, whether or not shown by the records of such agency or by the Public Records.
2. Any facts, rights, interests, or claims that are not shown by the Public Records but that could be ascertained by an inspection of the Land or that may be asserted by persons in possession of the Land.
3. Easements, liens or encumbrances, or claims thereof, not shown by the Public Records.
4. Any encroachment, encumbrance, violation, variation, or adverse circumstance affecting the Title that would be disclosed by an accurate and complete land survey of the Land and not shown by the Public Records.
5. (a) Unpatented mining claims; (b) reservations or exceptions in patents or in Acts authorizing the issuance thereof; (c) water rights, claims or title to water, whether or not the matters excepted under (a), (b), or (c) are shown by the Public Records.
6. Any lien or right to a lien for services, labor or material not shown by the Public Records.}

PART II

In addition to the matters set forth in Part I of this Schedule, the Title is subject to the following matters, and the Company insures against loss or damage sustained in the event that they are not subordinate to the lien of the Insured Mortgage:}

2006 ALTA OWNER'S POLICY (06-17-06)

EXCLUSIONS FROM COVERAGE

The following matters are expressly excluded from the coverage of this policy, and the Company will not pay loss or damage, costs, attorneys' fees, or expenses that arise by reason of:

1. (a) Any law, ordinance, permit, or governmental regulation (including those relating to building and zoning) restricting, regulating, prohibiting, or relating to
   (i) the occupancy, use, or enjoyment of the Land;
   (ii) the character, dimensions, or location of any improvement erected on the Land;
   (iii) the subdivision of land; or
   (iv) environmental protection;
   or the effect of any violation of these laws, ordinances, or governmental regulations. This Exclusion 1(a) does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 5.
   (b) Any governmental police power. This Exclusion 1(b) does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 6.
2. Rights of eminent domain. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 7 or 8.
3. Defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters
   (a) created, suffered, assumed, or agreed to by the Insured Claimant;
   (b) not Known to the Company, not recorded in the Public Records at Date of Policy, but Known to the Insured Claimant and not disclosed in writing to the Company by the Insured Claimant prior to the date the Insured Claimant became an Insured under this policy;
   (c) resulting in no loss or damage to the Insured Claimant;
   (d) attaching or created subsequent to Date of Policy (however, this does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 9 and 10); or
   (e) resulting in loss or damage that would not have been sustained if the Insured Claimant had paid value for the Title.
4. Any claim, by reason of the operation of federal bankruptcy, state insolvency, or similar creditors' rights laws, that the transaction vesting the Title as shown in Schedule A, is
   (a) a fraudulent conveyance or fraudulent transfer; or
   (b) a preferential transfer for any reason not stated in Covered Risk 9 of this policy.
5. Any lien on the Title for real estate taxes or assessments imposed by governmental authority and created or attaching between Date of Policy and the date of recording of the deed or other instrument of transfer in the Public Records that vests Title as shown in Schedule A.

The above policy form may be issued to afford either Standard Coverage or Extended Coverage. In addition to the above Exclusions from Coverage, the Exceptions from Coverage in a Standard Coverage policy will also include the following Exceptions from Coverage:

EXCEPTIONS FROM COVERAGE

This policy does not insure against loss or damage, and the Company will not pay costs, attorneys' fees or expenses, that arise by reason of:
{The above policy form may be issued to afford either Standard Coverage or Extended Coverage. In addition to the above Exclusions from Coverage, the Exceptions from Coverage in a Standard Coverage policy will also include the following Exceptions from Coverage:

1. (a) Taxes or assessments that are not shown as existing liens by the records of any taxing authority that levies taxes or assessments on real property or by the Public Records; (b) proceedings by a public agency that may result in taxes or assessments, or notices of such proceedings, whether or not shown by the records of such agency or by the Public Records.
2. Any facts, rights, interests, or claims that are not shown in the Public Records but that could be ascertained by an inspection of the Land or that may be asserted by persons in possession of the Land.
3. Easements, liens or encumbrances, or claims thereof, not shown by the Public Records.
4. Any encroachment, encumbrance, violation, variation, or adverse circumstance affecting the Title that would be disclosed by an accurate and complete land survey of the Land and that are not shown by the Public Records.
5. (a) Unpatented mining claims; (b) reservations or exceptions in patents or in Acts authorizing the issuance thereof; (c) water rights, claims or title to water, whether or not the matters excepted under (a), (b), or (c) are shown by the Public Records.
6. Any lien or right to a lien for services, labor or material not shown by the Public Records. }
7. {Variable exceptions such as taxes, easements, CC&R's, etc. shown here.}

© California Land Title Association. All rights reserved.
The use of this Form is restricted to CLTA subscribers in good standing as of the date of use. All other uses are prohibited. Reprinted under license or express permission from the California Land Title Association.


ALTA EXPANDED COVERAGE RESIDENTIAL LOAN POLICY – ASSESSMENTS PRIORITY (04-02-15)

EXCLUSIONS FROM COVERAGE

The following matters are expressly excluded from the coverage of this policy and the Company will not pay loss or damage, costs, attorneys' fees or expenses which arise by reason of:

1. (a) Any law, ordinance, permit, or governmental regulation (including those relating to building and zoning) restricting, regulating, prohibiting, or relating to
   (i) the occupancy, use, or enjoyment of the Land;
   (ii) the character, dimensions, or location of any improvement erected on the Land;
   (iii) the subdivision of land; or
   (iv) environmental protection;
   or the effect of any violation of these laws, ordinances, or governmental regulations. This Exclusion 1(a) does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 5, 6, 13(c), 13(d), 14 or 16.
   (b) Any governmental police power. This Exclusion 1(b) does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 5, 6, 13(c), 13(d), 14 or 16.
2. Rights of eminent domain. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 7 or 8.
3. Defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters
   (a) created, suffered, assumed, or agreed to by the Insured Claimant;
   (b) not Known to the Company, not recorded in the Public Records at Date of Policy, but Known to the Insured Claimant and not disclosed in writing to the Company by the Insured Claimant prior to the date the Insured Claimant became an Insured under this policy;
   (c) resulting in no loss or damage to the Insured Claimant;
   (d) attaching or created subsequent to Date of Policy (however, this does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27 or 28); or
   (e) resulting in loss or damage that would not have been sustained if the Insured Claimant had paid value for the Insured Mortgage.
4. Unenforceability of the lien of the Insured Mortgage because of the inability or failure of an Insured to comply with applicable doing-business laws of the state where the Land is situated.
5. Invalidity or unenforceability in whole or in part of the lien of the Insured Mortgage that arises out of the transaction evidenced by the Insured Mortgage and is based upon usury, or any consumer credit protection or truth-in-lending law. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided in Covered Risk 26.
6. Any claim of invalidity, unenforceability or lack of priority of the lien of the Insured Mortgage as to Advances or modifications made after the Insured has Knowledge that the vestee shown in Schedule A is no longer the owner of the estate or interest covered by this policy. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided in Covered Risk 11.
7. Any lien on the Title for real estate taxes or assessments imposed by governmental authority and created or attaching subsequent to Date of Policy. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided in Covered Risk 11(b) or 25.
8. The failure of the residential structure, or any portion of it, to have been constructed before, on or after Date of Policy in accordance with applicable building codes. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided in Covered Risk 5 or 6.
9. Any claim, by reason of the operation of federal bankruptcy, state insolvency, or similar creditors' rights laws, that the transaction creating the lien of the Insured Mortgage, is
   (a) a fraudulent conveyance or fraudulent transfer, or
   (b) a preferential transfer for any reason not stated in Covered Risk 27(b) of this policy.
10. Contamination, explosion, fire, flooding, vibration, fracturing, earthquake, or subsidence.
11. Negligence by a person or an Entity exercising a right to extract or develop minerals, water, or any other substances.

© California Land Title Association. All rights reserved.
The use of this Form is restricted to CLTA subscribers in good standing as of the date of use. All other uses are prohibited. Reprinted under license or express permission from the California Land Title Association.



This map/plat is being furnished as an aid in locating the herein described Land in relation to adjoining streets, natural boundaries and other land, and is not a survey of the land depicted. Except to the extent a policy of title insurance is expressly modified by endorsement, if any, the Company does not insure dimensions, distances, location of easements, acreage or other matters shown thereon.

OWNER'S DECLARATION

Escrow No.: 30081580-989-989-LD1
Property Address: Vacant Land
Jamul, CA 91935

The undersigned hereby declares as follows:

1. (Fill in the applicable paragraph and strike the other)
   a. Declarant ("Owner") is the owner or lessee, as the case may be, of certain premises located at Vacant Land, Jamul, CA 91935, further described as follows: See Preliminary Report/Commitment No. for full legal description (the "Land").
   b. Declarant is the _____ of _____ ("Owner"), which is the owner or lessee, as the case may be, of certain premises located at Vacant Land, Jamul, CA 91935, further described as follows: See Preliminary Report/Commitment No. for full legal description (the "Land").
2. (Fill in the applicable paragraph and strike the other)
   a. During the period of six months immediately preceding the date of this declaration no work has been done, no surveys or architectural or engineering plans have been prepared, and no materials have been furnished in connection with the erection, equipment, repair, protection or removal of any building or other structure on the Land or in connection with the improvement of the Land in any manner whatsoever.
   b. During the period of six months immediately preceding the date of this declaration certain work has been done and materials furnished in connection with _____ upon the Land in the approximate total sum of $_____, but no work whatever remains to be done and no materials remain to be furnished to complete the construction in full compliance with the plans and specifications, nor are there any unpaid bills incurred for labor and materials used in making such improvements or repairs upon the Land, or for the services of architects, surveyors or engineers, except as follows: _____. Owner, by the undersigned Declarant, agrees to and does hereby indemnify and hold harmless Fidelity National Title Company against any and all claims arising therefrom.
3. Owner has not previously conveyed the Land; is not a debtor in bankruptcy (and if a partnership, the general partner thereof is not a debtor in bankruptcy); and has not received notice of any pending court action affecting the title to the Land.
4. Except as shown in the above-referenced Preliminary Report/Commitment, there are no unpaid or unsatisfied mortgages, deeds of trust, Uniform Commercial Code financing statements, regular assessments, special assessments, periodic assessments or any assessment from any source, claims of lien, special assessments, or taxes that constitute a lien against the Land or that affect the Land but have not been recorded in the public records. There are no violations of the covenants, conditions and restrictions as shown in the above-referenced Preliminary Report/Commitment.
5. The Land is currently in use as _____; _____ occupy/occupies the Land; and the following are all of the leases or other occupancy rights affecting the Land:

   _____
6. There are no other persons or entities that assert an ownership interest in the Land, nor are there unrecorded easements, claims of easement, or boundary disputes that affect the Land.
7. There are no outstanding options to purchase or rights of first refusal affecting the Land.
8. Between the most recent Effective Date of the above-referenced Preliminary Report/Commitment and the date of recording of the Insured Instrument(s), Owner has not taken or allowed, and will not take or allow, any action or inaction to encumber or otherwise affect title to the Land.

This declaration is made with the intention that Fidelity National Title Company (the "Company") and its policy issuing agents will rely upon it in issuing their title insurance policies and endorsements. Owner, by the undersigned Declarant, agrees to indemnify the Company against loss or damage (including attorneys fees, expenses, and costs) incurred by the Company as a result of any untrue statement made herein.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on _____ at _____.

Signature: _____

STATEMENT OF INFORMATION

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION STATEMENT TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH ORDER NO: 30081580-989-LD1

COMPLETION OF THIS FORM WILL EXPEDITE YOUR ORDER AND WILL HELP PROTECT YOU.

THE STREET ADDRESS of the property in this transaction is:
IF NONE LEAVE BLANK

ADDRESS: CITY:

IMPROVEMENTS: ☐ SINGLE RESIDENCE ☐ MULTIPLE RESIDENCE ☐ COMMERCIAL
OCCUPIED BY: ☐ OWNER ☐ LESSEE ☐ TENANTS
ANY PORTION OF NEW LOAN FUNDS TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION: ☐ YES ☐ NO

NAME			**SPOUSES NAME**		
FIRST	MIDDLE	LAST	FIRST	MIDDLE	LAST
BIRTHPLACE		BIRTH DATE	BIRTHPLACE		BIRTH DATE
I HAVE LIVED IN CALIFORNIA SINCE		SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER	I HAVE LIVED IN CALIFORNIA SINCE		SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER
DRIVER'S LICENSE NO.			DRIVER'S LICENSE NO.		
WIFE'S MAIDEN NAME:					
WE WERE MARRIED ON			AT		

RESIDENCE(S) FOR LAST 10 YEARS

NUMBER AND STREET	CITY	FROM	TO
NUMBER AND STREET	CITY	FROM	TO
NUMBER AND STREET	CITY	FROM	TO
NUMBER AND STREET	CITY	FROM	TO

OCCUPATION(S) FOR LAST 10 YEARS

HUSBAND

PRESENT OCCUPATION	FIRM NAME	ADDRESS	NO. OF YEARS
PRIOR OCCUPATION	FIRM NAME	ADDRESS	NO. OF YEARS
PRIOR OCCUPATION	FIRM NAME	ADDRESS	NO. OF YEARS

WIFE

PRESENT OCCUPATION	FIRM NAME	ADDRESS	NO. OF YEARS
PRIOR OCCUPATION	FIRM NAME	ADDRESS	NO. OF YEARS
PRIOR OCCUPATION	FIRM NAME	ADDRESS	NO. OF YEARS

FORMER MARRIAGES: IF NO FORMER MARRIAGES, WRITE "NONE":

NAME OF FORMER SPOUSE

IF DECEASED: DATE WHERE

CURRENT LOAN ON PROPERTY

PAYMENTS ARE BEING MADE TO: 2.

1. 3.

HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION NUMBER:

DATE SIGNATURE

HOME PHONE BUSINESS PHONE

ALTA Information Collection Form

Under 31 U.S.C. § 5326(a), the Treasury Department's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) issued a Geographic Targeting Order to title insurance companies requiring the collection of beneficial ownership information for certain real estate transactions.

Please complete the below questionnaire. This Company will rely on the answers provided to meet its reporting obligations.

Who is completing this form?

Name	Position/Title	Company/Law Firm	
Postal Address (Headquarters	City	State	Zip
Phone	Email	Fax	

Transactional Information

Property Address *(If Multiple properties see NOTE below):*				
City		State	Zip	County
Date of Settlement	Total purchase price *(if multiple properties see NOTE below)*			
Type of Transaction: ☐ Residential (1-4 family) ☐ Commercial			Bank Financing: ☐ Yes ☐ No	
Purchase type: ☐ Natural Person ☐ Corporation ☐ LLC ☐ Partnership ☐ Other				

NOTE: *If more than one property is purchased, list each address and purchase price as an addendum.*

Purchase Funds Information

Total Amount paid by below instruments: $	
Which type of Monetary Instruments were used (*Use check boxes below*)	
☐ U.S. Currency (Paper money & coin)	
☐ Foreign Currency	Country:
☐ Cashier's check(s)	☐ Money order(s)
☐ Certified check(s)	☐ Personal or Business check(s)
☐ Wire or other funds transfer(s)	☐ Virtual Currency

ALTA Information Collection Form

Individual Primarily Representing Purchaser

(Define as the individual authorized by the entity to enter into legally binding contracts).

Attach Legible copy of government issued identification (i.e., passport, driver's license, etc.)			
Type of ID	Issuing State or Country	Gov't ID Number	
Last Name	First Name		M.I.
Date of Birth	Occupation	Individual Taxpayer ID # (*if none write N/A*)	% of ownership
Address	City	State	Zip

Purchasing Entity Name & Address

Name of Purchaser			
Taxpayer ID Number or EIN (*If none write N/A*)	Doing Business Name (DBA) (*if none write N/A)*		
Address	City	State	Zip

Complete the information below if the real estate purchase is being made by a corporation, LLC, partnership, other legal entity. (Do not report trusts.)

For Corporations, LLCs, Partnerships and Other Entities provide the information for:

- Each **BENEFICIAL OWNER** defined as an individual who, directly or indirectly, owns 25% or more of the equity interests of the Purchaser.
- If a legal entity or a series of legal entities own the equity interests of the Purchaser, provide information for each **BENEFICIAL OWNER**, of each legal entity in the series of legal entities.

(Note: It is NOT necessary to complete the address fields if the information is on a legible copy of the government issued ID submitted to the title company.)

ALTA Information Collection Form

Attach Legible copy of government issued identification (i.e., passport, driver's license, etc.)			
Type of ID	Issuing State or Country	Gov't ID Number	
Last Name	First Name		M.I.
Date of Birth	Occupation	Individual Taxpayer ID # (*if none write N/A*)	% of ownership
Address	City	State	Zip

Attach Legible copy of government issued identification (i.e., passport, driver's license, etc.)			
Type of ID	Issuing State or Country	Gov't ID Number	
Last Name	First Name		M.I.
Date of Birth	Occupation	Individual Taxpayer ID # (*if none write N/A*)	% of ownership
Address	City	State	Zip

Attach Legible copy of government issued identification (i.e., passport, driver's license, etc.)			
Type of ID	Issuing State or Country	Gov't ID Number	
Last Name	First Name		M.I.
Date of Birth	Occupation	Individual Taxpayer ID # (*if none write N/A*)	% of ownership
Address	City	State	Zip

Attach Legible copy of government issued identification (i.e., passport, driver's license, etc.)			
Type of ID	Issuing State or Country	Gov't ID Number	
Last Name	First Name		M.I.
Date of Birth	Occupation	Individual Taxpayer ID # (*if none write N/A*)	% of ownership
Address	City	State	Zip

Attach Legible copy of government issued identification (i.e., passport, driver's license, etc.)

ALTA Information Collection Form

Type of ID	Issuing State or Country	Gov't ID Number	
Last Name	First Name		M.I.
Date of Birth	Occupation	Individual Taxpayer ID # (*if none write N/A*)	% of ownership
Address	City	State	Zip

I declare that to the best of my knowledge, the information I have furnished is true, correct and complete. I understand that this Title Company will rely on this information for the purposes of completing any reports made pursuant to an obligation under 31 U.S.C. § 5326(a),

Signature:	Date:
Type or Print Name:	Title:

APPENDIX B
REGULATORY DATABASE REPORT

DATABASE REPORT

Project Property:	*APNs 600-101-04-00 and -05-00* *APNs 600-101-04-00 and -05-00* *Jamul CA*
Project No:	
Report Type:	*Database Report*
Order No:	*22051900829*
Requested by:	*C Young Associates*
Date Completed:	*May 20, 2022*

Environmental Risk Information Services
A division of Glacier Media Inc.
1.866.517.5204 | info@erisinfo.com | erisinfo.com

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....2
Executive Summary.....3
Executive Summary: Report Summary.....4
Executive Summary: Site Report Summary - Project Property.....9
Executive Summary: Site Report Summary - Surrounding Properties.....10
Executive Summary: Summary by Data Source.....11
Map.....12
Aerial.....15
Topographic Map.....16
Detail Report.....17
Unplottable Summary.....19
Unplottable Report.....20
Appendix: Database Descriptions.....21
Definitions.....37

Notice: IMPORTANT LIMITATIONS and YOUR LIABILITY

Reliance on information in Report: This report DOES NOT replace a full Phase I Environmental Site Assessment but is solely intended to be used as database review of environmental records.

License for use of information in Report: No page of this report can be used without this cover page, this notice and the project property identifier. The information in Report(s) may not be modified or re-sold.

Your Liability for misuse: Using this Service and/or its reports in a manner contrary to this Notice or your agreement will be in breach of copyright and contract and ERIS may obtain damages for such mis-use, including damages caused to third parties, and gives ERIS the right to terminate your account, rescind your license to any previous reports and to bar you from future use of the Service.

No warranty of Accuracy or Liability for ERIS: The information contained in this report has been produced by ERIS Information Inc. ("ERIS") using various sources of information, including information provided by Federal and State government departments. The report applies only to the address and up to the date specified on the cover of this report, and any alterations or deviation from this description will require a new report. This report and the data contained herein does not purport to be and does not constitute a guarantee of the accuracy of the information contained herein and does not constitute a legal opinion nor medical advice. Although ERIS has endeavored to present you with information that is accurate, ERIS disclaims, any and all liability for any errors, omissions, or inaccuracies in such information and data, whether attributable to inadvertence, negligence or otherwise, and for any consequences arising therefrom. Liability on the part of ERIS is limited to the monetary value paid for this report.

Trademark and Copyright: You may not use the ERIS trademarks or attribute any work to ERIS other than as outlined above. This Service and Report (s) are protected by copyright owned by ERIS Information Inc. Copyright in data used in the Service or Report(s) (the "Data") is owned by ERIS or its licensors. The Service, Report(s) and Data may not be copied or reproduced in whole or in any substantial part without prior written consent of ERIS.

