

SECTION 5

PRESERVE ASSEMBLY AND CONSERVATION ACTIONS

5.1 COMPONENTS OF HABITAT LANDS IN THE FPA

Upon completion of the habitat conservation program under the Escondido Subarea Plan, 6,568 acres of natural habitat in Escondido would be preserved and managed for biological value (Table 5-1). Of the total, 4,843 acres are currently under public ownership, including 2,842 acres in Daley Ranch Conservation Bank, and 1,725 acres under private ownership. Various components of the conserved habitat are described below.

5.1.1 Conserved Habitat on Public Lands

As of December 1998, there are 6,923 acres of public lands in the city's subarea plan area, including lands near Valley Center Road and Lake Wohlford outside the city boundary. These lands support 5,647 acres of natural habitat, of which 4,843 acres (86 percent) will be conserved as part of the preserve system.

Lands contained in an existing conservation bank (Daley Ranch) are already conserved and managed for their habitat value. Other habitat lands owned by the city and planned for conservation (e.g., passive recreational areas of Kit Carson Park) are identified in this plan, and the city's commitment to manage those lands for habitat purposes is described in the accompanying implementing agreement.

Daley Ranch Conservation Bank. In January 1997, the city purchased the 3,058-acre Daley Ranch property and entered into an agreement with the USFWS and CDFG to establish a conservation bank with 2,842 credits, corresponding to a numerically equal acreage of preserved natural habitat. The vegetation communities on the site include southern mixed chaparral (1,956 acres), coastal sage scrub (384 acres), oak woodlands (198 acres), riparian habitats (41 acres), and annual grassland (380 acres). The site supports sensitive butterfly, amphibian, reptile, and bird species.

The city has the right to use the bank's conservation credits, if suitable, for mitigation of impacts from city projects or to sell credits at market prices to public agencies, private

Table 5-1

TARGET CONSERVATION OF NATURAL HABITAT

	All Natural Habitat¹ (acres)	Target Conservation Natural Habitat (acres)
Public Lands		
City of Escondido		
Daley Ranch Conservation Bank	3,008	2,842
Other ²	2,361	1,947
Federal/State	125	40
Other Local Agencies	<u>153</u>	<u>15</u>
Total	5,647	4,843
Private Lands		
Hardline ³	1,836	1,091
Softline/Standards ⁴	<u>1,625</u>	<u>633</u>
Total	3,461	1,725
Total⁵	9,108	6,568

Source: SANDAG, 1999 MHCP GIS Database.

Figures do not sum to totals as shown due to rounding.

1. Excludes eucalyptus, agriculture, and disturbed lands.
2. See text for description of city-owned habitat lands other than Daley Ranch.
3. Target conservation of 90% or more of upland habitats; 100% or equivalent of wetland habitats.
4. Target conservation of less than 90% of upland habitats; 100% or equivalent of wetland habitats.
5. Figures for total acres of natural habitat and total acres conserved differ slightly from those of Table 4-1, due to errors introduced by the use of different data types.

organizations, or individuals for mitigation of impacts. The credit area, or the area in which project impacts may be mitigated using the bank's conservation credits, covers western San Diego County, from its boundary with Orange and Riverside Counties to the international U.S./Mexico border, and from the coast to the inland mountain ranges.

The credits are generally available for mitigation of impacts to both upland and wetland habitats. However, the conservation bank agreement states that certain sensitive species and habitats are not represented in the bank site and that the bank is not suitable for mitigating impacts to those resources. The unrepresented resources include California gnatcatcher-occupied lands, coastal obligate species, and certain rare, endemic, and/or listed species. Additionally, the existing wetland credits are for preserved wetlands and hence do not meet the "no net loss" requirement; however, the wetland and water-dependent habitat credits may be used as mitigation to partially offset wetland impacts, provided the "no net loss" requirement is otherwise met. The wetlands have not been delineated pursuant to the ACOE standards. Areas within the conservation bank could be restored or enhanced to establish banked wetland credits that would meet the "no net loss" requirement.

The conservation bank agreement stipulates that the city will manage and maintain the bank habitat, using interest revenues generated by an endowment fund, which will be established by setting aside a portion of the revenues generated by the sale of conservation credits (\$500 per credit). The endowment will be fully funded upon the sale of the last credit (but excluding the first 200 credits). Prior to full funding, the city will annually fund management and maintenance costs up to a maximum of \$80,000 in the first year, subject to inflation adjustment in subsequent years.

Lake Dixon. Lake Dixon is a recreational and biological open space area with preserve-compatible land uses, such as passive recreation. The primary habitats include chaparral, coastal sage scrub, and open water. The only sensitive species documented onsite as part of the MHCP database is California gnatcatcher. Natural upland habitat around Lake Dixon is designated for 90 percent conservation as part of the FPA. Up to 10 percent of the habitat is therefore available for expansion of allowable land uses (Section 4.3).

Water District Property. The city's approximately 2,000-acre water district property, which has water district facilities, supports undisturbed chaparral and oak woodland.

Some of the sensitive species that have been detected include southwestern pond turtle, bald eagle, osprey, and Engelmann oak. Upland habitat on this property is designated as 80 percent conserved as part of the FPA. Up to 20 percent of the habitat is therefore available for limited expansion of facilities (Section 4.3).

Kit Carson Park. Kit Carson Park is a 200-acre recreational and biological open space area with compatible land uses including passive recreation. The primary habitats include coastal sage scrub and riparian woodland and scrub. Some of the sensitive species that have been detected include least Bell's vireo, white-faced ibis, California gnatcatcher, Cooper's hawk, and golden eagle. Upland habitat in Kit Carson Park is designated as 90 percent conserved as part of the FPA.

Valley Center Road. The city owns and manages lands along both sides of Valley Center Road, north of Lake Wohlford Road. Existing uses include a police shooting range on the east side and a private archery range known as the Bear State Archery Range.

Other Public Lands. Other city-owned lands with habitat to be conserved are described in Section 4. They include Rancho San Pasqual public facility parcel, Escondido Creek southwest of Harmony Grove Road, oak trees and archaeological sites at proposed Citracado Park, a parcel adjacent to Palos Vista development and along Siphon Vista Canal, riparian areas of the Vineyard at Escondido Golf Club, and open space areas of Rod McLeod Park, Ryan Park, and Jesmond Dene Park.

5.1.2 Conserved Habitat on Private Lands

The subarea plan area contains 3,461 acres of privately owned habitat, of which 1,725 acres are planned to be conserved. Some habitat lands have already been protected as project open space (e.g., in Palos Vista, Neighborhood 2). Other areas are anticipated to be conserved through avoidance of project impacts and subsequent protection of habitat areas through conservation or open space easements. Long-term maintenance of habitat and open space areas will be the responsibility of the fee owner, generally a homeowners association. Impacts of new projects listed below will be mitigated within the FPA or within the gnatcatcher core area according to the guidelines in Section 5.2, unless otherwise specified below. In particular, mitigation for impacts to coastal sage

scrub should be directed toward acquisition of gnatcatcher and cactus wren habitat in the southern portion of the city.

Bernardo Mountain. This property has an approved tentative map (Tract 666) and development agreement for Phase I, a 32-acre portion of the 232-acre property. There is a pending application for a revised tentative map to reduce density and adjust the boundaries of the subdivision and may propose establishment of a conservation bank. No development proposal has been submitted for Phase II, which consists primarily of chaparral, coastal sage scrub, and riparian habitats.

Palos Vista Specific Plan, Neighborhood 3. The approved development agreement for this property permits an agricultural subdivision, without any requirement for natural habitat areas to be conserved. The development agreement remains effective until 2008. Any significant modification of the approved tentative map will be evaluated for conformance with the subarea plan. Conservation of approximately 50 percent of the coastal sage scrub and chaparral to provide linkage to adjacent habitat areas is anticipated as part of any significant modification.