Executive Summary

Property Information:

Project Property:		*APNs 600-101-04-00 and -05-00* *APNs 600-101-04-00 and -05-00 Jamul CA*
Project No:		
Coordinates:		
	Latitude:	*32.66357606*
	Longitude:	*-116.78689483*
	UTM Northing:	*3,614,012.02*
	UTM Easting:	*519,982.62*
	UTM Zone:	*11S*
Elevation:		*1,424 FT*

Order Information:

Order No:	*22051900829*
Date Requested:	*May 19, 2022*
Requested by:	*C Young Associates*
Report Type:	*Database Report*

Historicals/Products:

ERIS Xplorer	*ERIS Xplorer*
Excel Add-On	*Excel Add-On*

Executive Summary: Report Summary

Database	Searched	Search Radius	Project Property	Within 0.12mi	0.125mi to 0.25mi	0.25mi to 0.50mi	0.50mi to 1.00mi	Total
Standard Environmental Records								
Federal								
DOE FUSRAP	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
NPL	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
PROPOSED NPL	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
DELETED NPL	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
SEMS	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
ODI	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
SEMS ARCHIVE	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
CERCLIS	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
IODI	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
CERCLIS NFRAP	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
CERCLIS LIENS	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
RCRA CORRACTS	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
RCRA TSD	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
RCRA LQG	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
RCRA SQG	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
RCRA VSQG	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
RCRA NON GEN	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
RCRA CONTROLS	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
FED ENG	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
FED INST	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
LUCIS	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
NPL IC	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
ERNS 1982 TO 1986	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
ERNS 1987 TO 1989	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
ERNS	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
FED BROWNFIELDS	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
FEMA UST	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0

Database	Searched	Search Radius	Project Property	Within 0.12mi	0.125mi to 0.25mi	0.25mi to 0.50mi	0.50mi to 1.00mi	Total
FRP	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
HIST GAS STATIONS	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
REFN	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
BULK TERMINAL	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
SEMS LIEN	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
SUPERFUND ROD	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
State								
RESPONSE	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENVIROSTOR	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
DELISTED ENVS	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWF/LF	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
SWRCB SWF	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
WMUD	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
HWP	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWAT	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
C&D DEBRIS RECY	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
RECYCLING	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
PROCESSORS	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
CONTAINER RECY	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
LDS	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
LUST	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
DELISTED LST	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
UST	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
UST CLOSURE	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
HHSS	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
UST SWEEPS	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
AST	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
AST SWRCB	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
TANK OIL GAS	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
DELISTED TNK	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
CERS TANK	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
DELISTED CTNK	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
HIST TANK	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
LUR	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0

Database	Searched	Search Radius	Project Property	Within 0.12mi	0.125mi to 0.25mi	0.25mi to 0.50mi	0.50mi to 1.00mi	Total
CALSITES	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
HLUR	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
DEED	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
VCP	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
CLEANUP SITES	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
DELISTED COUNTY	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
Tribal								
INDIAN LUST	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
INDIAN UST	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
DELISTED ILST	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
DELISTED IUST	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
County								
SWF SANDIEGO	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
LOP SANDIEGO	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
HAZ SANDIEGO	Y	0.25	0	**1**	0	-	-	**1**
UST SANDIEGO	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
SAM SANDIEGO	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
Additional Environmental Records								
Federal								
FINDS/FRS	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
TRIS	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
PFAS TRI	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
PFAS NPL	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
PFAS WATER	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
PFAS SSEHRI	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
ERNS PFAS	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
HMIRS	Y	0.125	0	0	-	-	-	0
NCDL	Y	0.125	0	0	-	-	-	0
TSCA	Y	0.125	0	0	-	-	-	0
HIST TSCA	Y	0.125	0	0	-	-	-	0
FTTS ADMIN	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
FTTS INSP	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
PRP	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
SCRD DRYCLEANER	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0

Database	Searched	Search Radius	Project Property	Within 0.12mi	0.125mi to 0.25mi	0.25mi to 0.50mi	0.50mi to 1.00mi	Total
ICIS	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
FED DRYCLEANERS	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
DELISTED FED DRY	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
FUDS	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
FORMER NIKE	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
PIPELINE INCIDENT	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
MLTS	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
HIST MLTS	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
MINES	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
SMCRA	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
MRDS	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
URANIUM	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALT FUELS	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
CONSENT DECREES	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
SSTS	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
PCBT	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
PCB	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
State								
DRYCLEANERS	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
DELISTED DRYCLEANERS	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
DRYC GRANT	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
PFAS	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
PFAS GW	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
HWSS CLEANUP	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
TOXIC PITS	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
DTSC HWF	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
INSP COMP ENF	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCH	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
CHMIRS	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
HIST CHMIRS	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
HAZNET	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
HIST MANIFEST	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
HW TRANSPORT	Y	0.125	0	0	-	-	-	0
WASTE TIRE	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
MEDICAL WASTE	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0

Database	Searched	Search Radius	Project Property	Within 0.12mi	0.125mi to 0.25mi	0.25mi to 0.50mi	0.50mi to 1.00mi	Total
HIST CORTESE	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
CDO/CAO	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
CERS HAZ	Y	0.125	0	0	-	-	-	0
DELISTED HAZ	Y	0.5	0	0	0	0	-	0
GEOTRACKER	Y	0.125	0	0	-	-	-	0
MINE	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIEN	Y	PO	0	-	-	-	-	0
WASTE DISCHG	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
EMISSIONS	Y	0.25	0	0	0	-	-	0
CDL	Y	0.125	0	0	-	-	-	0

Tribal ***No Tribal additional environmental record sources available for this State.***

County ***No County additional environmental databases were selected to be included in the search.***

Total:	*0*	***1***	*0*	*0*	*0*	***1***

**** PO – Property Only***
**** 'Property and adjoining properties' database search radii are set at 0.25 miles.***

Executive Summary: Site Report Summary - Project Property

Map Key	DB	Company/Site Name	Address	Direction	Distance (mi/ft)	Elev Diff (ft)	Page Number

No records found in the selected databases for the project property.

Executive Summary: Site Report Summary - Surrounding Properties

Map Key	DB	Company/Site Name	Address	Direction	Distance (mi/ft)	Elev Diff (ft)	Page Number
1	HAZ SANDIEGO	HONEY SPRINGS RANCH	1850 HONEY SPRINGS RD, JAMUL, CA 91935 JAMUL CA 0	NW	0.10 / 514.70	-157	17

Executive Summary: Summary by Data Source


Standard

County

HAZ SANDIEGO - San Diego County - Hazardous Materials Management Division Database

A search of the HAZ SANDIEGO database, dated May 1, 2022 has found that there are 1 HAZ SANDIEGO site(s) within approximately 0.25 miles of the project property.

Lower Elevation	Address	Direction	Distance (mi/ft)	Map Key
HONEY SPRINGS RANCH	1850 HONEY SPRINGS RD, JAMUL, CA 91935 JAMUL CA 0	NW	0.10 / 514.70	1



Map: 1.0 Mile Radius


Order Number: 22051900829

Address: APNs 600-101-04-00 and -05-00, Jamul, CA

- Project Property
- Buffer Outline
- Eris Sites with Higher Elevation
- Eris Sites with Same Elevation
- Eris Sites with Lower Elevation
- Eris Sites with Unknown Elevation
- Eris Areas with Higher Elevation
- Eris Areas with Same Elevation
- Eris Areas with Lower Elevation
- Eris Areas with Unknown Elevation
- Freeways; Highways
- Traffic Circle; Ramp
- Major & Minor Arterial
- Traffic Circle; Ramp
- Local Road
- Rail
- State
- Country
- National Wetland
- Indian Reserve Land
- Plume
- 100 Year Flood Zone
- 500 Year Flood Zone
- FWS Special Designation Areas

Source: © 2021 ESRI StreetMap Premium

© ERIS Information Inc.



Map: 0.5 Mile Radius


Order Number: 22051900829

Address: APNs 600-101-04-00 and -05-00, Jamul, CA

- Project Property
- Buffer Outline
- Eris Sites with Higher Elevation
- Eris Sites with Same Elevation
- Eris Sites with Lower Elevation
- Eris Sites with Unknown Elevation
- Eris Areas with Higher Elevation
- Eris Areas with Same Elevation
- Eris Areas with Lower Elevation
- Eris Areas with Unknown Elevation
- Freeways; Highways
- Traffic Circle; Ramp
- Major & Minor Arterial
- Traffic Circle; Ramp
- Local Road
- Rail
- State
- Country
- National Wetland
- Indian Reserve Land
- Plume
- 100 Year Flood Zone
- 500 Year Flood Zone
- FWS Special Designation Areas

Source: © 2021 ESRI StreetMap Premium

© ERIS Information Inc.



Map: 0.25 Mile Radius

Order Number: 22051900829


Address: APNs 600-101-04-00 and -05-00, Jamul, CA

ERIS

- Project Property
- Buffer Outline
- Eris Sites with Higher Elevation
- Eris Sites with Same Elevation
- Eris Sites with Lower Elevation
- Eris Sites with Unknown Elevation
- Eris Areas with Higher Elevation
- Eris Areas with Same Elevation
- Eris Areas with Lower Elevation
- Eris Areas with Unknown Elevation
- Freeways; Highways
- Traffic Circle; Ramp
- Major & Minor Arterial
- Traffic Circle; Ramp
- Local Road
- Rail
- State
- Country
- National Wetland
- Indian Reserve Land
- Plume
- 100 Year Flood Zone
- 500 Year Flood Zone
- FWS Special Designation Areas

Source: © 2021 ESRI StreetMap Premium

© ERIS Information Inc.




Aerial **Year: 2021**

Order Number: 22051900829

Address: APNs 600-101-04-00 and -05-00, Jamul, CA

Source: ESRI World Imagery

© ERIS Information Inc.



Topographic Map

Year: 2015

Order Number: 22051900829

Address: APNs 600-101-04-00 and -05-00, CA

Quadrangle(s): Dulzura, CA

Source: USGS Topographic Map

© ERIS Information Inc.

Detail Report

Map Key	Number of Records	Direction	Distance (mi/ft)	Elev/Diff (ft)	Site	DB
1	1 of 1	NW	0.10 / 514.70	1,266.88 / -157	HONEY SPRINGS RANCH 1850 HONEY SPRINGS RD, JAMUL, CA 91935 JAMUL CA 0	HAZ SANDIEGO

Record ID:	DEH2003-HUPFP-202776	**GIS Record ID:**	DEH2003-HUPFP-202776
Facility Name:		**GIS Facility City:**	JAMUL
Facility City:		**GIS Facility ZipCode:**	0
Facility ZipCode:		**GIS Fac Latitude:**	0
Facility Latitude:		**GIS Fac Longitude:**	0
Facility Longitude:			
Facility Address:			
GIS Facility Name:	HONEY SPRINGS RANCH		
GIS Facility Address:	1850 HONEY SPRINGS RD, JAMUL, CA 91935		
Tank Owner Name:			

HMD Permits Map Data

GIS Facility ID:		**Status:**	
GIS CERS ID:		**ER Contact:**	
GIS Record Type:	LUEG-DEH/HMD/UPFP/Facility	**ER Con Work Ph:**	
Per Type:		**Census Tract:**	
Per Sub Type:		**Parcel Zip:**	
Per Cat:		**Community:**	
Record Status:	Completed	**Jurisdiction:**	
HW Tier:		**Basin No:**	
LRG QTY MW Gener:		**BOS Dist:**	
EPA ID No:		**Tbpg Grid:**	
RMP CAL ARP:		**Insp Dist:**	
Tank Owner:		**Feature ID:**	0
SIC Code:		**X Coord:**	0
NAICS Code:		**Y Coord:**	0
Disclose Qty Haz Mat:		**Kiva Per Typ:**	HK07 202776
Exp Date:		**Agency Name:**	COSD
Own/Operate USTs :		**Point X:**	6395946.22406
UST Facility:		**Point Y:**	1822339.31101
Total No USTs:		**Lat GS84:**	0
No of Tanks:		**Lon GS84:**	0
Own Oper APS:	N	**Loc Name:**	
Tot APSA Cap:	0	**Score:**	
Capacity LR:		**Match Type:**	
Haz Waste G:		**Side:**	
Recycle100:		**X Map Coord:**	-116.78847029744686
Onsite Haz Waste Tre:		**Y Map Coord:**	32.66547603594203
RCRA LRG Qty:		**User Fld:**	
Haz Wst Coll Site:		**Addr Type:**	
Accept Offs:		**ARC Address:**	
Universal Waste Han:		**ARC City:**	
Toxic Gas:		**ARC Zipcode:**	
Hazmat EHS:		**ARC State:**	
Hazmat Rad:		**ARC APN:**	
Haz Waste Rad:		**Zip:**	
Haz Waste EHS:		**Farm Nursery:**	
Full Name:		**Indian or Territory:**	
Email Perm:		**County ID:**	
Phone Perm:		**Bill Code 2:**	
Site Address:		**Bill Code 3:**	
Parcel No:	600-090-17-00	**Univ Waste Gen Type:**	

Map Key	Number of Records	Direction	Distance (mi/ft)	Elev/Diff (ft)	Site	DB

Record Ali:	Unified Program Facility Permit
Address:	1850 HONEY SPRINGS RD
Business Type:	
Bill Code:	
ER Con Name:	
ER Con Title:	
Water Purv:	
Fire Agency:	
Geo SRC:	Mapped to record address
Match Addr:	
Hirt Flag:	
Frhmbp Report Filename:	
Frhmbp Sitemap Filename:	

Unplottable Summary

Total: 0 Unplottable sites

DB	Company Name/Site Name	Address	City	Zip	ERIS ID

No unplottable records were found that may be relevant for the search criteria.

Unplottable Report

No unplottable records were found that may be relevant for the search criteria.

Appendix: Database Descriptions

Environmental Risk Information Services (ERIS) can search the following databases. The extent of historical information varies with each database and current information is determined by what is publicly available to ERIS at the time of update. ERIS updates databases as set out in ASTM Standard E1527-13 and E1527-21, Section 8.1.8 Sources of Standard Source Information:

"Government information from nongovernmental sources may be considered current if the source updates the information at least every 90 days, or, for information that is updated less frequently than quarterly by the government agency, within 90 days of the date the government agency makes the information available to the public."

Standard Environmental Record Sources

Federal

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program: DOE FUSRAP

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) established the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) in 1974 to remediate sites where radioactive contamination remained from the Manhattan Project and early U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) operations. The DOE Office of Legacy Management (LM) established long-term surveillance and maintenance (LTS&M) requirements for remediated FUSRAP sites. DOE evaluates the final site conditions of a remediated site on the basis of risk for different future uses. DOE then confirms that LTS&M requirements will maintain protectiveness.

Government Publication Date: Mar 4, 2017

National Priority List: NPL

Sites on the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s National Priorities List of the most serious uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites identified for possible long-term remedial action under the Superfund program. The NPL, which EPA is required to update at least once a year, is based primarily on the score a site receives from EPA's Hazard Ranking System. A site must be on the NPL to receive money from the Superfund Trust Fund for remedial action. Sites are represented by boundaries where available in the EPA Superfund Site Boundaries maintained by the Shared Enterprise Geodata and Services (SEGS). Site boundaries represent the footprint of a whole site, the sum of all of the Operable Units and the current understanding of the full extent of contamination; for Federal Facility sites, the total site polygon may be the Facility boundary. Where there is no polygon boundary data available for a given site, the site is represented as a point.

Government Publication Date: Mar 30, 2022

National Priority List - Proposed: PROPOSED NPL

Sites proposed - by the EPA, the state agency, or concerned citizens - for addition to the NPL due to contamination by hazardous waste and identified by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a candidate for cleanup because it poses a risk to human health and/or the environment. Sites are represented by boundaries where available in the EPA Superfund Site Boundaries maintained by the Shared Enterprise Geodata and Services (SEGS). Site boundaries represent the footprint of a whole site, the sum of all of the Operable Units and the current understanding of the full extent of contamination; for Federal Facility sites, the total site polygon may be the Facility boundary. Where there is no polygon boundary data available for a given site, the site is represented as a point.

Government Publication Date: Mar 30, 2022

Deleted NPL: DELETED NPL

Sites deleted from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s National Priorities List. The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) establishes the criteria that the EPA uses to delete sites from the NPL. In accordance with 40 CFR 300.425.(e), sites may be deleted from the NPL where no further response is appropriate. Sites are represented by boundaries where available in the EPA Superfund Site Boundaries maintained by the Shared Enterprise Geodata and Services (SEGS). Site boundaries represent the footprint of a whole site, the sum of all of the Operable Units and the current understanding of the full extent of contamination; for Federal Facility sites, the total site polygon may be the Facility boundary. Where there is no polygon boundary data available for a given site, the site is represented as a point.

Government Publication Date: Mar 30, 2022

SEMS List 8R Active Site Inventory: SEMS

The Superfund Program has deployed the Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS), which integrates multiple legacy systems into a comprehensive tracking and reporting tool. This inventory contains active sites evaluated by the Superfund program that are either proposed to be or are on the National Priorities List (NPL) as well as sites that are in the screening and assessment phase for possible inclusion on the NPL. The Active Site Inventory Report displays site and location information at active SEMS sites. An active site is one at which site assessment, removal, remedial, enforcement, cost recovery, or oversight activities are being planned or conducted.

Government Publication Date: Feb 24, 2022

Inventory of Open Dumps, June 1985: ODI

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) provides for publication of an inventory of open dumps. The Act defines "open dumps" as facilities which do not comply with EPA's "Criteria for Classification of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities and Practices" (40 CFR 257).

Government Publication Date: Jun 1985

SEMS List 8R Archive Sites: SEMS ARCHIVE

The Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) Archived Site Inventory displays site and location information at sites archived from SEMS. An archived site is one at which EPA has determined that assessment has been completed and no further remedial action is planned under the Superfund program at this time.

Government Publication Date: Feb 24, 2022

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System - CERCLIS: CERCLIS

Superfund is a program administered by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to locate, investigate, and clean up the worst hazardous waste sites throughout the United States. CERCLIS is a database of potential and confirmed hazardous waste sites at which the EPA Superfund program has some involvement. It contains sites that are either proposed to be or are on the National Priorities List (NPL) as well as sites that are in the screening and assessment phase for possible inclusion on the NPL. The EPA administers the Superfund program in cooperation with individual states and tribal governments; this database is made available by the EPA.

Government Publication Date: Oct 25, 2013

EPA Report on the Status of Open Dumps on Indian Lands: IODI

Public Law 103-399, The Indian Lands Open Dump Cleanup Act of 1994, enacted October 22, 1994, identified congressional concerns that solid waste open dump sites located on American Indian or Alaska Native (AI/AN) lands threaten the health and safety of residents of those lands and contiguous areas. The purpose of the Act is to identify the location of open dumps on Indian lands, assess the relative health and environment hazards posed by those sites, and provide financial and technical assistance to Indian tribal governments to close such dumps in compliance with Federal standards and regulations or standards promulgated by Indian Tribal governments or Alaska Native entities.

Government Publication Date: Dec 31, 1998

CERCLIS - No Further Remedial Action Planned: CERCLIS NFRAP

An archived site is one at which EPA has determined that assessment has been completed and no further remedial action is planned under the Superfund program at this time. The Archive designation means that, to the best of EPA's knowledge, assessment at a site has been completed and that EPA has determined no further steps will be taken to list this site on the National Priorities List (NPL). This decision does not necessarily mean that there is no hazard associated with a given site; it only means that, based upon available information, the location is not judged to be a potential NPL site.

Government Publication Date: Oct 25, 2013

CERCLIS Liens: CERCLIS LIENS

A Federal Superfund lien exists at any property where EPA has incurred Superfund costs to address contamination ("Superfund site") and has provided notice of liability to the property owner. A Federal CERCLA ("Superfund") lien can exist by operation of law at any site or property at which EPA has spent Superfund monies. This database is made available by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Government Publication Date: Jan 30, 2014

RCRA CORRACTS-Corrective Action: RCRA CORRACTS

RCRA Info is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. At these sites, the Corrective Action Program ensures that cleanups occur. EPA and state regulators work with facilities and communities to design remedies based on the contamination, geology, and anticipated use unique to each site.