Quail Hills. A specific plan and tentative map (Tract 677) have been approved for industrial development. Natural habitats include coastal sage scrub, grassland, and limited riparian habitats. The approved project proposes to remove all natural habitat onsite, subject to approval of a mitigation plan consistent with the guidelines of this subarea plan. Required mitigation will consist of 2:1 replacement for occupied coastal sage scrub acreage and conservation of an equal number of gnatcatchers, through acquisition of occupied habitat in the FPA or in a gnatcatcher core in the unincorporated area (see MHCP Plan). All other habitat impacts will be mitigated in accordance with guidelines in Section 5.2. A 4(d) permit was issued in January 2000 for the first phase.

Valley View (Specific Planning Area #4). This property is located outside the city's sphere of influence and is not included in the subarea plan area. Natural habitats consist of chaparral, oak woodland, and riparian habitat. A pending development application proposes to annex the property to the city. Approximately two-thirds of the property in the southern portion is within the County of San Diego's approved MSCP Subarea Plan and is designated as a preapproved mitigation bank. The relationship of the proposed annexation to the subarea plan is discussed in Section 6.

Montreux. A tentative map (Tract 781) and Specific Plan were approved in 1993 to allow 84 residential lots on 345 acres. Natural habitats consist primarily of chaparral and coastal sage scrub. The proposed preserve includes approximately 211 acres of natural open space to be maintained by the homeowners association. It is anticipated that mitigation will be provided in accordance with the certified environmental impact report (ER92-13). A 4(d) permit was approved in January 2000 for proposed impacts to coastal sage scrub.

Schooler et al. Any potential development on this site will be mitigated onsite consistent with the guidelines of this subarea plan. The site consists of high quality coastal sage scrub and cactus scrub habitat. Impacts to cactus wren habitat will require onsite conservation of cactus scrub and restoration of cactus scrub habitat. Any development of the three properties within this area will be planned as a single unit (Section 4.4).

Rancho San Pasqual and Adjacent Properties. Rancho San Pasqual includes a golf course, residential development, and approximately 430 acres of biological open space. The primary open space habitats include coastal sage scrub (that includes cactus patches) and riparian woodland/scrub. Some of the sensitive species that have been detected include coastal cactus wren and Cooper's hawk. The property to the north of Rancho San Pasqual primarily includes oak woodland and riparian habitat, and sensitive species detected include Harbison's dun skipper and Engelmann oak. The property to the west of Rancho San Pasqual primarily includes coastal sage scrub. The Rancho San Pasqual open space is designated as 100 percent conserved as part of the FPA and approved specific plan, while the property to the west is designated at 75 percent conserved, in anticipation of future development opportunities.

Other Areas. For developed properties, it is assumed that the open space areas are owned and managed by homeowner associations. For new projects, modifications, and previously approved projects that are not vested, mitigation will be in accordance with guidelines in Section 5.2.

5.1.3 Potential Habitat Acquisition

Private land with natural habitat may be acquired for the preserve from a willing seller at fair market value or upon terms mutually satisfactory to the buyer and seller. Although public acquisition of privately owned habitat lands is not required to implement this plan, if funding becomes available, then it is recommended that approximately 51 acres of undeveloped, private lands (Schooler et al.) in the south section of the subarea plan area be given priority for acquisition. The Bernardo Mountain Phase II property is also a potential acquisition site. Both of these sites in the southern area of the city are important to the conservation and persistence of core cactus wren and gnatcatcher populations in San Pasqual Valley. Other potential acquisition sites include BLM properties within and adjacent to Daley Ranch, private in-holding in Daley Ranch, private lands between Daley Ranch and the Water District properties, subdivided but undeveloped private lots adjacent to the Schooler site, and other sites containing occupied coastal sage scrub habitat or natural riparian areas. Funding for acquisition may be provided from federal, state, and city/local sources or through implementation of the MHCP regional funding program.

5.2 CITYWIDE CONSERVATION ACTIONS

This section describes specific conservation standards and policies that the city will enforce for all development projects in the city to ensure that preserve implementation achieves its intended objectives and criteria, as described in Section 4. The following standards and guidelines apply wherever a project may impact natural vegetation communities or biological resources within the city.

5.2.1 Mitigation Standards for Vegetation Communities

Table 5-2 contains mitigation standards for impacts to natural vegetation communities. Mitigation actions for unavoidable impacts should be selected from the following, arranged in order of preference:

- If impact is located inside the FPA, onsite conservation and/or revegetation.
- If offsite mitigation is required, then from Daley Ranch Conservation Bank, if applicable, then from within the city's FPA.

Table 5-2

**MITIGATION STANDARDS FOR IMPACTS TO NATURAL
VEGETATION AND HABITAT¹**

Habitat Group	Location of Impacted Habitat	
	Inside FPA ³	Outside FPA ⁴
A. Wetland/Riparian² - Coastal salt marsh, alkali marsh, freshwater marsh, estuarine, salt pan/mudflats, riparian forest, riparian woodland, riparian scrub, vernal pool, disturbed wetland, flood channel, freshwater	No net loss goal [Replacement ratio between 1:1 and 3:1]	No net loss goal [Replacement ratio between 1:1 and 3:1]
B. Rare Upland - Beach, southern coastal bluff scrub, maritime succulent scrub, southern maritime chaparral, Engelmann oak woodland, coast live oak woodland, native grassland	3:1	2:1
C. Coastal Sage Scrub - Coastal sage scrub, coastal sage/chaparral mix	2:1	1:1
D. Chaparral - Chaparral, excluding southern maritime chaparral	1:1	0.5:1
E. Annual Grassland - Annual (nonnative) grassland	0.5:1	0.5:1
F. Other - Disturbed land (including ruderal), agricultural land, eucalyptus	None	None

Notes:

1. This table describes standards for mitigation of impacts to vegetation communities (habitats), excluding narrow endemic species. Separate standards apply for impacts to narrow endemic or certain other species; see text for discussion of these species.
2. All impacts to wetland habitats and mitigation for such impacts must be reviewed and approved by federal and state agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands.
3. Primary conservation actions for natural habitats inside the FPA are to avoid impact as much as possible and to minimize any unavoidable impacts. Upland habitat that is conserved and managed onsite may be used to satisfy mitigation obligations associated with impacts to other upland habitats located elsewhere onsite.
4. Upland habitat (group B, C, D, or E) may be removed outside the FPA. All mitigation obligations associated with impacts to upland habitat must be located inside the city's FPA or other approved FPA. Conservation of upland habitat onsite cannot be used to satisfy mitigation obligations associated with impacts to other upland habitats.

- Offsite mitigation in core gnatcatcher habitat in unincorporated San Diego County.
- Offsite mitigation within the city's General Plan area that provides connectivity to the city's FPA.
- Other areas as directed by the city consistent with the biological goals of the subarea plan and the MHCP.

It should be noted that impacts to wetlands and wetland habitats must be reviewed by federal or state agencies having jurisdiction over those areas. The Escondido Subarea Plan and the MHCP have a policy of no net loss of wetland vegetation communities.

5.2.2 Narrow Endemic Species Standards

The MHCP defined "Narrow Endemic Species" (listed in Table 5-3) as follows:

MHCP species that are highly restricted by their habitat affinities, edaphic requirements, or other ecological factors, and that have limited but important populations within the MHCP area, such that substantial loss of these populations or their habitat within the MHCP area might jeopardize the continued existence or recovery of that species.

MHCP policies require maximum avoidance of project impacts, minimization of impacts, and species-specific mitigation measures for unavoidable impacts, with a goal of achieving no net loss of these populations within the FPA, and no more than 20 percent gross loss outside of the FPA. These policies, as further elaborated in the MHCP, are hereby incorporated into the Escondido Subarea Plan, as follows.