Government Publication Date: Apr 11, 2022

RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD Facilities: RCRA TSD

RCRA Info is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. This database includes Non-Corrective Action sites listed as treatment, storage and/or disposal facilities of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

Government Publication Date: Apr 11, 2022

RCRA Generator List: RCRA LQG

RCRA Info is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. RCRA Info replaces the data recording and reporting abilities of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) and the Biennial Reporting System (BRS). A hazardous waste generator is any person or site whose processes and actions create hazardous waste (see 40 CFR 260.10). Large Quantity Generators (LQGs) generate 1,000 kilograms per month or more of hazardous waste or more than one kilogram per month of acutely hazardous waste.

Government Publication Date: Apr 11, 2022

RCRA Small Quantity Generators List: RCRA SQG

RCRA Info is the EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. RCRA Info replaces the data recording and reporting abilities of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) and the Biennial Reporting System (BRS). A hazardous waste generator is any person or site whose processes and actions create hazardous waste (see 40 CFR 260.10). Small Quantity Generators (SQGs) generate more than 100 kilograms, but less than 1,000 kilograms, of hazardous waste per month.

Government Publication Date: Apr 11, 2022

RCRA Very Small Quantity Generators List: RCRA VSQG

RCRA Info is the EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. A hazardous waste generator is any person or site whose processes and actions create hazardous waste (see 40 CFR 260.10). Very Small Quantity Generators (VSQG) generate 100 kilograms or less per month of hazardous waste, or one kilogram or less per month of acutely hazardous waste. Additionally, VSQG may not accumulate more than 1,000 kilograms of hazardous waste at any time.

Government Publication Date: Apr 11, 2022

RCRA Non-Generators: RCRA NON GEN

RCRA Info is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. RCRA Info replaces the data recording and reporting abilities of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) and the Biennial Reporting System (BRS). A hazardous waste generator is any person or site whose processes and actions create hazardous waste (see 40 CFR 260.10). Non-Generators do not presently generate hazardous waste.

Government Publication Date: Apr 11, 2022

RCRA Sites with Controls: RCRA CONTROLS

List of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) facilities with institutional controls in place. RCRA gives the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) the authority to control hazardous waste from the "cradle-to-grave." This includes the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste. RCRA also set forth a framework for the management of non-hazardous solid wastes. The 1986 amendments to RCRA enabled EPA to address environmental problems that could result from underground tanks storing petroleum and other hazardous substances.

Government Publication Date: Apr 11, 2022

Federal Engineering Controls-ECs: FED ENG

Engineering controls (ECs) encompass a variety of engineered and constructed physical barriers (e.g., soil capping, sub-surface venting systems, mitigation barriers, fences) to contain and/or prevent exposure to contamination on a property. This database is made available by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Government Publication Date: Dec 30, 2021

Federal Institutional Controls- ICs: FED INST

Institutional controls are non-engineered instruments, such as administrative and legal controls, that help minimize the potential for human exposure to contamination and/or protect the integrity of the remedy. Although it is EPA's (United States Environmental Protection Agency) expectation that treatment or engineering controls will be used to address principal threat wastes and that groundwater will be returned to its beneficial use whenever practicable, ICs play an important role in site remedies because they reduce exposure to contamination by limiting land or resource use and guide human behavior at a site.

Government Publication Date: Dec 30, 2021

Land Use Control Information System: LUCIS

The LUCIS database is maintained by the U.S. Department of the Navy and contains information for former Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) properties across the United States.

Government Publication Date: Sep 1, 2006

Institutional Control Boundaries at NPL sites: NPL IC

Boundaries of Institutional Control areas at sites on the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s National Priorities List, or Proposed or Deleted, made available by the EPA's Shared Enterprise Geodata and Services (SEGS). United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s National Priorities List of the most serious uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites identified for possible long-term remedial action under the Superfund program. Institutional controls are non-engineered instruments such as administrative and legal controls that help minimize the potential for human exposure to contamination and/or protect the integrity of the remedy.

Government Publication Date: Mar 30, 2022

Emergency Response Notification System: ERNS 1982 TO 1986

Database of oil and hazardous substances spill reports controlled by the National Response Center. The primary function of the National Response Center is to serve as the sole national point of contact for reporting oil, chemical, radiological, biological, and etiological discharges into the environment anywhere in the United States and its territories.

Government Publication Date: 1982-1986

Emergency Response Notification System: ERNS 1987 TO 1989

Database of oil and hazardous substances spill reports controlled by the National Response Center. The primary function of the National Response Center is to serve as the sole national point of contact for reporting oil, chemical, radiological, biological, and etiological discharges into the environment anywhere in the United States and its territories.

Government Publication Date: 1987-1989

Emergency Response Notification System: ERNS

Database of oil and hazardous substances spill reports made available by the United States Coast Guard National Response Center (NRC). The NRC fields initial reports for pollution and railroad incidents and forwards that information to appropriate federal/state agencies for response. These data contain initial incident data that has not been validated or investigated by a federal/state response agency.

Government Publication Date: Dec 31, 2021

The Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES) Brownfield Database: FED BROWNFIELDS

Brownfields are real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant. Cleaning up and reinvesting in these properties protects the environment, reduces blight, and takes development pressures off greenspaces and working lands. This database is made available by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Government Publication Date: Aug 20, 2021

FEMA Underground Storage Tank Listing: FEMA UST

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) of the Department of Homeland Security maintains a list of FEMA owned underground storage tanks.

Government Publication Date: Dec 31, 2017

Facility Response Plan: FRP

List of facilities that have submitted Facility Response Plans (FRP) to EPA. Facilities that could reasonably be expected to cause "substantial harm" to the environment by discharging oil into or on navigable waters are required to prepare and submit Facility Response Plans (FRPs). Harm is determined based on total oil storage capacity, secondary containment and age of tanks, oil transfer activities, history of discharges, proximity to a public drinking water intake or sensitive environments.

Government Publication Date: Dec 2, 2020

Historical Gas Stations: HIST GAS STATIONS

This historic directory of service stations is provided by the Cities Service Company. The directory includes Cities Service filling stations that were located throughout the United States in 1930.

Government Publication Date: Jul 1, 1930

Petroleum Refineries: REFN

List of petroleum refineries from the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) Refinery Capacity Report. Includes operating and idle petroleum refineries (including new refineries under construction) and refineries shut down during the previous year located in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and other U.S. possessions. Survey locations adjusted using public data.

Government Publication Date: Feb 4, 2022

Petroleum Product and Crude Oil Rail Terminals: BULK TERMINAL

List of petroleum product and crude oil rail terminals made available by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). Includes operable bulk petroleum product terminals located in the 50 States and the District of Columbia with a total bulk shell storage capacity of 50,000 barrels or more, and/or the ability to receive volumes from tanker, barge, or pipeline; also rail terminals handling the loading and unloading of crude oil that were active between 2017 and 2018. Petroleum product terminals comes from the EIA-815 Bulk Terminal and Blender Report, which includes working, shell in operation, and shell idle for several major product groupings. Survey locations adjusted using public data.

Government Publication Date: Feb 4, 2022

LIEN on Property: SEMS LIEN

The EPA Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) provides LIEN information on properties under the EPA Superfund Program.

Government Publication Date: Feb 24, 2022

Superfund Decision Documents: SUPERFUND ROD

This database contains a listing of decision documents for Superfund sites. Decision documents serve to provide the reasoning for the choice of (or) changes to a Superfund Site cleanup plan. The decision documents include Records of Decision (ROD), ROD Amendments, Explanations of Significant Differences (ESD), along with other associated memos and files. This information is maintained and made available by the US EPA (Environmental Protection Agency).

Government Publication Date: Nov 16, 2021

State

State Response Sites: RESPONSE

A list of identified confirmed release sites where the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is involved in remediation, either in a lead or oversight capacity. These confirmed release sites are generally high-priority and high potential risk. This database is state equivalent NPL.

Government Publication Date: Jan 6, 2022

EnviroStor Database: ENVIROSTOR

The EnviroStor Data Management System is made available by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Includes Corrective Action sites, Tiered Permit sites, Historical Sites and Evaluation/Investigation sites. This database is state equivalent CERCLIS.

Government Publication Date: Jan 6, 2022

Delisted State Response Sites: DELISTED ENVS

Sites removed from the list of State Response Sites made available by the EnviroStor Data Management System, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

Government Publication Date: Jan 6, 2022

Solid Waste Information System (SWIS): SWF/LF

The Solid Waste Information System (SWIS) database made available by the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) contains information on solid waste facilities, operations, and disposal sites throughout the State of California. The types of facilities found in this database include landfills, transfer stations, material recovery facilities, composting sites, transformation facilities, waste tire sites, and closed disposal sites.

Government Publication Date: Feb 2, 2022

Solid Waste Disposal Sites with Waste Constituents Above Hazardous Waste Levels: SWRCB SWF

This is a list of solid waste disposal sites identified by California State Water Resources Control Board with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside the waste management unit.

Government Publication Date: Sep 20, 2006

Waste Management Unit Database: WMUD

The Waste Management Unit Database System tracks and inventories waste management units. CCR Title 27 contains criteria stating that Waste Management Units are classified according to their ability to contain wastes. Containment shall be determined by geology, hydrology, topography, climatology, and other factors relating to the ability of the Unit to protect water quality. Water Code Section 13273.1 requires that operators submit a water quality solid waste assessment test (SWAT) report to address leak status. The WMUDS was last updated by the State Water Resources control board in 2000.

Government Publication Date: Jan 1, 2000

EnviroStor Hazardous Waste Facilities: HWP

A list of hazardous waste facilities including permitted, post-closure and historical facilities found in the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database.

Government Publication Date: Jan 6, 2022

Sites Listed in the Solid Waste Assessment Test (SWAT) Program Report: SWAT

In a 1993 Memorandum of Understanding, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) agreed to submit a comprehensive report on the Solid Waste Assessment Test (SWAT) Program to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). This report summarizes the work completed to date on the SWAT Program, and addresses both the impacts that leakage from solid waste disposal sites (SWDS) may have upon waters of the State and the actions taken to address such leakage.

Government Publication Date: Dec 31, 1995

Construction and Demolition Debris Recyclers: C&D DEBRIS RECY

This listing of Construction and Demolition Debris Recyclers is maintained by the California Intergrated Waste Management Board-common C&D materials include lumber, drywall, metals, masonry (brick, concrete, etc.), carpet, plastic, pipe, rocks, dirt, paper, cardboard, or green waste related to land development.

Government Publication Date: Jun 20, 2018

Recycling Centers: RECYCLING

This list of Certified Recycling Centers that are operating under the state of California's Beverage Container Recycling Program is maintained by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

Government Publication Date: Apr 12, 2022

Listing of Certified Processors: PROCESSORS

This list of Certified Processors that are operating under the state of California's Beverage Container Recycling Program is maintained by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

Government Publication Date: Apr 12, 2022

Listing of Certified Dropoff, Collection, and Community Service Programs: CONTAINER RECY

This list of Certified Dropoff, Collection, and Community Service Programs (non-buyback) operating under the state of California's Beverage Container Recycling Program is maintained by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

Government Publication Date: Apr 12, 2022

Land Disposal Sites: LDS

Land Disposal Sites in GeoTracker, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)'s data management system. The Land Disposal program regulates of waste discharge to land for treatment, storage and disposal in waste management units. Waste management units include waste piles, surface impoundments, and landfills.

Government Publication Date: Feb 15, 2022

Leaking Underground Fuel Tank Reports: LUST

List of Leaking Underground Storage Tanks within the Cleanup Sites data in GeoTracker database. GeoTracker is the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) data management system for managing sites that impact groundwater, especially those that require groundwater cleanup (Underground Storage Tanks, Department of Defense and Site Cleanup Program) as well as permitted facilities such as operating Underground Storage Tanks. The Leak Prevention Program that overlooks LUST sites is the SWRCB in California's Environmental Protection Agency.

Government Publication Date: Feb 15, 2022

Delisted Leaking Storage Tanks: DELISTED LST

List of Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) cleanup sites removed from GeoTracker, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)'s database system, as well as sites removed from the SWRCB's list of UST Case closures.

Government Publication Date: Feb 15, 2022

Permitted Underground Storage Tank (UST) in GeoTracker: UST

List of Permitted Underground Storage Tank (UST) sites made available by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in California's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Government Publication Date: Apr 25, 2022

Proposed Closure of Underground Storage Tank Cases: UST CLOSURE

List of UST cases that are being considered for closure by either the California Environmental Protection Agency, State Water Resources Control Board or the Executive Director that have been posted for a 60-day public comment period.

Government Publication Date: May 5, 2021

Historical Hazardous Substance Storage Information Database: HHSS

The Historical Hazardous Substance Storage database contains information collected in the 1980s from facilities that stored hazardous substances. The information was originally collected on paper forms, was later transferred to microfiche, and recently indexed as a searchable database. When using this database, please be aware that it is based upon self-reported information submitted by facilities which has not been independently verified. It is unlikely that every facility responded to the survey and the database should not be expected to be a complete inventory of all facilities that were operating at that time. This database is maintained by the California State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) Geotracker.

Government Publication Date: Aug 27, 2015

Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System: UST SWEEPS

The Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System (SWEEPS) is a historical listing of active and inactive underground storage tanks made available by the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

Government Publication Date: Oct 1, 1994

Aboveground Storage Tanks: AST

A statewide list from 2009 of aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) made available by the Cal FIRE Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM). This list is no longer maintained or updated by the Cal FIRE OSFM.

Government Publication Date: Aug 31, 2009

SWRCB Historical Aboveground Storage Tanks: AST SWRCB

A list of aboveground storage tanks made available by the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Effective January 1, 2008, the Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPAs) are vested with the responsibility and authority to implement the Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act (APSA).

Government Publication Date: Dec 1, 2007

Oil and Gas Facility Tanks: TANK OIL GAS

Locations of oil and gas tanks that fall under the jurisdiction of the Geologic Energy Management Division of the California Department of Conservation (CalGEM) (CCR 1760). CalGEM was formerly the Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR).

Government Publication Date: Apr 4, 2022

Delisted Storage Tanks: DELISTED TNK

This database contains a list of storage tank sites that were removed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in California's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Cal FIRE Office of State Fire Marshal (OSFM).

Government Publication Date: May 2, 2022

California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) Tanks: CERS TANK

List of sites in the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) Regulated Site Portal which fall under the Aboveground Petroleum Storage and Underground Storage Tank regulatory programs. The CalEPA oversees the statewide implementation of the Unified Program which applies regulatory standards to protect Californians from hazardous waste and materials.

Government Publication Date: Apr 5, 2022

Delisted California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) Tanks: DELISTED CTNK

This database contains a list of Aboveground Petroleum Storage and Underground Storage Tank sites that were removed from in the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) Regulated Site Portal.

Government Publication Date: Apr 5, 2022

Historical Hazardous Substance Storage Container Information - Facility Summary: HIST TANK

The State Water Resources Control Board maintained the Hazardous Substance Storage Containers listing and inventory in th 1980s. This facility summary lists historic tank sites where the following container types were present: farm motor vehicle fuel tanks; waste tanks; sumps; pits, ponds, lagoons, and others; and all other product tanks. This set, published in May 1988, lists facility and owner information, as well as the number of containers. This data is historic and will not be updated.

Government Publication Date: May 27, 1988

Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Facility Sites with Land Use Restrictions: LUR

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program (SMBRP) list includes sites cleaned up under the program's oversight and generally does not include current or former hazardous waste facilities that required a hazardous waste facility permit. The list represents land use restrictions that are active. Some sites have multiple land use restrictions.

Government Publication Date: Jan 6, 2022

CALSITES Database: CALSITES

This historical database was maintained by the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) for more than a decade. CALSITES contains information on Brownfield properties with confirmed or potential hazardous contamination. In 2006, DTSC introduced EnviroStor as the latest Brownfields site database.

Government Publication Date: May 1, 2004

Hazardous Waste Management Program Facility Sites with Deed / Land Use Restrictions: HLUR

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Hazardous Waste Management Program (HWMP) has developed a list of current or former hazardous waste facilities that have a recorded land use restriction at the local county recorder's office. The land use restrictions on this list were required by the DTSC HWMP as a result of the presence of hazardous substances that remain on site after the facility (or part of the facility) has been closed or cleaned up. The types of land use restriction include deed notice, deed restriction, or a land use restriction that binds current and future owners.

Government Publication Date: Feb 18, 2021

Deed Restrictions and Land Use Restrictions: DEED

List of Deed Restrictions, Land Use Restrictions and Covenants in GeoTracker made available by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in California's Environmental Protection Agency. A deed restriction (land use covenant) may be required to facilitate the remediation of past environmental contamination and to protect human health and the environment by reducing the risk of exposure to residual hazardous materials.

Government Publication Date: Feb 15, 2022

Voluntary Cleanup Program: VCP

List of sites in the Voluntary Cleanup Program made available by the Department of Toxic Substances and Control (DTSC). The Voluntary Cleanup Program was designed to respond to lower priority sites. Under the Voluntary Cleanup Program, DTSC enters site-specific agreements with project proponents for DTSC oversight of site assessment, investigation, and/or removal or remediation activities, and the project proponents agree to pay DTSC's reasonable costs for those services.

Government Publication Date: Jan 6, 2022

GeoTracker Cleanup Program Sites: CLEANUP SITES

A list of Cleanup Program sites in the state of California made available by The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) of the California Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). SWRCB tracks leaking underground storage tank cleanups as well as other water board cleanups.

Government Publication Date: Feb 15, 2022

Delisted County Records: DELISTED COUNTY

Records removed from county or CUPA databases. Records may be removed from the county lists made available by the respective county departments because they are inactive, or because they have been deemed to be below reportable thresholds.

Government Publication Date: May 9, 2022

Tribal

Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUSTs) on Indian Lands: INDIAN LUST

LUSTs on Tribal/Indian Lands in Region 9, which includes California.

Government Publication Date: Oct 12, 2021

Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) on Indian Lands: INDIAN UST

USTs on Tribal/Indian Lands in Region 9, which includes California.

Government Publication Date: Oct 12, 2021

Delisted Tribal Leaking Storage Tanks: DELISTED ILST

Leaking Underground Storage Tank facilities which have been removed from the Regional Tribal LUST lists made available by the EPA.

Government Publication Date: Oct 12, 2021

Delisted Tribal Underground Storage Tanks: DELISTED IUST

Underground Storage Tank facilities which have been removed from the Regional Tribal UST lists made available by the EPA.

Government Publication Date: Oct 13, 2021

County

San Diego County - Solid Waste Facility List: SWF SANDIEGO

A list of open and closed Solid Waste Facilities in the County of San Diego. The County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) is certified by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery to enforce state solid waste laws and regulations in San Diego County, excluding the City of San Diego. The list is made available by San Diego County Department of Environmental Health.

Government Publication Date: Apr 13, 2021

San Diego County - Local Oversight Program List: LOP SANDIEGO

A list of Underground Storage Tank (UST) release sites in the County of San Diego. This list is made available by San Diego County Department of Environmental Health.

Government Publication Date: Jun 15, 2020

San Diego County - Hazardous Materials Management Division Database: HAZ SANDIEGO

A list of facilities with Unified Program Facility Permit in San Diego County. This list has been made available by County of San Diego Environmental Health.

Government Publication Date: May 1, 2022

San Diego County - UST List: UST SANDIEGO

A list of registered Underground Storage Tanks in the County of San Diego. The list is made available by the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Division.

Government Publication Date: Apr 25, 2022

San Diego County - Site Assessment and Mitigation Investigation Sites: SAM SANDIEGO

List of sites which have undergone a Site Assessment and Mitigation investigation. This list is made available by the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health.

Government Publication Date: Jun 30, 2020

Additional Environmental Record Sources

Federal

Facility Registry Service/Facility Index: FINDS/FRS

The Facility Registry Service (FRS) is a centrally managed database that identifies facilities, sites, or places subject to environmental regulations or of environmental interest. FRS creates high-quality, accurate, and authoritative facility identification records through rigorous verification and management procedures that incorporate information from program national systems, state master facility records, and data collected from EPA's Central Data Exchange registrations and data management personnel. This list is made available by the Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA).

Government Publication Date: Nov 2, 2020

Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) Program: TRIS

The EPA's Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) is a database containing data on disposal or other releases of over 650 toxic chemicals from thousands of U. S. facilities and information about how facilities manage those chemicals through recycling, energy recovery, and treatment. One of TRI's primary purposes is to inform communities about toxic chemical releases to the environment.

Government Publication Date: Aug 24, 2021

Perfluorinated Alkyl Substances (PFAS) Releases: PFAS TRI

List of Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) facilities at which the reported chemical is a Per- or polyfluorinated alkyl substance (PFAS) included in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s consolidated PFAS Master List of PFAS Substances. The EPA's Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) is a database containing data on disposal or other releases of over 650 toxic chemicals from thousands of U.S. facilities and information about how facilities manage those chemicals through recycling, energy recovery, and treatment.

Government Publication Date: Aug 24, 2021

PFOA/PFOS Contaminated Sites: PFAS NPL

List of sites where PFOA or PFOS contaminants have been found in drinking water or soil. Made available by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Government Publication Date: Jan 11, 2022

Perfluorinated Alkyl Substances (PFAS) Water Quality: PFAS WATER

The Water Quality Portal (WQP) is a cooperative service sponsored by the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the National Water Quality Monitoring Council (NWQMC). This listing includes records from the Water Quality Portal where the characteristic (environmental measurement) is in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s consolidated PFAS Master List of PFAS Substances.

Government Publication Date: Jul 20, 2020

SSEHRI PFAS Contamination Sites: PFAS SSEHRI

This PFAS Contamination Site Tracker database is compiled by the Social Science Environmental Health Research Institute (SSEHRI) at Northeastern University. According to the SSEHRI, the database records qualitative and quantitative data from each known site of PFAS contamination, including timeline of discovery, sources, levels, health impacts, community response, and government response. The goal of this database is to compile information and support public understanding of the rapidly unfolding issue of PFAS contamination. All data presented was extracted from government websites, news articles, or publicly available documents, and this is cited in the tracker. Disclaimer: The source conveys this database undergoes regular updates as new information becomes available, some sites may be missing and/or contain information that is incorrect or outdated, as well as their information represents all contamination sites SSEHRI is aware of, not all possible contamination sites. This data is not intended to be used for legal purposes. Limited location details are available with this data. Access the following for the most current informations https://pfasproject.com/pfas-contamination-site-tr acker/

Government Publication Date: Dec 12, 2019

National Response Center PFAS Spills: ERNS PFAS

National Response Center (NRC) calls from 1990 to the most recent complete calendar year where there is indication of Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) usage. NRC calls may reference AFFF usage in the "Material Involved" or "Incident Description" fields. Data made available by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Disclaimer: dataset may include initial or misidentified incident data not yet validated or investigated by a federal/state response agency.

Government Publication Date: Feb 23, 2022

Hazardous Materials Information Reporting System: HMIRS

US DOT - Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) Incidents Reports Database taken from Hazmat Intelligence Portal, U.S. Department of Transportation.

Government Publication Date: Sep 1, 2020

National Clandestine Drug Labs: NCDL

The U.S. Department of Justice ("the Department") provides this data as a public service. It contains addresses of some locations where law enforcement agencies reported they found chemicals or other items that indicated the presence of either clandestine drug laboratories or dumpsites. In most cases, the source of the entries is not the Department, and the Department has not verified the entry and does not guarantee its accuracy.

Government Publication Date: Nov 22, 2021

Toxic Substances Control Act: TSCA

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is amending the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) section 8(a) Inventory Update Reporting (IUR) rule and changing its name to the Chemical Data Reporting (CDR) rule.

The CDR enables EPA to collect and publish information on the manufacturing, processing, and use of commercial chemical substances and mixtures (referred to hereafter as chemical substances) on the TSCA Chemical Substance Inventory (TSCA Inventory). This includes current information on chemical substance production volumes, manufacturing sites, and how the chemical substances are used. This information helps the Agency determine whether people or the environment are potentially exposed to reported chemical substances. EPA publishes submitted CDR data that is not Confidential Business Information (CBI).

Government Publication Date: Apr 11, 2019

Hist TSCA: HIST TSCA

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is amending the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) section 8(a) Inventory Update Reporting (IUR) rule and changing its name to the Chemical Data Reporting (CDR) rule.
The 2006 IUR data summary report includes information about chemicals manufactured or imported in quantities of 25,000 pounds or more at a single site during calendar year 2005. In addition to the basic manufacturing information collected in previous reporting cycles, the 2006 cycle is the first time EPA collected information to characterize exposure during manufacturing, processing and use of organic chemicals. The 2006 cycle also is the first time manufacturers of inorganic chemicals were required to report basic manufacturing information.

Government Publication Date: Dec 31, 2006

FTTS Administrative Case Listing: FTTS ADMIN

An administrative case listing from the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, & Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), together known as FTTS. This database was obtained from the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Compliance Database (NCDB). The FTTS and NCDB was shut down in 2006.

Government Publication Date: Jan 19, 2007

FTTS Inspection Case Listing: FTTS INSP

An inspection case listing from the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, & Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), together known as FTTS. This database was obtained from the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Compliance Database (NCDB). The FTTS and NCDB was shut down in 2006.

Government Publication Date: Jan 19, 2007

Potentially Responsible Parties List: PRP

Early in the cleanup process, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conducts a search to find the potentially responsible parties (PRPs). EPA looks for evidence to determine liability by matching wastes found at the site with parties that may have contributed wastes to the site.

Government Publication Date: Mar 30, 2022

State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners Listing: SCRD DRYCLEANER

The State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners (SCRD) was established in 1998, with support from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation. Coalition members are states with mandated programs and funding for drycleaner site remediation. Current members are Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin.

Government Publication Date: Nov 08, 2017

Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS): ICIS

The Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS) is a system that provides information for the Federal Enforcement and Compliance (FE&C) and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) programs. The FE&C component supports the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Civil Enforcement and Compliance program activities. These activities include Compliance Assistance, Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement. The NPDES program supports tracking of NPDES permits, limits, discharge monitoring data and other program reports.

Government Publication Date: Jan 15, 2022

Drycleaner Facilities: FED DRYCLEANERS

A list of drycleaner facilities from Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO) online search. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) tracks facilities that possess NAIC and SIC codes that classify businesses as drycleaner establishments.

Government Publication Date: May 5, 2021

Delisted Drycleaner Facilities: DELISTED FED DRY

List of sites removed from the list of Drycleaner Facilities (sites in the EPA's Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS) with NAIC or SIC codes identifying the business as a drycleaner establishment).

Government Publication Date: May 5, 2021

Formerly Used Defense Sites: FUDS

Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) are properties that were formerly owned by, leased to, or otherwise possessed by and under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense prior to October 1986, where the Department of Defense (DoD) is responsible for an environmental restoration. This list is published by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Government Publication Date: May 26, 2021

Former Military Nike Missile Sites: FORMER NIKE

This information was taken from report DRXTH-AS-IA-83A016 (Historical Overview of the Nike Missile System, 12/1984) which was performed by Environmental Science and Engineering, Inc. for the U.S. Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency Assessment Division. The Nike system was deployed between 1954 and the mid-1970's. Among the substances used or stored on Nike sites were liquid missile fuel (JP-4); starter fluids (UDKH, aniline, and furfuryl alcohol); oxidizer (IRFNA); hydrocarbons (motor oil, hydraulic fluid, diesel fuel, gasoline, heating oil); solvents (carbon tetrachloride, trichloroethylene, trichloroethane, stoddard solvent); and battery electrolyte. The quantities of material a disposed of and procedures for disposal are not documented in published reports. Virtually all information concerning the potential for contamination at Nike sites is confined to personnel who were assigned to Nike sites. During deactivation most hardware was shipped to depot-level supply points. There were reportedly instances where excess materials were disposed of on or near the site itself at closure. There was reportedly no routine site decontamination.
Government Publication Date: Dec 2, 1984

PHMSA Pipeline Safety Flagged Incidents: PIPELINE INCIDENT
A list of flagged pipeline incidents made available by the U.S. Department of Transportation (US DOT) Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA). PHMSA regulations require incident and accident reports for five different pipeline system types.
Government Publication Date: Jul 7, 2020

Material Licensing Tracking System (MLTS): MLTS
A list of sites that store radioactive material subject to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) licensing requirements. This list is maintained by the NRC. As of September 2016, the NRC no longer releases location information for sites. Site locations were last received in July 2016.
Government Publication Date: May 11, 2021

Historic Material Licensing Tracking System (MLTS) sites: HIST MLTS
A historic list of sites that have inactive licenses and/or removed from the Material Licensing Tracking System (MLTS). In some cases, a site is removed from the MLTS when the state becomes an "Agreement State". An Agreement State is a State that has signed an agreement with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) authorizing the State to regulate certain uses of radioactive materials within the State.
Government Publication Date: Jan 31, 2010

Mines Master Index File: MINES
The Master Index File (MIF) contains mine identification numbers issued by the Department of Labor Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) for mines active or opened since 1971. Note that addresses may or may not correspond with the physical location of the mine itself.
Government Publication Date: Nov 2, 2021

Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act Sites: SMCRA
An inventory of land and water impacted by past mining (primarily coal mining) is maintained by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) to provide information needed to implement the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). The inventory contains information on the location, type, and extent of Abandoned Mine Land (AML) impacts, as well as information on the cost associated with the reclamation of those problems. The inventory is based upon field surveys by State, Tribal, and OSMRE program officials. It is dynamic to the extent that it is modified as new problems are identified and existing problems are reclaimed.
Government Publication Date: Dec 18, 2020

Mineral Resource Data System: MRDS
The Mineral Resource Data System (MRDS) is a collection of reports describing metallic and nonmetallic mineral resources throughout the world. Included are deposit name, location, commodity, deposit description, geologic characteristics, production, reserves, resources, and references. This database contains the records previously provided in the Mineral Resource Data System (MRDS) of USGS and the Mineral Availability System/Mineral Industry Locator System (MAS/MILS) originated in the U.S. Bureau of Mines, which is now part of USGS. The USGS has ceased systematic updates of the MRDS database with their focus more recently on deposits of critical minerals while providing a well-documented baseline of historical mine locations from USGS topographic maps.
Government Publication Date: Mar 15, 2016

Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act Sites: URANIUM
The Legacy Management Office of the Department of Energy (DOE) manages radioactive and chemical waste, environmental contamination, and hazardous material at over 100 sites across the U.S. The L.M. Office manages this database of sites registered under the Uranium Mill Tailings Control Act (UMTRCA).
Government Publication Date: Mar 4, 2017

Alternative Fueling Stations: ALT FUELS

List of alternative fueling stations made available by the US Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy. Includes Biodiesel stations, Ethanol (E85) stations, Liquefied Petroleum Gas (Propane) stations, Ethanol (E85) stations, Natural Gas stations, Hydrogen stations, and Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE). The National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) obtains information about new stations from trade media, Clean Cities coordinators, a Submit New Station form on the Station Locator website, and through collaborating with infrastructure equipment and fuel providers, original equipment manufacturers (OEMs), and industry groups.

Government Publication Date: Mar 7, 2022

Superfunds Consent Decrees: CONSENT DECREES

A list of Superfund consent decrees made available by the Department of Justice, Environment & Natural Resources Division (ENRD).

Government Publication Date: Sep 30, 2018

Registered Pesticide Establishments: SSTS

List of active EPA-registered foreign and domestic pesticide-producing and device-producing establishments based on data from the Section Seven Tracking System (SSTS). The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) Section 7 requires that facilities producing pesticides, active ingredients, or devices be registered. The list of establishments is made available by the EPA.

Government Publication Date: Mar 30, 2022

Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Transformers: PCBT

Locations of Transformers Containing Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) registered with the United States Environmental Protection Agency. PCB transformer owners must register their transformer(s) with EPA. Although not required, PCB transformer owners who have removed and properly disposed of a registered PCB transformer may notify EPA to have their PCB transformer de-registered. Data made available by EPA.

Government Publication Date: Oct 15, 2019

Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Notifiers: PCB

Facilities included in the national list of facilities that have notified the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) of Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) activities. Any company or person storing, transporting or disposing of PCBs or conducting PCB research and development must notify the EPA and receive an identification number.

Government Publication Date: Jan 20, 2022

State

Dry Cleaning Facilities: DRYCLEANERS

A list of drycleaner related facilities that have EPA ID numbers. These are facilities with certain SIC codes: power laundries, family and commercial, linen supply, commercial laundry, dry cleaning and pressing machines - Coin Operated Laundry and Dry Cleaning. This is provided by the Department of Toxic Substance Control.

Government Publication Date: Dec 20, 2021

Delisted Drycleaners: DELISTED DRYCLEANERS

Sites removed from the list of drycleaner related facilities that have EPA ID numbers, made available by the California Department of Toxic Substance Control.

Government Publication Date: Feb 28, 2020

Non-Toxic Dry Cleaning Incentive Program: DRYC GRANT

A list of grant recipients of the Non-Toxic Dry Cleaning Incentive Program made available by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The program provides grants to eligible dry cleaning businesses to assist them in transitioning away from PERC machines to alternative non-toxic and non-smog forming technologies.

Government Publication Date: Feb 28, 2020

Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS): PFAS

List of sites from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)'s GeoTracker at which one or more of the potential contaminants of concern are in the PFAS Master List of PFAS Substances made available by the Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA).

Government Publication Date: Feb 15, 2022

PFOA/PFOS Groundwater: PFAS GW

A list of water wells from the Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment Program (GAMA) Groundwater Information System with the groundwater chemical perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) (NL = 0.014 UG/L) or perfluorooctanoic sulfonate (PFOS) (NL = 0.013 UG/L). The GAMA Groundwater Information System search is made available by California Water Boards.

Government Publication Date: Apr 27, 2022

Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup: HWSS CLEANUP

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. This list is published by California Department of Toxic Substance Control.

Government Publication Date: May 20, 2021

Toxic Pit Cleanup Act Sites: TOXIC PITS

The Toxic Pits Cleanup Act (TPCA) list identifies sites suspected of containing hazardous substances where cleanup has not yet been completed. This list was maintained by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), is not longer maintained, and updates are not planned.

Government Publication Date: Jul 1, 1995

List of Hazardous Waste Facilities Subject to Corrective Action: DTSC HWF

This is a list of hazardous waste facilities identified in Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 25187.5. These facilities are those where Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has taken or contracted for corrective action because a facility owner/operator has failed to comply with a date for taking corrective action in an order issued under HSC § 25187, or because DTSC determined that immediate corrective action was necessary to abate an imminent or substantial endangerment.

Government Publication Date: Jul 18, 2016

EnviroStor Inspection, Compliance, and Enforcement: INSP COMP ENF

A list of permitted facilities with inspections and enforcements tracked in the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) EnviroStor.

Government Publication Date: Apr 29, 2021

School Property Evaluation Program Sites: SCH

A list of sites registered with The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) School Property Evaluation and Cleanup (SPEC) Division. SPEC is responsible for assessing, investigating and cleaning up proposed school sites. The Division ensures that selected properties are free of contamination or, if the properties were previously contaminated, that they have been cleaned up to a level that protects the students and staff who will occupy the new school.

Government Publication Date: Jan 6, 2022

California Hazardous Material Incident Report System (CHMIRS): CHMIRS

A list of reported hazardous material incidents, spills, and releases from the California Hazardous Material Incident Report System (CHMIRS). This list has been made available by the California Office of Emergency Services (OES).

Government Publication Date: Feb 8, 2022

Historical California Hazardous Material Incident Report System (CHMIRS): HIST CHMIRS

A list of reported hazardous material incidents, spills, and releases from the California Hazardous Material Incident Report System (CHMIRS) prior to 1993. This list has been made available by the California Office of Emergency Services (OES).

Government Publication Date: Jan 1, 1993

Hazardous Waste Manifest Data: HAZNET

A list of hazardous waste manifests received each year by Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). The volume of manifests is typically 900,000 - 1,000,000 annually, representing approximately 450,000 - 500,000 shipments.

Government Publication Date: Oct 24, 2016

Historical Hazardous Waste Manifest Data: HIST MANIFEST

A list of historic hazardous waste manifests received by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) from year the 1980 to 1992. The volume of manifests is typically 900,000 - 1,000,000 annually, representing approximately 450,000 - 500,000 shipments.

Government Publication Date: Dec 31, 1992

DTSC Registered Hazardous Waste Transporters: HW TRANSPORT

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains this list of Registered Hazardous Waste Transporters.

Government Publication Date: Oct 19, 2020

Registered Waste Tire Haulers: WASTE TIRE

This list of registered waste tire haulers is maintained by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

Government Publication Date: Apr 12, 2022

California Medical Waste Management Program Facility List: MEDICAL WASTE

This list of Medical Waste Management Program Facilities is maintained by the California Department of Public Health. The Medical Waste Management Program (MWMP) regulates the generation, handling, storage, treatment, and disposal of medical waste by providing oversight for the implementation of the Medical Waste Management Act (MWMA). The MWMP permits and inspects all medical waste off-site treatment facilities, medical waste transporters, and medical waste transfer stations. This list contains transporters, treatment, and transfer facilities.

Government Publication Date: Dec 31, 2020

Historical Cortese List: HIST CORTESE

List of sites which were once included on the Cortese list. The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements for providing information about the location of hazardous sites.

Government Publication Date: Nov 13, 2008

Cease and Desist Orders and Cleanup and Abatement Orders: CDO/CAO

The California Environment Protection Agency "Cortese List" of active Cease and Desist Orders (CDO) and Cleanup and Abatement Orders (CAO). This list contains many CDOs and CAOs that do NOT concern the discharge of wastes that are hazardous materials. Many of the listed orders concern, as examples, discharges of domestic sewage, food processing wastes, or sediment that do not contain hazardous materials, but the Water Boards' database does not distinguish between these types of orders.

Government Publication Date: Dec 6, 2021

California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) Hazardous Waste Sites: CERS HAZ

List of sites in the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) Regulated Site Portal which fall under the following regulatory programs: Hazardous Chemical Management, Hazardous Waste Onsite Treatment, Household Hazardous Waste Collection, Hazardous Waste Generator, RCRA LQ HW Generator. The CalEPA oversees the statewide implementation of the Unified Program which applies regulatory standards to protect Californians from hazardous waste and materials.

Government Publication Date: Apr 5, 2022

Delisted Environmental Reporting System (CERS) Hazardous Waste Sites: DELISTED HAZ

This database contains a list of sites that were removed from the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) in the following regulatory programs: Hazardous Chemical Management, Hazardous Waste Onsite Treatment, Household Hazardous Waste Collection, Hazardous Waste Generator, RCRA LQ HW Generator.

Government Publication Date: Nov 29, 2018

Sites in GeoTracker: GEOTRACKER

GeoTracker is the State Water Resource Control Boards' data management system for sites that impact, or have the potential to impact, water quality in California, with emphasis on groundwater. This is a list of sites in GeoTracker that aren't otherwise categorized as LUST, Land Disposal Sites (LDS), Cleanup Sites, or sites having Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR). This listing includes program types such as Underground Injection Control (UIC), Confined Animal Facilities (CAF), Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, plans, and non-case information.

Government Publication Date: Feb 15, 2022

Mines Listing: MINE

This list includes mine site locations extracted from the Mines Online database, maintained by the California Department of Conservation. Mines Online (MOL) is an interactive web map designed with GIS features that provide information such as the mine name, mine status, commodity sold, location, and other mine specific data. Please note: Mine location information is provided to assist experts in determining the location of mine operators in accordance with California Civil Code section 1103.4 and reflects information reported by mine operators in annual reports provided under Public Resources Code section 2207. While the Division of Mine Reclamation (DMR) attempts to populate MOL with accurate location information, the DMR cannot guarantee the accuracy of operator reported location information.

Government Publication Date: Dec 17, 2021

Recorded Environmental Cleanup Liens: LIEN

The California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) maintains this list of liens placed upon real properties. A lien is utilized by the DTSC to obtain reimbursement from responsible parties for costs associated with the remediation of contaminated properties.

Government Publication Date: May 4, 2022

Waste Discharge Requirements: WASTE DISCHG

List of sites in California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Program in California, made available by the SWRCB via GeoTracker. The WDR program regulates point discharges that are exempt pursuant to Subsection 20090 of Title 27 and not subject to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The scope of the WDRs Program also includes the discharge of wastes classified as inert, pursuant to section 20230 of Title 27.

Government Publication Date: Feb 15, 2022

Toxic Pollutant Emissions Facilities: EMISSIONS

A list of criteria and toxic pollutant emissions data for facilities in California made available by the California Environmental Protection Agency - Air Resources Board (ARB). Risk data may be based on previous inventory submittals. The toxics data are submitted to the ARB by the local air districts as requirement of the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program. This program requires emission inventory updates every four years.

Government Publication Date: Dec 31, 2019

Clandestine Drug Lab Sites: CDL

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a listing of drug lab sites. DTSC is responsible for removal and disposal of hazardous substances discovered by law enforcement officials while investigating illegal/clandestine drug laboratories.

Government Publication Date: Jan 19, 2021

Tribal

No Tribal additional environmental record sources available for this State.

County

No County additional environmental databases were selected to be included in the search.

Definitions

Database Descriptions: This section provides a detailed explanation for each database including: source, information available, time coverage, and acronyms used. They are listed in alphabetic order.

Detail Report: This is the section of the report which provides the most detail for each individual record. Records are summarized by location, starting with the project property followed by records in closest proximity.