1. For species identified in Table 5-3 as Narrow Endemic Species, the City of Escondido will require, in priority order, maximum avoidance of project impacts, minimization of impacts, and species-specific mitigation measures for unavoidable impacts. Maximum avoidance and minimization shall be interpreted as avoidance of impacts to the degree practicable without precluding reasonable use of the

Table 5-3

MHCP NARROW ENDEMIC SPECIES LIST^{1,2}

Scientific Name	Common Name	Known Locality in Escondido?
Plants		
<i>Acanthomintha ilicifolia</i> (s)	San Diego Thornmint	Yes
<i>Ambrosia pumila</i> (g)	San Diego Ambrosia	No
<i>Arctostaphylos glandulosa</i> ssp. <i>crassifolia</i> (g)	Del Mar Manzanita	No
<i>Baccharis vanessae</i> (g)	Encinitas Baccharis	No
<i>Brodiaea filifolia</i> (s)	Thread-leaved Brodiaea	No
<i>Chorizanthe orcuttiana</i> (g)	Orcutt's Spineflower	No
<i>Corethrogyne filaginifolia</i> var. <i>linifolia</i> (g)	Del Mar Mesa Sand Aster	No
<i>Dudleya blochmaniae</i> ssp. <i>brevifolia</i> (g, s)	Short-leaved Dudleya	No
<i>Dudleya variegata</i> (s)	Variegated Dudleya	No
<i>Eryngium aristulatum</i> var. <i>parishii</i> (v, s)	San Diego Button-celery	No
<i>Hazardia orcuttii</i> (g)	Orcutt's Hazardia	No
<i>Lotus nuttallianus</i> (g)	Nuttall's Lotus	No
<i>Muilla clevelandii</i> (s)	San Diego Goldenstar	No
<i>Myosurus minimus</i> ssp. <i>apus</i> (v, s)	Little Mousetail	No
<i>Navarretia fossalis</i> (v, s)	Prostrate Navarretia	No
<i>Orcuttia californica</i> (v, s)	California Orcutt Grass	No
Animals		
<i>Streptocephalus woottoni</i> (v)	Riverside Fairy Shrimp	No
<i>Branchinecta sandiegoensis</i> (v)	San Diego Fairy Shrimp	No
<i>Cicindela latesignata obliviosa</i> (g)	Oblivious Tiger Beetle	No
<i>Perognathus longimembris pacificus</i> (g, s)	Pacific Pocket Mouse	No
<i>Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus cousei</i> (g)	Coastal Cactus Wren	Yes

Notes:

1. Species on this list meet the criteria of being highly restricted by geographical or ecological factors *and* having important populations within the MHCP area, such that substantial loss of these populations or their habitat within the MHCP area might jeopardize the continued existence or recovery of that species.
2. Letters in parentheses indicate the nature of the endemism: g = geographic endemic; v = vernal pool endemic; s = edaphic (soil) endemic. Note that some species classified as geographic endemics for purposes of the MHCP study are more widespread in Baja California.

property. Species-specific mitigation measures for unavoidable impacts shall be designed to achieve no net loss of narrow endemic populations, occupied acreage, or population viability. Mitigation options for achieving this goal (e.g., transplantation of plants) are discussed in the species justifications of MHCP Volume II.

2. In no case shall the city permit more than 5 percent gross loss of narrow endemic populations or occupied acreage (whichever is most appropriate for the species) within the FPA, or more than 20 percent gross loss within the city as a whole.
3. Any take of Narrow Endemic populations or occupied acreage within the FPA (up to 5 percent of total within these designated areas) must be mitigated so as to achieve no net loss of such populations. Any take of Narrow Endemic populations or occupied acreage outside the FPA (up to 20 percent of the total within the city) must be mitigated based on species-specific criteria discussed in the MHCP species justifications or designed in consultation with the wildlife agencies, to minimize adverse effects to species viability and to contribute to species recovery.
4. Areas conserved for Narrow Endemics shall include biologically justified buffer zones around the population sites to allow for natural expansion and contraction of populations, persistence of pollinators, and other essential ecological functions (see Ogden 1998). The width of the buffer and allowable activities within this zone will be determined on a species- and site-specific basis. Any conserved lands that support narrow endemic species shall be added to the Escondido preserve system and managed for the continued viability of the population.
5. Regardless of location, Narrow Endemic populations listed as “critical” in the MHCP Biological Goals, Standards, and Guidelines (Ogden 1998) must be totally avoided, and any populations that are later discovered and determined to meet the criteria for a critical population must be maximally avoided. In no case shall the city permit more than 5 percent gross loss of known or newly found critical populations of narrow endemic species, regardless of location within the city. Any take of major or critical populations (up to 5 percent of total within the city) must be mitigated so as to achieve a no net loss of such populations within the city.