Distance: The distance value is the distance between plotted points, not necessarily the distance between the sites' boundaries. All values are an approximation.

Direction: The direction value is the compass direction of the site in respect to the project property and/or center point of the report.

Elevation: The elevation value is taken from the location at which the records for the site address have been plotted. All values are an approximation. Source: Google Elevation API.

Executive Summary: This portion of the report is divided into 3 sections:

'Report Summary'- Displays a chart indicating how many records fall on the project property and, within the report search radii.

'Site Report Summary'-Project Property'- This section lists all the records which fall on the project property. For more details, see the 'Detail Report' section.

'Site Report Summary-Surrounding Properties'- This section summarizes all records on adjacent properties, listing them in order of proximity from the project property. For more details, see the 'Detail Report' section.

Map Key: The map key number is assigned according to closest proximity from the project property. Map Key numbers always start at #1. The project property will always have a map key of '1' if records are available. If there is a number in brackets beside the main number, this will indicate the number of records on that specific property. If there is no number in brackets, there is only one record for that property.

The symbol and colour used indicates 'elevation': the red inverted triangle will dictate 'ERIS Sites with Lower Elevation', the yellow triangle will dictate 'ERIS Sites with Higher Elevation' and the orange square will dictate 'ERIS Sites with Same Elevation.'

Unplottables: These are records that could not be mapped due to various reasons, including limited geographic information. These records may or may not be in your study area, and are included as reference.

APPENDIX C
REGULATORY AGENCY RECORDS

From: DEH, Public Records <PublicRecords.DEH@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 1:54 PM
To: danw@cyaforensics.com
Subject: Records Request - APN 600-101-04 & -05-00

Good Afternoon,

No requested records were found for the provided APNs.

New Search Function: Scanned files for closed Site Assessment and Mitigation Program cases and Monitoring Well Program permits can be downloaded directly through the new DEH Document Library at:

http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/deh/doclibrary/

You can search by Record ID, APN, address, document category, or keyword.

Thank you,

Edwin C. Andrus
Edwin C. Andrus
Office Support Specialist
DEHQ – ADMIN

Help us make sure our customers have a positive experience. Please take 60 seconds to provide us with your feedback.

From: danw@cyaforensics.com <danw@cyaforensics.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 1:06 PM
To: DEH, Public Records <PublicRecords.DEH@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] Public Records Requests

Hello. Please see the attached public records requests. Thanks in advance for processing these.

Dan

Dan Weis
Project Manager
C Young Associates
760.672.6338
danw@cyaforensics.com

Request # _____

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
P.O. BOX 129261, SAN DIEGO, CA 92112-9261
(858) 505-6700 FAX (858) 505-6848
www.sdcdeh.org

PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST FOR THE SITE ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION (SAM) PROGRAM AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS DIVISION (HMD)

Requestor Name: Dan Weis **E-Mail:** danw@cyaforensics.com

Phone: 760-672-6338 **FAX:**

Company Name: C Young Associates

Mailing Address: 1042 Skylark Drive, San Diego CA 92037

(You may attach a business card/overprint with business card if preferred)

Additional information may be accessed from the DEH website, www.sdcdeh.org. Fax or email your completed form to the Public Records Program at (858) 505-6848 or PublicRecords.DEH@sdcounty.ca.gov. The following information is required. Separate forms are needed for each address or parcel number.

_____ **or** **600-101-04**

Exact Address (Street, City and Zip Code) Assessor Parcel Number

Optional information (establishment permit number, business name, etc.):

Please indicate the purpose of your search by checking all that apply:

☒ Contaminated Property Investigation(s) (SAM Cases) ☒ Monitoring Well Files

☒ SAM Closure Letter/Report

☒ Hazardous Materials Permit & Underground Storage Tank Files (HMD/UST)

☐ Other (specify):

27

OFFICE USE ONLY BELOW THIS LINE

Files reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Files copied for: _____ Date: _____

Request cancelled by: _____ Date: _____

Photocopies _____ Cost _____ E-mailed / picked up / mailed on _____ By _____

A search for DEH records checked above has been conducted and the following apply:

☐ SAM files for the permit number(s) listed below are available.

#_____ #_____ #_____ #_____ #_____

☐ HMD/UST files for the permit number(s) listed below are available.

#_____ #_____ #_____ #_____ #_____

☐ LMWP files for the permit number(s) listed below are available.

#_____ #_____ #_____ #_____ #_____

☐ No SAM/HMD/UST records were found / purged for the address/APN you requested.

_____ _____

Signature - DEH Representative Date

DEH complies fully with the California Public Records Act and the Federal Freedom of Information Act. Please be advised that photocopy and/or scanned file fees may apply.

Request # _____

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
P.O. BOX 129261, SAN DIEGO, CA 92112-9261
(858) 505-6700 FAX (858) 505-6848
www.sdcdeh.org

PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST FOR THE SITE ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION (SAM) PROGRAM AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS DIVISION (HMD)

Requestor Name: Dan Weis **E-Mail:** danw@cyaforensics.com

Phone: 760-672-6338 **FAX:**

Company Name: C Young Associates

Mailing Address: 1042 Skylark Drive, San Diego CA 92037

(You may attach a business card/overprint with business card if preferred)

Additional information may be accessed from the DEH website, www.sdcdeh.org. Fax or email your completed form to the Public Records Program at (858) 505-6848 or PublicRecords.DEH@sdcounty.ca.gov. The following information is required. Separate forms are needed for each address or parcel number.

_____ **or** **600-101-05**

Exact Address (Street, City and Zip Code) Assessor Parcel Number

Optional information (establishment permit number, business name, etc.):

Please indicate the purpose of your search by checking all that apply:

☒ Contaminated Property Investigation(s) (SAM Cases) ☒ Monitoring Well Files

☒ SAM Closure Letter/Report

☒ Hazardous Materials Permit & Underground Storage Tank Files (HMD/UST)

☐ Other (specify):

27

OFFICE USE ONLY BELOW THIS LINE

Files reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Files copied for: _____ Date: _____

Request cancelled by: _____ Date: _____

Photocopies _____ Cost _____ E-mailed / picked up / mailed on _____ By _____

A search for DEH records checked above has been conducted and the following apply:

☐ SAM files for the permit number(s) listed below are available.

#_____ #_____ #_____ #_____ #_____

☐ HMD/UST files for the permit number(s) listed below are available.

#_____ #_____ #_____ #_____ #_____

☐ LMWP files for the permit number(s) listed below are available.

#_____ #_____ #_____ #_____ #_____

☐ No SAM/HMD/UST records were found / purged for the address/APN you requested.

_____ _____

Signature - DEH Representative Date

DEH complies fully with the California Public Records Act and the Federal Freedom of Information Act. Please be advised that photocopy and/or scanned file fees may apply.

APPENDIX D
PHOTOGRAPHS



1. Site from NW Corner Looking SE



2. Site from NW Corner Looking East



3. Site from Northern Boundary Looking South



4. Site from Northern Boundary Looking West



5. Site from Northern Boundary Looking SW



6. North-Central Portion of Site



7. Site and adjacent Open Space Looking North



8. Site and adjacent Open Space Looking NE



9. Site and adjacent Open Space Looking East



10. Site and adjacent Open Space Looking SE



11. Site and adjacent Open Space Looking South



12. Site and adjacent Open Space Looking SW



13. Peak of Site Looking NW



14. Site and adjacent Open Space Looking SW



15. Site and adjacent Residential Properties Looking West



16. Site and adjacent Residential Properties Looking West



17. Site and adjacent Residential Properties Looking NW



18. Site and adjacent Residential Properties Looking NW

APPENDIX E
INTERVIEW QUESTIONAIRRE

C Young Associates
Due Diligence Environmental Questionnaire - *OWNER*

Project Name/Location: Honey Springs Jamul CA

APNs: 600-101-05-00

Completed by: Simi Rush

Company or Organization: Willis Allen Real Estate

Title: Realtor

Date: 5/19/22 @ 12:15 pm via phone with Martha Slee

Please email completed questionnaire to colin@cyaforensics.com

1.) Who is the current owner of the subject property and when was it purchased?

Martha Slee - current owner
Quit claimed June 8, 1990
original purchase as joint owners approx. 1980

2.) Who are the past owners of the property and years of ownership (if available)?

Richard Slee
Martha A Slee, jointly

3.) What was the past use of the subject property?

Vacant land, no known other usage

4.) Are you aware of any environmental cleanup liens that are filed or recorded against the subject property?

No

5.) Are you aware of any activity and land use limitations that are in place on the property that have been filed or recorded in a registry?

No

6.) Are you aware of any specialized knowledge or experience related to the property or nearby properties that is pertinent to potential adverse environmental conditions?

No

7.) Are you aware of commonly known or reasonably obtainable information that would help C Young Associates to identify conditions indicative of releases or threatened releases of hazardous wastes/materials at the property? Such information includes knowledge of specific chemicals that are present or were once present on the property, spills or other chemicals releases that may have occurred, underground or aboveground storage tanks and environmental cleanups that have been conducted on the property.

No

8.) Based on your knowledge and experience related to the property, are there any obvious indicators that point to the presence or likely presence of contamination at the property?

No.

Please email completed questionnaire to colin@cyaforensics.com

APPENDIX F
QUALIFICATIONS

COLIN P. YOUNG, CIH

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY

Current

- C Young Associates (CYA), La Jolla, California, 1996-2000, 2003, 01/2009-Present

Previous

- ERM-West, Inc., San Diego, California, Partner-Managing Principal, San Diego Office, 12/03-01/09
- Geocon, Inc., San Diego, California, Vice President/Southern California Operations Manager, 2000-2003, Project Manager/ Marketing Coordinator, 1989-1991
- Metcalf & Eddy, Inc., San Diego, California, Associate/Business Manager-Environmental Services Division, October 1994-1996
- University of California, San Diego (UCSD), Instructor for Occupational Medicine/Public Health & Safety Extension Certificate Program, 1992-2003
- Brown & Root Environmental/Halliburton NUS Corporation
  - San Diego, California, West Region Manager-Western Division Operations, 1991-1993
  - Boston, Massachusetts, U.S. EPA, Region 1 FIT Public Health Specialist, 1982-1985
- Westec Services, Inc./ERCE, San Diego, California, Project Manager/ Manager of Corporate Health & Safety, 1986-1989

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE and QUALIFICATIONS-Academic

- UCSD, Course Instructor for Occupational Medicine Certificate Program, *Industrial Hygiene for the Occupational Health Nurse*, 1992-1995
- UCSD, Course Instructor for Occupational Health & Safety/ Hazardous Materials Certificate Program, *Principles in Industrial Hygiene*, 1995-2003

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE and QUALIFICATIONS-Technical

Industrial Hygiene

Provide, or have provided, forensic investigation, human health assessment and exposure/injury prevention related services, including the performance of "sick-building"/indoor air quality evaluations, worker exposure assessments, biological contamination (e.g., bioaerosol/mold) studies, litigation support, workers' comp. investigations, asbestos and lead assessments, industrial process safety evaluations, health & safety training and support programs for environmental, hazardous waste, industrial and construction projects and activities. Services have been provided to legal, insurance, industrial, commercial and governmental (e.g., Navy, DOE, regulatory, etc.) clients, alike. Experience representations are summarized, as follows:

- Provide technical and risk management counsel on civil and exposure/toxic tort matters involving alleged environmental impairment and human exposures to hazardous materials, including chemicals and bioaerosols. To date, approximately 200 legal matters have been

C YOUNG ASSOCIATES
1042 Skylark Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
Cell: (858) 945-7029
E-Mail: colin@cyaforensics.com

supported.

- Provided industrial hygiene/health & safety support and programs for more than 400 environmental and hazardous waste investigations and remediation programs for the US EPA and private entities. Typical projects involved the handling of, and/or potential for exposure to, biological contaminants, fuel and chlorinated hydrocarbons, pesticides, PCBs, asbestos, lead and explosive materials.
- Performed numerous surveys of commercial, industrial and residential structures believed to contain unhealthy and/or potentially hazardous indoor air-quality conditions, including chemical and bioaerosol intrusion.
- Performed numerous industrial process safety evaluations in support of both Workers' Compensation claim-reduction (i.e., limitation of liability) programs and impending Workers' Compensation claims. The services have been provided for the benefit of employers, property owners and business/property insurers and legal counsel.
- Provided training and developed corporate health and safety programs for more than thirty industrial facilities, environmental laboratories and/or engineering consulting firms.
- Performed a Job Safety Analysis (JSA) of more than 300 aerospace manufacturing processes in support of the company's existing and developing Industrial Health & Safety Program.
- Developed and managed a complex health and safety program for a multi-million dollar remediation project for the Department of Energy at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The remedial and site safety program innovatively employed the use of remotely operated vehicles (i.e., submarines) to retrieve and decommission over 7000 containers of explosive, water-reactive and radiologically-contaminated materials.
- Developed and managed a health & safety/quality assurance-quality control (QA/QC) program for a study involving the assessment of 15 uncontrolled disposal sites at the Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS) in China Lake, California. The studies evaluated the degree of environmental impact from chemical, biological and live ordnance wastes in the (typical) 115°F area climate.
- Contributed to the development of health and safety Standard Operating Procedures and training protocols currently used by each of the U.S. EPA FIT, Zone 1 offices.

Environmental Engineering

Provide, or have provided, forensic studies, environmental site assessments; remediation programs; environmental litigation support, and; regulatory compliance support and permitting.

- Developed and managed a multimillion-dollar burn dump remediation project for a client who was redeveloping a former Navy facility. Provided project management and oversight, data interpretation, training, and HASP development. The contaminants of concern include burn ash, lead, asbestos, PCBs, chlorinated and/or petroleum hydrocarbons.
- Managed multiple environmental assessments and mitigation programs of former

C YOUNG ASSOCIATES
1042 Skylark Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
Cell: (858) 945-7029
E-Mail: colin@cyaforensics.com

agricultural properties. Many possessed impairment by the historic and legal application of pesticides and/or natural occurrence of arsenic. In all situations, the impairment was managed on-site by controlled burial of the impaired soils, resulting in no need for costly or wasteful removal, transport and treatment/disposal of the same.

- Provided technical support for an underground storage tank (UST) investigation at San Diego International Airport's (Lindbergh Field) tank farm. The project was performed for the local Port Authority and involved the in situ inspection of the interior of numerous fuel tanks throughout the fuel farm. This activity required the use of Level B PPE in confined space environments.
- Provided management of a million-dollar environmental design contract for Naval Public Works Center (PWC), San Diego, California. Services included the development of SPCC Plans, preparation of RCRA Part B permits, performance of cathodic protection evaluations and the design of TSD facilities.
- Planned and managed a multitude of UST investigations for the Department of Defense at MCB Camp Pendleton, North Island NAS and 32nd Street Naval Station, California. The results of each investigation were used to develop remediation specifications for MCON projects planned at each site. The remedial programs were subsequently implemented using fixed or unit-cost pricing structures dependent on the prepared specifications. Remediation technologies applied included controlled aeration, vapor extraction (VES), pump and treat, and dig and dispose. All of the projects were performed either on or under budget.
- Provided operations management of a multi-million dollar fuel recovery/remediation project at the fuel farm at Naval Air Station North Island (NASNI), California. Ground water at the site had been impaired by a 2-3 foot thick layer of fuel hydrocarbon, released from a multitude of concrete USTs on the base. The remediation technology applied to date included pump and treat.
- Provided Delivery Order management of a large-scale asbestos survey project at Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado for Southwest Division NAVFACENGCOM.
- Planned and managed an assessment and remediation project at Fire Fighting Training Areas at Pacific Missile Test Center (PMTC) in Point Mugu and CBC Port Hueneme, California, for the Western Division NAVFACENGCOM. The remedial programs were subsequently implemented using fixed or unit-cost pricing structures dependent on the prepared specifications. Remediation technologies applied included VES and dig and dispose. Each of the projects was performed under budget.
- Removed and performed an investigation of multiple USTs located on agricultural property owned by the Viejas Indian Reservation. The property is slated for Casino and Resort expansion.
- Performed a UST investigation at several commercial service stations. Determined MTBE impacts to beneficial-use ground water. Data used to initiate a ground water investigation and remediation plans.
- Provided environmental support and waste characterization services for engineering (i.e.,

C YOUNG ASSOCIATES
1042 Skylark Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
Cell: (858) 945-7029
E-Mail: colin@cyaforensics.com

clean-out) projects performed within lead-impacted storm water basins throughout San Diego County.

- Provided technical and environmental management support for numerous engineering projects performed within lead-impacted areas along the highways of Orange County. Formulated a Lead Management Plan for the engineering/utility contractor providing the construction services for Caltrans.
- Provided environmental compliance support services to supplement an aerospace manufacturing company's environmental department. Products supported include the Hazardous Materials Business Plan, Storm Water Pollution Prevention (SWPP) Plan, Underground Storage Tank (UST) Program, Compliance Audit Program, etc.
- Providing environmental support to the owners of a property involved in litigation over the condemnation of the property by the local municipality acquisition.

ACADEMIC HISTORY

- University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, B.S., School of Environmental Science and Public Health, 1982
- Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts, Certificate of Risk Analysis in Environmental Health, 1985

PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATIONS

- Certified Industrial Hygienist (CIH) No. 3987, American Board of Industrial Hygiene (ABIH), 1988; Recertified 1995, 2001, 2006, 2011, 2015
- Certified Safety Specialist/Executive (CSS/CSE), World Safety Organization (WSO), 1986 (inactive)
- AHERA-Certified Asbestos Inspector-California No. 855, U.S. EPA/UC Berkeley, 1989 (inactive)

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

- Certificate in Professional Engineering Practice, ASFE/Institute for Professional Practice, 1990
  - Program Facilitator, 1991
- Professional "Loss Prevention" Training, ASFE, 1989
- Professional Management Training, Management Action Programs (MAP), 1990
- HazWOpER (29CFR 1910.120) Training, 1982; - Trainer, 1986-Present
- Guidelines for the Assessment of Microbiological Contamination, AIHA, 2002

PUBLICATIONS

- Fung M.D., F. Y., Young CIH, C. P., Mold-Associated Asthma, IAQ 2001, ASHRAE

C YOUNG ASSOCIATES
1042 Skylark Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
Cell: (858) 945-7029
E-Mail: colin@cyaforensics.com

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATION HISTORY

- American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA), Fairfax, VA
- American Academy of Industrial Hygiene (AAIH), Lansing, MI
- American Lung Association, San Diego and Imperial Counties, CA, Member-Board of Directors, 2002-2006, Board Chair 2006
- ASFE, Silver Spring, MD
  - "Loss Prevention Education" Committee (1990-1991)
- American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE)
- Association for Environmental Health and Sciences (AEHS), Amherst, MA
- American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH), Cincinnati, OH
- Institute for Professional Practice (IPP), Silver Spring, MD
- Society of American Military Engineers (SAME), San Diego, CA
- American Indoor Air Quality Council

C YOUNG ASSOCIATES
1042 Skylark Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
Cell: (858) 945-7029
E-Mail: colin@cyaforensics.com

DANIEL A. WEIS, R.E.H.S.

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY

Current

- C Young Associates (CYA), La Jolla, California, Senior Associate/Technical Advisor, 01/2009-Present
- Weis Environmental, Carlsbad, California, Environmental Manager, 8/2020-Present

Previous

- Advantage Environmental Consultants, San Marcos, California, Branch Manager, 11/2005-8/2020
- Rincon Consultants, Carlsbad, California, Project Manager, 11/2003-11/2005
- Geocon, Inc., San Diego, California, Project Manager, 11/2001-11/2003
- Geosoils, Inc., Carlsbad, California, Field Technician, 11/1999-11/2001

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE SUMMARY

Twenty-one years of experience in the environmental sciences consulting field. Responsibilities include client development and management, project management, technical oversight and quality control for assessment, and remediation and construction oversight services. Clients include, but are not limited to, local government entities, developers (affordable housing and market rate), Federal government entities, law firms, architectural and engineering firms, commercial lending institutions, conservancies, commercial/industrial real estate owners/managers, insurance companies, wireless telecommunication carriers and other real estate developers. Experienced in the completion of assessment, construction and remediation quality assurance during the completion of urban redevelopment/brownfields projects, many of which have been located in downtown areas of San Diego, Los Angeles, Oakland, San Francisco, and other urban communities throughout the State of California.

Completed or managed over 2,500 due diligence related environmental assessments and completed or managed over 500 subsurface environmental investigations of soil gas, soil, groundwater and other media. Investigations have included human health and ecological risk assessments, evaluations of indoor air conditions based on interpretations of subsurface conditions, underground storage tank (UST) evaluation/closure and hazardous waste characterization/management. Subsurface activities performed include the completion of soil borings using various drilling technologies, soil and groundwater sampling, installation and sampling of groundwater monitoring wells, free product evaluations, exploratory trenching and real-time delineation using mobile analytical laboratories and other soil screening technology. Assets evaluated include industrial, commercial, residential, agricultural and vacant land sites throughout the State of California and numerous other states, with many of the assessments completed under the regulatory oversight of local environmental regulatory agencies, the California Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) and the California Environmental Protection Agency Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Has also conducted and/or managed hundreds of public/environmental health related assessments including electromagnetic field surveys, radionuclide surveys, indoor air quality investigations, radon surveys, drinking water assessments,

C YOUNG ASSOCIATES
1042 Skylark Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
Cell: (760) 672-6338
E-Mail: danw@cyaforensics.com

asbestos containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP) surveys and mold/microbial evaluations.

Managed over 100 remediation or construction management related projects primarily related to source removal of subsurface contaminants, including but not limited to, petroleum hydrocarbons, chlorinated solvents, heavy metals, organochlorine pesticides and other agricultural related chemicals, dioxins and furans and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Has also assisted in cost recovery efforts from private parties and State/Federal funding programs for environmental assessment and remediation work and has served as an expert witness during legal proceedings pertaining to environmental related claims.

SPECIFIC PROJECT EXPERIENCE (COMPLETED WITH VARIOUS FIRMS)

- 14th and Island, San Diego, California – Development of Site Mitigation Plan, contaminated soil management and disposal concurrent with site construction activities at the superblock construction site in downtown San Diego and achievement of regulatory closure with the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health.
- 2198 Market Street, San Francisco, California – Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments, supplemental subsurface investigation, Site Mitigation Plan development, contaminated soil management and disposal concurrent with site construction activities and negotiation/achievement of regulatory closure with the City of San Francisco Department of Public Health.
- Former EZ Serve, 9305 Mission Gorge Road, Santee, California – Closure report preparation and San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board interface and negotiation/achievement of regulatory closure under State of California low-threat policy.
- French Field – Former Vista Burn Dump, Oceanside, California – Oversight of the capping of a former burn dump/landfill facility and restoration for public use as a sports facility. Negotiation and achievement of regulatory closure with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control with concurrence from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board and the County of San Diego Local Enforcement Agency.
- Indoor Skydiving Facility, 1401 Imperial Avenue, San Diego, California – Development of Soil Management Plan and contaminated soil management and disposal concurrent with site construction activities in downtown San Diego.
- Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment Project, Lemon Grove, California – Development of Impacted Soil Management Plan, Community Health and Safety Plan and Worker Health and Safety Plan and oversight of the implementation of such plans during construction activities.
- North Side Interior Road and Utilities Project at San Diego International Airport, San Diego, California - Subsurface assessment, development of Soil Management Plan and Work Health and Safety Plan and implementation and monitoring of soil management strategies.
- Olympic and Hill, Los Angeles, California – Removal of multiple underground storage tanks and underlying contaminated soil and achievement of regulatory closure with the City of Los Angeles Fire Department.
- San Ysidro - U.S. Land Port of Entry, San Diego, California – Subsurface assessment and development and implementation of soil management strategies.

C YOUNG ASSOCIATES
1042 Skylark Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
Cell: (760) 672-6338
E-Mail: danw@cyaforensics.com

- Tabata Ranch Site, Carlsbad, California – Development of Soil Management Plan and Community Health and Safety Plan, completion of soil removal action of petroleum hydrocarbon impacted soil, oversight and management of selective reuse and replacement of pesticide impacted soil and subsequent export of inert soils and achievement of regulatory closure with the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health. Consent to discharge inert soils at an off-site receiving location was granted by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- VA Medical Center Long Beach, 5901 East 7th Street, Long Beach, California - VA Long Beach: Seismic Corrections – Mental Health, Community Living Center and Chiller Replacements Project – Asbestos containing materials and lead-based paint surveys and preparation of abatement contractor bid specifications.

EDUCATION

- Bachelor of Arts - University of Delaware, Newark, DE (1995)
- Master of Science – Public Health, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA (1998)

PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATIONS, LICENSES, AND CERTIFICATIONS

- Registered Environmental Health Specialist #8172 in the State of California
- OSHA 40-hour Hazardous Waste Operations Worker and Supervisor Certifications and Annual Refreshers

PUBLICATIONS

- Gersberg, R.M., Brown, C., Zambrano, V., Worthington, K., and Weis, D. (2000) Quality of urban runoff in the Tijuana River watershed. In Westerhoff, P. (editors), SCERP Monograph Series (no.2) on Water Issues Along the United States and Mexico Border. : Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy, 31-45.
- Weis, D.A., Callaway, J.C., and R.M. Gersberg (2001). Vertical Accretion Rates and Heavy Metal Chronologies in Wetland Sediments of the Tijuana Estuary. Estuaries 24(6A).
- Gersberg, R.M., Pitt, J.L., Weis, D.A., and D.D. Yorkey. Characterizing In-Stream Metal Loading in the Tijuana River Watershed. (2002). National TMDL Science and Policy Conference, Specialty Conference Proceeding on CD Rom, November 13-16, Phoenix, Arizona

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

- Building Industry Association
- San Diego Environmental Professionals
- San Diego Housing Federation

C YOUNG ASSOCIATES
1042 Skylark Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
Cell: (760) 672-6338
E-Mail: danw@cyaforensics.com

ANDREW POTTER, CCB
EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ROOM 402, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-2422
(619) 531-5600

RYAN SHARP
ASSISTANT CLERK

ANN MOORE
ASSISTANT CLERK

August 6, 2025

TO: Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer, Chair
Supervisor Monica Montgomery Steppe, Vice-Chair
Supervisor Paloma Aguirre
Supervisor Joel Anderson
Supervisor Jim Desmond

FROM: Andrew Potter
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

REFERRAL

Attached for your information, is correspondence from Jennifer M. Norris PhD, Executive Director of California Wildlife Conservation Board, regarding consideration of the allocation of a grant to Escondido Creek Conservancy, and allocation of funds for a grant to San Diego Bay Salt Marsh Enhancement (Project ID: 2025059).

Respectfully,

ANDREW POTTER

Attachment

cc: Ebony N. Shelton, Chief Administrative Officer
Dahvia Lynch, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Land Use & Environment Group
Board of Supervisors Communications Received

AJP:sh

Docusign Envelope ID: 1814F9F1-0082-43FE-99F7-6521DEBBB7A1

California WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, California 94244-2090
www.wcb.ca.gov
(916) 445-8448

San Diego County Board of Supervisors
1600 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA. 92101
PublicComment@sdcounty.ca.gov

WHITE ATTERBURY
SAN DIEGO COUNTY
PROJECT ID: 2024105

Dear Board Members:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), through the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB), is involved in a land acquisition program focused on the long-range protection and enhancement of habitat for fish and wildlife. The CDFW identifies sites considered for acquisition in response to public interest, legislative mandate and departmental goals.

I am writing to advise you that the WCB will consider the allocation of a grant to The Escondido Creek Conservancy to assist in its acquisition of 160± acres of land for the preservation and enhancement of wildlife habitat located in San Diego County and identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 222-190-09-00, 222-190-11-00, 222-190-10-00, 222- 180-41-00, 222-121-27-00, 222-121-05-00, 222-121-39-00, and 222-121-08-00. The proposal is scheduled to be presented at the August 28, 2025, Board meeting. An electronic copy of the preliminary agenda is available for your review at www.wcb.ca.gov under News and Announcements. A more complete description of each proposal will be contained in the final meeting Agenda, which will be available at www.wcb.ca.gov ten days prior to the Board meeting.

If you have any questions about this proposal or need additional information, please feel free to contact us at (916) 445-8448.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
Jennifer Norris
F2A457B0E7174C7...

Jennifer M. Norris, PhD
Executive Director

Enclosure(s)

ec: The Honorable Brian W. Jones
senator.jones@senate.ca.gov

The Honorable Dr. Darshana Patel
assemblymember.patel@assembly.ca.gov

Erinn Wilson-Olgin, Regional Manager
CDFW, South Coast Region (5)

Docusign Envelope ID: 1814F9F1-0082-43FE-99F7-6521DEBBB7A1

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, California 94244-2090
www.wcb.ca.gov
(916) 445-8448

San Diego County Board of Supervisors
1600 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA. 92101
publiccomment@sdcounty.ca.gov

PROJECT FOR CONSIDERATION IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY

Dear Board Members:

The Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB), in addition to other responsibilities, carries out a program that includes the enhancement or restoration of fish and wildlife habitat, as well as the development of public access facilities for hunting, fishing or other wildlife-oriented recreational uses.

WCB proposes to consider the allocation of funds for a grant to one project in San Diego County at the next scheduled Board meeting on August 28, 2025. The project below is listed on the Preliminary Agenda, available for your review at www.wcb.ca.gov under News and Announcements.

- San Diego Bay Salt Marsh Enhancement (Project ID: 2025059)

A more complete description of the project will be contained in the final meeting Agenda, which will be available at www.wcb.ca.gov ten days prior to the Board meeting.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at (916) 212-5637.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
Jennifer Norris
F2A457B0E7174C7...

Jennifer M. Norris, PhD
Executive Director

Docusign Envelope ID: 1814F9F1-0082-43FE-99F7-6521DEBBB7A1

Enclosure(s)

ec: The Honorable Steve Padilla
senator.padilla@senate.ca.gov

The Honorable Akilah Weber Pierson
senator.pierson@senate.ca.gov

The Honorable Tasha Boerner
assemblymember.boerner@assembly.ca.gov

The Honorable David A. Alvarez
assemblymember.alvarez@assembly.ca.gov

Erinn Wilson-Olgin, Regional Manager
CDFW, South Coast Region (5)

Docusign Envelope ID: 1814F9F1-0082-43FE-99F7-6521DEBBB7A1

California WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, California 94244-2090
www.wcb.ca.gov
(916) 445-8448

San Diego County Board of Supervisors
1600 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA. 92101
publiccomment@sdcounty.ca.gov

ELFIN ACRES
SAN DIEGO COUNTY
PROJECT ID: 2024104

Dear Board Members:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), through the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB), is involved in a land acquisition program focused on the long-range protection and enhancement of habitat for fish and wildlife. The CDFW identifies sites considered for acquisition in response to public interest, legislative mandate and departmental goals.

I am writing to advise you that the WCB will consider the allocation of a grant to Escondido Creek Conservancy to assist in its acquisition of 96± acres of land for the preservation and enhancement of wildlife habitat located in San Diego County and identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 264-053-11, -12, and -19. The proposal is scheduled to be presented at the August 28, 2025, Board meeting. An electronic copy of the preliminary agenda is available for your review at www.wcb.ca.gov under News and Announcements. A more complete description of each proposal will be contained in the final meeting Agenda, which will be available at www.wcb.ca.gov ten days prior to the Board meeting.

If you have any questions about this proposal or need additional information, please feel free to contact us at (916) 445-8448.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
Jennifer Norris
F2A457B0E7174C7...

Jennifer M. Norris, PhD
Executive Director

Enclosure(s)

ec: The Honorable Brian Jones
senator.jones@senate.ca.gov

Docusign Envelope ID: 1814F9F1-0082-43FE-99F7-6521DEBBB7A1

The Honorable Darshana Patel
assemblymember.patel@assembly.ca.gov

Erinn Wilson-Olgin, Regional Manager
CDFW, South Coast Region (5)

ANDREW POTTER, CCB
EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ROOM 402, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-2422
(619) 531-5600

RYAN SHARP
ASSISTANT CLERK

ANN MOORE
ASSISTANT CLERK

July 22, 2025

TO: Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer, Chair
Supervisor Monica Montgomery Steppe, Vice-Chair
Supervisor Paloma Aguirre
Supervisor Joel Anderson
Supervisor Jim Desmond

FROM: Andrew Potter
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

REFERRAL

Attached, for your information, is correspondence from Sarina Kernberg, Associate with Jones Hall LLP, regarding the successful Bond Election held in the Encinitas Union School District on November 5, 2024, and the Certification of the Results of Bond Measure Z.

Respectfully,

ANDREW POTTER

Attachment

cc: Ebony N. Shelton, Chief Administrative Officer
Cynthia L. Paes, Registrar of Voters
Board of Supervisors Communications Received

AJP:sh

JONES HALL

COSD CLERK OF THE BOARD
2025 JUL 15 PM4:10

July 15, 2025

4 West 4th Avenue
Suite 406
San Mateo, CA 94402
t. 415.391.5780
f. 415.276.2088

VIA E-MAIL

Superintendent of Schools
San Diego County Office of Education
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, California 92111

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of San Diego
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 402
San Diego, California 92101

Re: Encinitas Union School District
November 5, 2024, General Obligation Bond Election

To Whom it May Concern:

In connection with the successful bond election held in the Encinitas Union School District (the "District") on November 5, 2024, and pursuant to California Education Code Section 15274, I am transmitting to you, on behalf of the District, the enclosed copy of the resolution of the Board of Trustees of the District declaring the election results and certifying the proceedings of such school bond election, together with the certification of election results, prepared by the Clerk and Registrar of Voters of the County of San Diego.

Very truly yours,

Sarina Kernberg
Sarina Kernberg
Associate

Encinitas
UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

Agenda Item Details

Meeting	Jan 14, 2025 - Regular Meeting
Category	9. Action Items
Subject	E. Certification of Results of Bond Measure Z from the November 5, 2024 General Election
Type	Action
Recommended Action	It is recommended that the Board of Trustees certify the election results for Bond Measure Z from the November 5, 2024 General Election and have such reflected in the minutes of a Board meeting, to meet legal requirements of California Education Code 15274.

Background: Per California Education Code Section 15274, a district must certify the election results of all Bond measures. On November 5, 2024, the Encinitas Union School District passed Measure Z School Bond with over 55% of the tallied vote. The final results from the election were certified by the County on December 4, 2024 and are attached, with the certification letter from the County Clerk of San Diego County. Per Ed Code 15274, "If it appears from the certificate of election results that 55 percent of the votes cast on the proposition of issuing bonds pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 18 of Article XVI of the California Constitution are in favor of issuing bonds, the governing board shall cause an entry of that fact to be made upon its minutes. The Board of Trustees shall then certify to the Board of Supervisors of the county whose superintendent of schools has jurisdiction over the district, all proceedings had in the premises. The County superintendent of schools shall send a copy of the certificate of election results to the board of supervisors of the county."

LCAP Goal(s) Alignment:
Goal 3: Improve and maintain safe, green, and innovative learning environments and promote health and wellness

Prepared by: Joseph Dougherty, Assistant Superintendent of Business Services
Submitted by: Andrée Grey, Ed.D., Superintendent

Certification - County of SD Registrar of Voters.pdf (386 KB)

Motion & Voting

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees certify the election results for Bond Measure Z from the November 5, 2024 General Election and have such reflected in the minutes of a Board meeting, to meet legal requirements of California Education Code 15274.

Motion by Marla Strich, second by Emily Andrade.
Final Resolution: Motion Carried
Aye: Emily Andrade, Tom Morton, Marla Strich, Marlon Taylor, Monica Lee

County of San Diego
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
County Operations Center Campus
5600 Overland Avenue, Suite 100, San Diego, California 92123-1278
Telephone: (858) 565-5800 Toll-free: 1 (800) 696-0136 TTY / TDD: (800) 735-2929
Facsimile: (858) 505-7294 Web Address: www.sdvote.com

CYNTHIA L. PAES
Registrar of Voters

SHAWN K. BROM
Assistant Registrar of Voters

December 3, 2024

TO: Andrew Potter
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Cynthia L. Paes
Registrar of Voters

STATEWIDE GENERAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 5, 2024, CERTIFICATION

Enclosed are the certified results for the following election:

Jurisdiction: Statewide General Election

Election Date: November 5, 2024

Please contact my staff at (858) 505-7210 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Enclosure: Election Results

c: Supervisor Nora Vargas, Chair
Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer, Vice Chair
Supervisor Joel Anderson
Supervisor Monica Montgomery Steppe
Supervisor Jim Desmond
Ebony N. Shelton, Chief Administrative Officer
Caroline Smith, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
Brian Albright, Deputy CAO, Finance & General Government Group
County Board of Education
LUEG, Community Groups

Continued:

Incorporated Cities:
- Carlsbad
- Chula Vista
- Coronado
- Del Mar
- El Cajon
- Encinitas
- Escondido
- Imperial Beach
- La Mesa
- Lemon Grove
- National City
- Oceanside
- Poway
- San Diego
- San Marcos
- Santee
- Vista

Community College Districts:
- Grossmont-Cuyamaca
- MiraCosta
- Palomar
- San Diego
- Southwestern

Unified School Districts:
- Bonsall
- Borrego Springs
- Carlsbad
- Coronado
- Oceanside
- Poway
- Ramona
- San Diego
- San Marcos
- Valley Center-Pauma
- Vista
- Warner

High School Districts:
- Escondido
- Fallbrook
- Grossmont
- Julian
- San Dieguito
- Sweetwater

Union/Elementary School Districts:
- Alpine
- Cajon Valley
- Cardiff
- Chula Vista
- Del Mar
- Dehesa
- Encinitas
- Escondido
- Fallbrook
- Lakeside
- Lemon Grove
- National
- Rancho Santa Fe
- San Ysidro
- Santee
- South Bay

Special Districts:
- Borrego Water
- Canebrake County Water
- Fallbrook Community Planning Group
- Grossmont Healthcare
- Helix Water
- Lakeside Fire Protection
- Lakeside Water
- Morro Hills Community Services
- North County Fire Protection
- Olivenhain Municipal Water
- Otay Water
- Padre Dam Municipal Water
- Palomar Health
- Pauma Valley Community Services
- Rainbow Municipal Water
- Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection
- South Bay Water
- Sweetwater Community Planning Group
- Tri-City Healthcare
- Vallecitos Water
- Valley Center Community Planning Group
- Vista Fire Protection
- Vista Irrigation

CERTIFICATION OF
COUNTY CLERK/REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OF THE
RESULTS OF THE CANVASS
OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2024,
GENERAL ELECTION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF San Diego } ss.

I, Cynthia Paes, County Clerk/Registrar of Voters of County of San Diego, do hereby certify that, in pursuance of the provisions of Elections Code section 15300, et seq., I did canvass the results of the votes cast in the General Election held in said County on November 5, 2024, for measures and contests that were submitted to the vote of the voters, and that the Statement of Votes Cast, to which this certificate is attached is full, true, and correct.

I hereby set my hand and official seal this 3rd day of December, 2024, at the County of San Diego



County Clerk/Registrar of Voters
County of San Diego
State of California

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

	Registered Voters	Turnout
Total Registration and Turnout	1,983,767	1,503,018
Mail		1,275,304
Vote Centers		227,714

PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

DEM - KAMALA D. HARRIS / TIM WALZ	841,372	56.93%
REP - DONALD J. TRUMP / JD VANCE	593,270	40.14%
AI - ROBERT F. KENNEDY JR. / NICOLE SHANAHAN	16,387	1.11%
GRN - JILL STEIN / RUDOLPH WARE	14,207	0.96%
LIB - CHASE OLIVER / MIKE TER MAAT	7,487	0.51%
PF - CLAUDIA DE LA CRUZ / KARINA GARCIA	5,063	0.34%
Peter Sonski / Lauren Onak	242	0.02%
Total	**1,478,028**	

UNITED STATES SENATOR (Full Term)

DEM - ADAM B. SCHIFF	817,805	56.68%
REP - STEVE GARVEY	625,129	43.32%
Total	**1,442,934**	

UNITED STATES SENATOR (Partial/Unexpired Term)

DEM - ADAM B. SCHIFF	797,127	56.61%
REP - STEVE GARVEY	610,883	43.39%
Total	**1,408,010**	

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE 48TH DISTRICT (SAN DIEGO PORTION ONLY)

REP - DARRELL E. ISSA	142,476	59.09%
DEM - STEPHEN HOULAHAN	98,637	40.91%
Total	**241,113**	

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE 49TH DISTRICT (SAN DIEGO PORTION ONLY)

DEM - MIKE LEVIN	137,469	56.36%
REP - MATT GUNDERSON	106,438	43.64%
Total	**243,907**	

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE 50TH DISTRICT

DEM - SCOTT PETERS	231,836	64.27%
REP - PETER J. BONO	128,859	35.73%
Total	**360,695**	

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE 51ST DISTRICT

DEM - SARA JACOBS	198,835	60.70%
REP - BILL WELLS	128,749	39.30%
Total	**327,584**	

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE 52ND DISTRICT

DEM - JUAN VARGAS	172,217	66.31%
REP - JUSTIN LEE	87,501	33.69%
Total	**259,718**	

STATE SENATOR 39TH DISTRICT

DEM - AKILAH WEBER	266,830	63.01%
REP - BOB DIVINE	156,616	36.99%
Total	**423,446**	

MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY 74TH DISTRICT (SAN DIEGO PORTION ONLY)

DEM - CHRIS DUNCAN	65,972	54.78%
REP - LAURIE DAVIES	54,457	45.22%
Total	**120,429**	

MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY 75TH DISTRICT

REP - CARL DEMAIO	121,167	57.02%
REP - ANDREW HAYES	91,337	42.98%
Total	**212,504**	

MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY 76TH DISTRICT

DEM - DARSHANA PATEL	113,242	54.03%
REP - KRISTIE BRUCE-LANE	96,358	45.97%
Total	**209,600**	

MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY 77TH DISTRICT

DEM - TASHA BOERNER	154,202	60.43%
REP - JAMES BROWNE	100,954	39.57%
Total	**255,156**	

MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY 78TH DISTRICT

DEM - CHRIS WARD	175,178	100.00%
Total	**175,178**	

MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY 79TH DISTRICT

DEM - LASHAE SHARP-COLLINS	79,215	54.03%
DEM - COLIN PARENT	67,390	45.97%
Total	**146,605**	

MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY 80TH DISTRICT

DEM - DAVID A. ALVAREZ	113,768	60.97%
REP - MICHAEL W. WILLIAMS	72,836	39.03%
Total	**186,604**	

COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION 1ST DISTRICT

GREGG ROBINSON	198,977	100.00%
Total	**198,977**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION 2ND DISTRICT

GUADALUPE GONZÁLEZ	167,698	100.00%
Total	**167,698**	

COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION 4TH DISTRICT

ERIN EVANS	174,253	68.29%
SARAH SONG	80,916	31.71%
Total	**255,169**	

GROSSMONT-CUYAMACA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA 4

ELENA ADAMS	22,448	50.67%
LEE QUINN	21,851	49.33%
Total	**44,299**	

MIRACOSTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 5

ANN CROSBIE	16,353	66.34%
ALEXANDER THOMAS WELLS III	8,297	33.66%
Total	**24,650**	

PALOMAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 2

YVETTE MARIE ACOSTA	22,512	52.68%
EDWARD POHLERT	20,221	47.32%
Total	**42,733**	

PALOMAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 4

HOLLY M. HAMILTON-BLEAKLEY	40,092	57.88%
MICHELLE RAINS	19,798	28.58%
AMI ADMIRE	9,376	13.54%
Total	**69,266**	

SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF TRUSTEES DISTRICT D

MARIAH JAMESON	50,032	74.93%
ANDREW GOMEZ II	16,740	25.07%
Total	**66,772**	

SOUTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 2

KRISTINE "KRIS" GALICIA BROWN	17,966	59.48%
ERIKA LOWERY	12,239	40.52%
Total	**30,205**	

BONSALL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA E

ERIC ORTEGA	798	54.88%
LINDSAY JONES	656	45.12%
Total	**1,454**	

BORREGO SPRINGS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER

Vote For 3

MARTHA DEICHLER	1,084	41.36%
STEVE DUNN	529	20.18%
STEVE RIEHLE	511	19.50%
PETER KELLNER	497	18.96%
Total	**2,621**	

CARLSBAD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 2

ALISON EMERY	4,780	62.80%
JEN BELNAP	2,832	37.20%
Total	**7,612**	

CARLSBAD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 3

LAURA SIAOSI	4,556	52.89%
EJEHAN TURKER	4,058	47.11%
Total	**8,614**	

CORONADO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER

Vote For 2

RENEE CAVANAUGH	4,339	30.97%
FITZHUGH "FITZ" LEE	4,137	29.53%
BILL SANDKE	3,096	22.10%
SHAWNEE BARTON MERRIMAN	2,438	17.40%
Total	**14,010**	

OCEANSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 2

ELEANOR EVANS	6,178	51.51%
EMILY ORTIZ WICHMANN	5,815	48.49%
Total	**11,993**	

OCEANSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 5

MIKE BLESSING	6,354	53.44%
ROSIE HIGUERA	5,536	46.56%
Total	**11,890**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

POWAY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA A		
TIM DOUGHERTY	10,063	55.09%
DEVESH VASHISHTHA	8,205	44.91%
Total	**18,268**	

POWAY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA E		
DAVID CHENG	6,528	38.34%
CRAIG POND	6,386	37.51%
CINDY SYTSMA	4,111	24.15%
Total	**17,025**	

RAMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 3		
DAWN PERFECT	2,141	60.89%
STEPHANIE COOTER	1,375	39.11%
Total	**3,516**	

RAMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 4		
DARYN DRUM	2,423	63.53%
JOHN RAJCIC	1,391	36.47%
Total	**3,814**	

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF EDUCATION DISTRICT A		
SABRINA BAZZO	40,289	50.93%
CRYSTAL TRULL	38,818	49.07%
Total	**79,107**	

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF EDUCATION DISTRICT D		
RICHARD BARRERA	64,671	100.00%
Total	**64,671**	

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF EDUCATION DISTRICT E		
SHARON D. WHITEHURST-PAYNE	49,166	100.00%
Total	**49,166**	

SAN MARCOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA A		
HEIDI HERRICK	7,047	56.04%
CARLOS ULLOA	5,527	43.96%
Total	**12,574**	

SAN MARCOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA B		
SARAH AHMAD	7,096	58.98%
BRITTANY BOWER	4,935	41.02%
Total	**12,031**	

SAN MARCOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA D		
LENA LAUER MEUM	5,949	58.77%
JAIME CHAMBERLIN	4,174	41.23%
Total	**10,123**	

VISTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 1		
MIKE MARKOV	6,728	51.91%
AMANDA "MANDY" REMMEN	6,234	48.09%
Total	**12,962**	

VISTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 4		
CIPRIANO VARGAS	3,371	39.06%
FRANK NUNEZ	3,075	35.63%
ZULEMA GOMEZ	2,184	25.31%
Total	**8,630**	

VISTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 5		
SUE MARTIN	9,540	60.39%
ANTHONY "TJ" CROSSMAN	6,258	39.61%
Total	**15,798**	

WARNER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER		
Vote For 3		
MELISSA KROGH	603	27.41%
MELODY SEES	544	24.73%
GENE DOXEY	533	24.23%
DEBORAH CASTEEL	520	23.64%
Total	**2,200**	

ESCONDIDO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 3		
CHRISTI KNIGHT	7,538	65.36%
CLAY BROWN	3,995	34.64%
Total	**11,533**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

ESCONDIDO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 4

RYAN S. WILLIAMS	7,848	64.66%
DARA CZERWONKA	4,289	35.34%
Total	**12,137**	

FALLBROOK UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 4

OSCAR CARALAMPIO	1,721	60.07%
JOSHUA TILLER	1,144	39.93%
Total	**2,865**	

GROSSMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 1

CHRIS FITE	13,923	43.30%
RANDALL DEAR	10,485	32.61%
DEBRA HARRINGTON	4,614	14.35%
AZURE CHRISAWN	3,132	9.74%
Total	**32,154**	

GROSSMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 2

SCOTT ECKERT	14,768	36.64%
JAY STEIGER	13,645	33.85%
JIM STIERINGER	7,980	19.80%
MARSHA J. CHRISTMAN	3,914	9.71%
Total	**40,307**	

JULIAN UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER

Vote For 2

BRITNI A MUSHET	986	30.37%
MIKE CHARLONNE	738	22.73%
ERIK FLEET	612	18.85%
CAROL M. FRAUSTO	581	17.89%
ADRYENN CANTOR	330	10.16%
Total	**3,247**	

SAN DIEGUITO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 2

JODIE WILLIAMS	10,126	51.22%
KELLY FRIIS	9,643	48.78%
Total	**19,769**	

SAN DIEGUITO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 4

MICHAEL ALLMAN	8,990	51.12%
KEVIN SABELLICO	8,595	48.88%
Total	**17,585**	

SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA 2

ADRIAN E. ARANCIBIA	21,226	56.72%
ANGELICA S. MARTINEZ	16,195	43.28%
Total	**37,421**	

SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA 4

RODOLFO "RUDY" LOPEZ	19,192	62.68%
OLGA ESPINOZA	11,426	37.32%
Total	**30,618**	

ALPINE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER

Vote For 2

ERIKA SIMMONS	5,814	38.34%
TRAVIS LYON	5,355	35.31%
CEE GOULD	2,313	15.25%
JOSEPH PERRICONE	1,682	11.09%
Total	**15,164**	

CAJON VALLEY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 3 (Short Term)

EMILY "LILY" SCHWORM	3,895	59.66%
DINA POLUS	2,634	40.34%
Total	**6,529**	

CAJON VALLEY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 5

JIM MILLER	6,888	47.02%
ODAY YOUSIF	4,355	29.73%
ALEX WELLING	3,407	23.26%
Total	**14,650**	

CARDIFF SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER

Vote For 2

RHEA STEWART	2,997	33.69%
RICHARD BROCCHINI	2,958	33.25%
NANCY ORR	2,941	33.06%
Total	**8,896**	

CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER SEAT NO. 2

LUCY UGARTE	80,824	69.85%
SHARMANE ESTOLANO	34,885	30.15%
Total	**115,709**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER SEAT NO. 4

FRANCISCO TAMAYO	34,227	29.61%
KATE BISHOP	27,681	23.94%
TANYA WILLIAMS	26,232	22.69%
JESUS F. PARTIDA	15,977	13.82%
ZENITH KHAN	11,491	9.94%
Total	**115,608**	

DEL MAR UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER

Vote For 2

GEE WAH MOK	10,885	33.88%
BILL PORTER	9,445	29.40%
DANIELLE ROYBAL	6,700	20.85%
HELEN DOYLE	5,101	15.88%
Total	**32,131**	

DEL MAR UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER (Short Term)

ALAN SCOTT KHOLOS	12,805	66.98%
GENEVIEVE OKADA GOLDSTONE	6,312	33.02%
Total	**19,117**	

ENCINITAS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER

Vote For 2

MONICA LEE	19,951	35.22%
MARLON TAYLOR	18,466	32.60%
JILLIAN COCAYNE	18,232	32.18%
Total	**56,649**	

ENCINITAS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER (Short Term)

TOM MORTON	19,053	51.36%
AIMEE SPROUL	18,042	48.64%
Total	**37,095**	

ESCONDIDO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 3

MARK OLSON	6,563	53.16%
JUAN MANUEL VARGAS	5,783	46.84%
Total	**12,346**	

FALLBROOK UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 2

LIEF HANSEN	1,481	69.30%
LESLIE SOMMERS	656	30.70%
Total	**2,137**	

FALLBROOK UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 4 (Short Term)

MARIA G. MORAN	3,228	50.56%
CONSTANCE FISH	3,156	49.44%
Total	**6,384**	

LAKESIDE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 2

AUTUMN ELLENSON	2,957	75.24%
TWILA GODLEY	973	24.76%
Total	**3,930**	

NATIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER

Vote For 2

CINDY LOPEZ	6,400	30.46%
MICHELLE GATES	5,841	27.80%
MARIA MIRANDA	4,544	21.63%
ROCINA LIZARRAGA	4,223	20.10%
Total	**21,008**	

RANCHO SANTA FE SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER

Vote For 3

KAREN "KATE" BUTLER	1,511	21.62%
KERRY VINCI	1,395	19.96%
ANNETTE ROSS	1,230	17.60%
MARIA LUONI	742	10.62%
VICTORIA GAMBLE	737	10.55%
JANICE LEE HOLOWKA	720	10.30%
KAREN ESCHRICH	653	9.34%
Total	**6,988**	

SAN YSIDRO SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER

Vote For 2

ANTONIO MARTINEZ	6,444	37.95%
KENIA PERAZA	3,555	20.94%
JOSE MANUEL DIRCIO	2,319	13.66%
YVETTE OLEA	1,834	10.80%
MARTIN ARIAS	1,646	9.69%
ROSALEAH PALLASIGUE	1,183	6.97%
Total	**16,981**	

SANTEE SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER SEAT NO. 4

TRACIE THILL	16,446	59.94%
MONIQUE SILVER	10,992	40.06%
Total	**27,438**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

SOUTH BAY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER TRUSTEE AREA NO. 4 (Short Term)		
MANUEL "MANNY" ESPARZA	2,448	57.84%
LIZBETH BECERRA	1,784	42.16%
Total	**4,232**	

MEMBER, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DISTRICT NO. 1		
NORA VARGAS	127,708	62.46%
ALEJANDRO GALICIA	76,761	37.54%
Total	**204,469**	

MEMBER, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DISTRICT NO. 2		
JOEL ANDERSON	155,232	59.81%
GINA JACOBS	104,326	40.19%
Total	**259,558**	

MEMBER, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DISTRICT NO. 3		
TERRA LAWSON-REMER	178,781	56.98%
KEVIN L. FAULCONER	134,991	43.02%
Total	**313,772**	

CITY OF CARLSBAD MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2		
KEVIN SHIN	8,414	58.14%
TYLER COLLINS	6,057	41.86%
Total	**14,471**	

CITY OF CARLSBAD MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4		
TERESA ACOSTA	9,380	55.53%
GREG DAY	7,511	44.47%
Total	**16,891**	

CITY OF CARLSBAD TREASURER (Short Term)		
CHRISTIAN PEACOX	14,877	28.16%
THOMAS KROUSE, JR.	13,506	25.56%
GREGORIO KAHN	12,931	24.47%
MICHAEL J. WILLIAMS	11,521	21.81%
Total	**52,835**	

CITY OF CHULA VISTA MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3		
MICHAEL INZUNZA	18,508	68.58%
LETICIA MUNGUIA	8,478	31.42%
Total	**26,986**	

CITY OF CHULA VISTA MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4		
CESAR FERNANDEZ	13,401	60.75%
RUDY RAMIREZ	8,659	39.25%
Total	**22,060**	

CITY OF CORONADO MAYOR		
JOHN DUNCAN	4,124	45.50%
CASEY TANAKA	3,819	42.13%
MIKE DONOVAN	1,121	12.37%
Total	**9,064**	

CITY OF CORONADO MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL		
Vote For 2		
MARK FLEMING	3,524	22.57%
AMY STEWARD	3,093	19.81%
LAURA WILKINSON SINTON	3,013	19.30%
MARK WARNER	2,555	16.37%
CHRISTINE MOTT	2,187	14.01%
ANDREW GADE	1,240	7.94%
Total	**15,612**	

CITY OF DEL MAR MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL		
Vote For 3		
TRACY MARTINEZ	1,633	39.56%
JOHN W. SPELICH	1,380	33.43%
DANIEL QUIRK	1,115	27.01%
Total	**4,128**	

CITY OF EL CAJON MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2		
MICHELLE METSCHEL	4,636	100.00%
Total	**4,636**	

CITY OF EL CAJON MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3		
STEVE GOBLE	5,754	66.95%
COURTNEY HALL	2,840	33.05%
Total	**8,594**	

CITY OF EL CAJON MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4		
PHIL ORTIZ	4,823	100.00%
Total	**4,823**	

CITY OF ENCINITAS MAYOR		
BRUCE EHLERS	18,311	52.39%
TONY KRANZ	16,638	47.61%
Total	**34,949**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

CITY OF ENCINITAS MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 1		
LUKE SHAFFER	5,329	57.00%
ALLISON BLACKWELL	4,020	43.00%
Total	**9,349**	

CITY OF ENCINITAS MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2		
JIM O'HARA	4,109	55.47%
DESTINY PRESTON	3,298	44.53%
Total	**7,407**	

CITY OF ESCONDIDO MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3		
CHRISTIAN GARCIA	5,594	60.94%
VERONICA CIGARROA	2,513	27.37%
CHRISTINE SPENCER	1,073	11.69%
Total	**9,180**	

CITY OF ESCONDIDO MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4		
JUDY FITZGERALD	10,190	68.42%
RODERICK "ROD" HOWELL	4,704	31.58%
Total	**14,894**	

CITY OF ESCONDIDO TREASURER		
DOUGLAS W. SHULTZ	40,680	100.00%
Total	**40,680**	

CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2		
JOHN "JACK" FISHER	1,076	42.56%
MARTIN "MARTY" MATTES	799	31.61%
BEN SWEARINGEN	653	25.83%
Total	**2,528**	

CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4		
MATTHEW LEYBA-GONZALEZ	1,061	68.28%
LINDA KAYE	493	31.72%
Total	**1,554**	

CITY OF LA MESA MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL		
Vote For 2		
LAUREN CAZARES	12,587	32.22%
GENEVIEVE SUZUKI	11,984	30.68%
KRISTINE C. ALESSIO	11,238	28.77%
SHAWN TOWNSEND	3,253	8.33%
Total	**39,062**	

CITY OF LEMON GROVE MAYOR		
ALYSSON SNOW	4,059	39.77%
LIANA LEBARON	3,087	30.25%
RACQUEL VASQUEZ	3,059	29.98%
Total	**10,205**	

CITY OF LEMON GROVE MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL		
Vote For 2		
JESSYKA HEREDIA	4,494	29.13%
SITIVI "STEVE" FAIAI	4,051	26.26%
GEORGE GASTIL	3,757	24.35%
SETH SMITH	3,127	20.27%
Total	**15,429**	

CITY OF NATIONAL CITY MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2		
JOSE RODRIGUEZ	2,578	73.32%
RANDI CASTLE-SALGADO	938	26.68%
Total	**3,516**	

CITY OF NATIONAL CITY MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4		
MARCUS BUSH	1,736	43.77%
VICTOR M. ARREOLA	1,509	38.05%
DANIEL PEREZ	721	18.18%
Total	**3,966**	

CITY OF OCEANSIDE MAYOR		
ESTHER SANCHEZ	39,100	50.15%
RYAN KEIM	38,868	49.85%
Total	**77,968**	

CITY OF OCEANSIDE MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3		
JIMMY FIGUEROA	10,250	47.53%
LAURA BASSETT	8,804	40.82%
TOM DEMOOY	1,679	7.79%
AUSTIN SORENSEN	833	3.86%
Total	**21,566**	

CITY OF OCEANSIDE MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4		
PETER WEISS	8,995	45.15%
AMBER KAE NIUATOA	5,810	29.16%
OMAR HASHIMI	5,119	25.69%
Total	**19,924**	

CITY OF OCEANSIDE CITY CLERK		
ZEB NAVARRO	62,004	100.00%
Total	**62,004**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

CITY OF OCEANSIDE TREASURER		
PHYLLIS DOMINGUEZ	24,843	35.32%
VICTOR ROY	23,849	33.90%
JACK FERNANDES	21,654	30.78%
Total	**70,346**	

CITY OF POWAY MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2		
TONY BLAIN	2,783	37.84%
VANESSA SPRINGETT	2,515	34.19%
JARED WILSON	2,057	27.97%
Total	**7,355**	

CITY OF POWAY MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4		
JENNY C. MAEDA	2,463	50.12%
CAYLIN FRANK	2,451	49.88%
Total	**4,914**	

CITY OF SAN DIEGO MAYOR		
TODD GLORIA	317,015	55.35%
LARRY TURNER	255,782	44.65%
Total	**572,797**	

CITY OF SAN DIEGO MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3		
STEPHEN WHITBURN	38,344	57.53%
COLEEN CUSACK	28,303	42.47%
Total	**66,647**	

CITY OF SAN DIEGO MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 9		
SEAN ELO-RIVERA	28,106	60.71%
TERRY HOSKINS	18,189	39.29%
Total	**46,295**	

CITY OF SAN DIEGO CITY ATTORNEY		
HEATHER FERBERT	282,912	56.83%
BRIAN MAIENSCHEIN	214,872	43.17%
Total	**497,784**	

CITY OF SAN MARCOS MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3		
DANIELLE LEBLANG	5,552	57.09%
ALAN GERACI	4,173	42.91%
Total	**9,725**	

CITY OF SAN MARCOS MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4		
ED MUSGROVE	6,846	64.49%
NATASHA ZANDER HILMES	3,769	35.51%
Total	**10,615**	

CITY OF SANTEE MAYOR		
JOHN W. MINTO	20,733	77.80%
KELLI L. O'BRIEN	5,917	22.20%
Total	**26,650**	

CITY OF SANTEE MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3		
LAURA KOVAL	5,317	100.00%
Total	**5,317**	

CITY OF SANTEE MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 4		
DUSTIN TROTTER	4,342	62.36%
AUGIE SCALZITTI	2,621	37.64%
Total	**6,963**	

CITY OF VISTA MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 2		
JEFF FOX	6,047	62.35%
ANTHONY WHITE	3,651	37.65%
Total	**9,698**	

CITY OF VISTA MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 3		
KATIE MELENDEZ	4,323	55.32%
DENISSE BARRAGAN	3,492	44.68%
Total	**7,815**	

BORREGO WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS		
Vote For 2		
MARTHA DEICHLER	738	37.98%
TAMMY BAKER	505	25.99%
DIANE E. JOHNSON	418	21.51%
PETER KELLNER	282	14.51%
Total	**1,943**	

CANEBRAKE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS		
Vote For 2		
CHRISTOPHER MACDONALD	14	43.75%
MARSHA CAMPBELL	12	37.50%
JERALD BUCHEIT	6	18.75%
Total	**32**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP MEMBER, PLANNING GROUP

Vote For 8		
ALDO ALVIDRES	11,590	12.14%
ROSS PIKE	11,305	11.84%
THOMAS GERALD HARRINGTON IV	11,146	11.68%
ROY MOOSA	10,448	10.95%
STEPHANI BAXTER	9,922	10.40%
KATHLEEN "KATHIE" MORRIS	9,413	9.86%
LEE J. DE MEO	9,068	9.50%
JIM LOGE	8,786	9.21%
MARK MERVICH	7,946	8.33%
MARK HOYE	5,818	6.10%
Total	**95,442**	

GROSSMONT HEALTHCARE DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS ZONE NO. 3

NADIA FARJOOD	23,515	55.69%
BRENDA MILLER	18,711	44.31%
Total	**42,226**	

HELIX WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 3

MARK A. GRACYK	12,434	65.25%
JEANETTE ERICKSON	6,622	34.75%
Total	**19,056**	

LAKESIDE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 3

JAMES BINGHAM	5,217	83.82%
SANDRA DEAKINS	1,007	16.18%
Total	**6,224**	

LAKESIDE WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 4

STEVE ROBAK	1,609	67.98%
JEANNE SWARINGEN	758	32.02%
Total	**2,367**	

MORRO HILLS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Vote For 3		
JEFF WALKER	354	28.80%
THOMAS HARRINGTON III	278	22.62%
JEANINE ROSKOS	228	18.55%
BILL WEBER	189	15.38%
CHARLENE WEBER	180	14.65%
Total	**1,229**	

NORTH COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 1

ROSS PIKE	1,559	73.43%
JEANETTE BARRAGAN	564	26.57%
Total	**2,123**	

NORTH COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 4

JEFF EGKAN	4,801	74.03%
JOHN VAN DOORN	1,684	25.97%
Total	**6,485**	

NORTH COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 5

MARK BARTHOLOMEW	4,684	80.23%
SHEILA A. LANCASTER	1,154	19.77%
Total	**5,838**	

OLIVENHAIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 2

SCOTT MALONI	4,481	58.31%
ERIC K. ARMSTRONG	1,752	22.80%
GREG BARTH	865	11.26%
ERIC T. ANDERSON	587	7.64%
Total	**7,685**	

OLIVENHAIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 5

NEAL MEYERS	3,968	54.48%
CHRIS CIEPLEY	3,315	45.52%
Total	**7,283**	

OTAY WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 2

DELFINA GONZALEZ	9,537	58.08%
RYAN KEYES	6,883	41.92%
Total	**16,420**	

OTAY WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 5

MARK ROBAK	12,161	58.36%
GREGORY J MARTINEZ	8,676	41.64%
Total	**20,837**	

PADRE DAM MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 2

SUZANNE TILL	6,447	61.56%
ROBERT "BOB" T. LLOYD SR.	4,026	38.44%
Total	**10,473**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

PADRE DAM MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 4

KIM HALES	5,708	55.75%
IVAN ANDUJAR	4,530	44.25%
Total	**10,238**	

PALOMAR HEALTH MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 4

ABBI L. JAHAASKI	10,051	65.31%
LAURA BARRY	5,339	34.69%
Total	**15,390**	

PALOMAR HEALTH MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 6

JEFF GRIFFITH	17,683	61.65%
JOE MUGA	9,524	33.20%
GAURAV DHIMAN	1,477	5.15%
Total	**28,684**	

PAUMA VALLEY COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS (Short Term)

Vote For 2		
LOLO LEVY	271	43.57%
MICHAEL ESPARZA	202	32.48%
BILL COLLIER	149	23.95%
Total	**622**	

RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 1

LISA HOFFMAN	1,136	52.40%
JULIE JOHNSON	1,032	47.60%
Total	**2,168**	

RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 3 (Short Term)

GREG IRVINE	1,585	57.24%
CARI DALE	1,184	42.76%
Total	**2,769**	

RANCHO SANTA FE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Vote For 3		
NANCY C. HILLGREN	8,089	21.23%
JAMES H. ASHCRAFT	6,826	17.91%
KEVIN BARNARD	6,617	17.36%
ANDREW KRYNEN	5,538	14.53%
RANDALL MALIN	5,528	14.51%
DOUGLAS DILL	5,511	14.46%
Total	**38,109**	

SOUTH BAY WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 5

ELIZABETH COX	5,105	52.95%
JOSIE CALDERON - SCOTT	4,537	47.05%
Total	**9,642**	

SWEETWATER COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP MEMBER, PLANNING GROUP

Vote For 8		
PATTY O'MARA	3,367	15.27%
JUDITH A. TIEBER	2,607	11.82%
MICHAEL GARROD	2,487	11.28%
FELIX M. FELIX	2,433	11.03%
ELIZABETH LEE STONEHOUSE	2,359	10.70%
PENNI WILSON-NEELY	2,308	10.46%
MARK KUKUCHEK	2,288	10.37%
UWE WERNER	2,178	9.88%
STEPHEN STONEHOUSE	2,028	9.20%
Total	**22,055**	

TRI-CITY HEALTHCARE DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS ZONE NO. 1

ADELA IRMA SANCHEZ	16,538	65.77%
ALLEN L NEWSOME	8,609	34.23%
Total	**25,147**	

TRI-CITY HEALTHCARE DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS ZONE NO. 5

SHEILA BROWN	15,263	62.12%
AARON J. BYZAK	9,307	37.88%
Total	**24,570**	

TRI-CITY HEALTHCARE DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS ZONE NO. 7

NINA CHAYA	16,840	62.63%
VALERIE MITCHELL	10,046	37.37%
Total	**26,886**	

VALLECITOS WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 4

JENNIFER KERSCHBAUM	6,354	58.53%
ERIK A. GROSET	4,502	41.47%
Total	**10,856**	

VALLECITOS WATER DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 5

TIFFANY BOYD-HODGSON	6,065	61.19%
HENRY "WALLY" SIMPSON	3,846	38.81%
Total	**9,911**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

VALLEY CENTER COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP MEMBER, PLANNING GROUP

Vote For 8		
DELORES CHAVEZ HARMES	5,495	11.35%
DORI RATTRAY	4,639	9.58%
KAREN A. LIEBER	4,514	9.32%
BOB LITTLEJOHN	4,494	9.28%
S. MICHELLE BOTHOF	4,430	9.15%
MARY HOPE L. HODSON	4,268	8.81%
CHRISTOPHER "CHRIS" BARBER	4,025	8.31%
TOM J. STINSON	4,012	8.29%
LISA ADAMS	3,568	7.37%
RANDY LIUAG	3,266	6.75%
PATRICK MALLOY	2,955	6.10%
ANDREW NOLL	2,752	5.68%
Total	**48,418**	

VISTA FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION B

ROB FOUGNER	1,496	75.98%
RICHARD TILCH	473	24.02%
Total	**1,969**	

VISTA IRRIGATION DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 2

BYRON L. OLSON	4,856	70.86%
KAREN M. WILCOX	1,997	29.14%
Total	**6,853**	

VISTA IRRIGATION DISTRICT MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIVISION NO. 5

JO MACKENZIE	5,983	65.98%
BILL HARD	3,085	34.02%
Total	**9,068**	

PROP 2 - PUBLIC SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITIES BONDS - Majority-Required to pass

YES	783,150	55.63%
NO	624,625	44.37%
Total	**1,407,775**	

PROP 3 - RIGHT TO MARRIAGE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT - Majority-Required to pass

YES	929,477	65.57%
NO	488,011	34.43%
Total	**1,417,488**	

PROP 4 - SAFE DRINKING WATER, WILDFIRE PREVENTION AND CLIMATE RISK BONDS - Majority-Required to pass

YES	811,585	57.27%
NO	605,458	42.73%
Total	**1,417,043**	

PROP 5 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE BONDS - 55% Required to pass

NO	806,241	57.58%
YES	594,029	42.42%
Total	**1,400,270**	

PROP 6 - ELIMINATES INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE FOR INCARCERATED PERSONS - Majority-Required to pass

NO	756,244	54.64%
YES	627,728	45.36%
Total	**1,383,972**	

PROP 32 - RAISES MINIMUM WAGE - Majority-Required to pass

NO	761,603	53.51%
YES	661,731	46.49%
Total	**1,423,334**	

PROP 33 - EXPANDS LOCAL AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL - Majority-Required to pass

NO	835,944	59.98%
YES	557,730	40.02%
Total	**1,393,674**	

PROP 34 - RESTRICTS SPENDING OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG REVENUES BY CERTAIN HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS - Majority-Required to pass

YES	736,187	55.00%
NO	602,270	45.00%
Total	**1,338,457**	

PROP 35 - PERMANENT FUNDING FOR MEDI-CAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES - Majority-Required to pass

YES	908,009	65.77%
NO	472,535	34.23%
Total	**1,380,544**	

PROP 36 - ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN CRIMES - Majority-Required to pass

YES	912,939	65.27%
NO	485,821	34.73%
Total	**1,398,760**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO - MEASURE G - Majority-Required to pass

NO	701,639	50.46%
YES	688,922	49.54%
Total	**1,390,561**	

CITY OF CARLSBAD - MEASURE B - Majority-Required to pass

YES	32,759	53.06%
NO	28,981	46.94%
Total	**61,740**	

CITY OF CHULA VISTA - MEASURE P - Majority-Required to pass

YES	81,009	73.40%
NO	29,361	26.60%
Total	**110,370**	

CITY OF DEL MAR - MEASURE M - Majority-Required to pass

YES	1,866	71.52%
NO	743	28.48%
Total	**2,609**	

CITY OF DEL MAR - MEASURE A - Majority-Required to pass

YES	1,652	66.24%
NO	842	33.76%
Total	**2,494**	

CITY OF EL CAJON - MEASURE J - Majority-Required to pass

YES	22,631	67.97%
NO	10,663	32.03%
Total	**33,294**	

CITY OF ENCINITAS - MEASURE K - Majority-Required to pass

NO	18,884	51.91%
YES	17,492	48.09%
Total	**36,376**	

CITY OF ESCONDIDO - MEASURE I - Majority-Required to pass

YES	32,802	61.12%
NO	20,863	38.88%
Total	**53,665**	

CITY OF LA MESA - MEASURE L - Majority-Required to pass

YES	23,073	81.37%
NO	5,284	18.63%
Total	**28,357**	

CITY OF LEMON GROVE - MEASURE T - Majority-Required to pass

YES	7,503	71.59%
NO	2,977	28.41%
Total	**10,480**	

CITY OF NATIONAL CITY - MEASURE R - Majority-Required to pass

NO	10,145	66.15%
YES	5,192	33.85%
Total	**15,337**	

CITY OF OCEANSIDE - MEASURE X - Majority-Required to pass

YES	55,360	69.67%
NO	24,104	30.33%
Total	**79,464**	

CITY OF POWAY - MEASURE H - Majority-Required to pass

NO	17,880	68.66%
YES	8,163	31.34%
Total	**26,043**	

CITY OF SAN DIEGO - MEASURE C - Majority-Required to pass

YES	264,086	67.47%
NO	127,314	32.53%
Total	**391,400**	

CITY OF SAN DIEGO - MEASURE D - Majority-Required to pass

YES	375,039	72.32%
NO	143,549	27.68%
Total	**518,588**	

CITY OF SAN DIEGO - MEASURE E - Majority-Required to pass

NO	288,446	50.31%
YES	284,940	49.69%
Total	**573,386**	

County of San Diego
Presidential General Election
November 5, 2024
Official Results
(San Diego Portion Only)

CITY OF SAN MARCOS - MEASURE Q - Majority-Required to pass

YES	24,411	60.44%
NO	15,977	39.56%
Total	**40,388**	

CITY OF SANTEE - MEASURE S - Majority-Required to pass

NO	14,992	52.30%
YES	13,675	47.70%
Total	**28,667**	

SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT - MEASURE HH - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	256,983	60.64%
BONDS - NO	166,782	39.36%
Total	**423,765**	

SOUTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT - MEASURE SW - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	108,970	59.03%
BONDS - NO	75,636	40.97%
Total	**184,606**	

BONSALL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE V - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - NO	5,536	51.96%
BONDS - YES	5,119	48.04%
Total	**10,655**	

RAMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE GG - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - NO	10,139	54.51%
BONDS - YES	8,460	45.49%
Total	**18,599**	

SAN MARCOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE JJ - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	32,919	57.77%
BONDS - NO	24,064	42.23%
Total	**56,983**	

VALLEY CENTER-PAUMA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE SS - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - NO	7,243	53.00%
BONDS - YES	6,422	47.00%
Total	**13,665**	

WARNER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE TT - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	716	63.36%
BONDS - NO	414	36.64%
Total	**1,130**	

FALLBROOK UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE BB - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - NO	10,870	50.25%
BONDS - YES	10,761	49.75%
Total	**21,631**	

SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE RR - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	107,629	61.14%
BONDS - NO	68,400	38.86%
Total	**176,029**	

ALPINE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE U - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - NO	6,356	60.63%
BONDS - YES	4,127	39.37%
Total	**10,483**	

CAJON VALLEY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE W - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	31,992	52.30%
BONDS - NO	29,182	47.70%
Total	**61,174**	

CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE AA - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	76,517	61.72%
BONDS - NO	47,459	38.28%
Total	**123,976**	

DEHESA SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE Y - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - NO	774	60.28%
BONDS - YES	510	39.72%
Total	**1,284**	

ENCINITAS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE Z - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	24,167	56.84%
BONDS - NO	18,347	43.16%
Total	**42,514**	

LEMON GROVE SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE CC - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	8,445	62.54%
BONDS - NO	5,058	37.46%
Total	**13,503**	

LEMON GROVE SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE EE - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	8,743	64.49%
BONDS - NO	4,814	35.51%
Total	**13,557**	

SAN YSIDRO SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE KK - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	3,554	63.91%
BONDS - NO	2,007	36.09%
Total	**5,561**	

SAN YSIDRO SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE LL - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	3,537	63.36%
BONDS - NO	2,045	36.64%
Total	**5,582**	

SAN YSIDRO SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE MM - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	4,977	77.95%
BONDS - NO	1,408	22.05%
Total	**6,385**	

SANTEE SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE NN - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	15,580	52.38%
BONDS - NO	14,167	47.62%
Total	**29,747**	

SOUTH BAY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE PP - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	16,034	66.00%
BONDS - NO	8,259	34.00%
Total	**24,293**	

SOUTH BAY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT - MEASURE QQ - 55% Required to pass

BONDS - YES	16,523	67.64%
BONDS - NO	7,906	32.36%
Total	**24,429**	

ANDREW POTTER, CCB
EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ROOM 402, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-2422
(619) 531-5600

RYAN SHARP
ASSISTANT CLERK

ANN MOORE
ASSISTANT CLERK

July 23, 2025

TO: Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer, Chair
Supervisor Monica Montgomery Steppe, Vice-Chair
Supervisor Paloma Aguirre
Supervisor Joel Anderson
Supervisor Jim Desmond

FROM: Andrew Potter
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

REFERRAL

Attached, for your information, is correspondence from Terrie Best, regarding an article about a High Impact Drug Trafficking Report.

Respectfully,

ANDREW POTTER

Attachment

cc: Ebony N. Shelton, Chief Administrative Officer
Andrew Strong, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Public Safety Group
Board of Supervisors Communications Received

AJP:sh

From: Terrie Best [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 8:08 AM
Subject: [External] High Intencity Drug Trafficking Report

Dear Valued Clerk,

Thank you for your service. Please distribute this important article to city council members. It is fact-based critique of the high impact drug trafficking report that was recently disseminated.

Cannabis Facts Over Fear: The Danger of Confusing Correlation with Causation

By Shelby Huffaker, MPH | Chair, San Diego Chapter of Americans for Safe Access

Recent news coverage of a new report highlighting data on the impacts of cannabis legalization in California—including in San Diego/Imperial Counties, the region's High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA)—is generating quite a buzz. The periodic report, entitled *Marijuana's Impact on California*, is funded by the Office of National Drug Control Policy and forefronts data linking the use of "THC and other substances" to high rates of suicide among individuals aged 25 and under in San Diego County. However, absent in the discourse about these and other findings in the report is the nuance between correlation versus causation—a basic concept taught in introductory public health courses.

Correlation means that a certain variable (typically genetic traits, behaviors, or environmental factors) is *associated* with a particular health outcome, but is not necessarily the cause. For example, individuals with a bachelor's degree tend to live longer than those without one. Yet, no credible scientist claims that earning a degree causes longevity. Instead, other factors—like increased income, better access to healthcare, and higher health literacy—may explain both the degree attainment and the longer lifespan. These are known as confounding variables.

Causation, on the other hand, means that through a controlled process of elimination, certain variables can be shown to *cause* specific health outcomes (note that it is impossible to control for every confounder, and it is never possible to state with 100% certainty that something is causal. However, researchers can get very close). For example, by controlling for confounding variables, establishing temporal (e.g., X comes before Y, not the other way around) and dose-response relationships, there is now a great deal of evidence that smoking tobacco causes cancer.

The relationship between cannabis use and suicide is a correlational one, and there are a number of confounding variables that are not routinely controlled for and may lead teens and young adults to start using cannabis—including underlying mental health conditions,

untreated chronic pain, and situations of domestic or interpersonal abuse.* For example, teens and young adults suffering from depression or who are genetically predisposed to the development of psychosis may be more likely to start using cannabis to self-medicate. Other medications associated with increased suicide risk include antidepressants, antipsychotics, antiepileptics, and antihypertensives. To be clear, this does not mean these medications cause suicide, but it could mean that individuals taking them have underlying conditions that predispose them to suicidal ideation. In sum, to infer that it is cannabis and not another underlying factor leading to suicide is misinformed at best and misleading and worst.

Our mission at Americans for Safe Access is to advance safe access to cannabis for therapeutic use and research. As part of this mission, we are dedicated to educating patients and consumers on how to use cannabis more safely and responsibly, including through guides on dosing and proper storage, and advocating for legislation to improve product testing and labeling.

Cannabis has been shown through decades of rigorous, controlled research to be effective in alleviating pain, as affirmed by the World Health Organization, the United Nations, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, among others. In a nation facing a chronic pain epidemic, commonly addressed through the use of opioids, now is not the time to be spreading dangerous misinformation about cannabis that further restricts patient access. Rather, we must ground our public discourse in evidence, not fear.

**Notably, the number of suicides is presented as resulting from "THC and other substances," but not THC alone. Those "other substances" could also be confounding variables.*

verizon

Jul 10, 2025

Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov

RE: Notification Letter for SWEET JAM - A

Spring Valley, CA /Verizon Wireless (VAW) LLC

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact the representative below.

Verizon Wireless

Felipe Martinez
Coordinator RE & Compliance - West Territory
1515 Woodfield Road, #1400
Schaumburg, IL 60173
WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com

process under Public Communication

previous sample can be found in Dec. 2019 CRS last item on page 5 CRList

verizon

JURISDICTION	PLANNING MANAGER	CITY MANAGER	CITY CLERK	DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL BOARD	COUNTY
County of San Diego	Mark.Wardlaw@sdcounty.ca.gov	cao_mail@sdcounty.ca.gov	COBRecords@sdcounty.ca.gov		San Diego

VZW Legal Entity		Site Name		Site Address		Tower Design	Size of Building or NA
Verizon Wireless (VAW) LLC		SWEET JAM - A		1247 Sweetwater Road, Spring Valley , CA91977		Rooftop	Rooftop
Site Latitude	**Site Longitude**	**PS Location Code**	**Tower Appearance**	**Tower Height (in feet)**	**Type of Approval**	**Approval Issue Date**	
32°42'56.32"N	117°0'44.08"WNAD(83)	281477	null	42.2	Zoning	03/29/2024	
Project Description: NA New Build							