5.2.3 Wetlands Mitigation Standards

Wetland communities within Escondido include areas subject to CDFG Code Section 1600 et seq. and Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act. Such areas will continue to be regulated by these state and federal statutes. The ACOE will continue to consult with the USFWS pursuant to Section 7 of the federal ESA on projects that may affect federally listed species within ACOE jurisdictional wetlands. The CDFG will work closely with the ACOE, USFWS, and the City of Escondido to ensure that Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq. agreements are consistent with (1) the mitigation required for covered species by Section 404 permits (including federal ESA Section 7 consultations) and (2) the Escondido Subarea Plan.

This subarea plan addresses avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for wetland habitats subject to development impacts. Development projects that affect wetland vegetation communities will be required to comply with these terms, which meet the federal policy of no net loss of wetland functions and values, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) 404(b)(1) Guidelines (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 230). Compliance with these subarea plan terms will constitute the full extent of mitigation measures for the take of covered species required or recommended by the USFWS pursuant to the ESA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the CDFG pursuant to the CESA, NCCP Act, and CEQA.

The following standards and policies apply to all wetland vegetation communities within the city:

No Net Loss Policy. For all vegetation communities listed by the MHCP as wetland vegetation communities (Table 5-2), the city shall require, in priority order, maximum avoidance of project impacts, minimization of impacts, and mitigation of impacts. Mitigation of unavoidable impacts shall be designed to achieve no net loss of both wetland vegetation acreage *and biological value* within the city. This is consistent with existing wetland policies of the CDFG.

Mitigation for Unavoidable Impacts. To achieve the no net loss standard, mitigation for unavoidable impacts (e.g., wetland habitat creation) should preferably occur on the project site. Alternatively, offsite mitigation may occur as long as such mitigation

demonstrably contributes to the Escondido preserve design and biological value (e.g., by adjacency to other preserve areas). Offsite mitigation should preferentially occur within the same watershed as the impact. In any case, wetland mitigation sites shall be designated as preserve lands protected by a conservation easement and managed for biological values.

Conservation and Buffer Requirements Along Tributaries and Creeks. Wherever development or other discretionary actions are proposed in or adjacent to riparian habitats under common ownership, the riparian area shall be designated as biological open space and incorporated into the preserve. In addition, a minimum 50-foot biological buffer, plus a minimum 50-foot planning buffer (total width of both equals 100 feet) should be established for upland habitats, beginning at the outer edge of riparian vegetation. Within the 50-foot biological buffer, no new development shall be allowed, and the area shall be managed for natural biological values as part of the preserve system. In the event that natural habitats do not currently (at the time of proposed action) cover the 50-foot buffer area, habitats appropriate to the location and soils shall be restored as a condition for the proposed action. Within the additional 50-foot planning buffer, no new buildings or other uses considered incompatible with adjacent preserve goals shall be established, although uses considered compatible in preserve buffer areas may be established (e.g., trails or utilities; see MHCP Section 4.3 for a complete discussion of compatible and incompatible land uses adjacent to the preserve).

5.2.4 Fire and Fuel Management Standards

For all future development projects' plans and approvals, firebreaks and fuel modification zones must be addressed in accordance with the requirements of the fire chief pursuant to the city's fire ordinance, and must be considered part of the development footprint for determining project impacts and mitigation requirements. Fuel breaks and modification zones shall not be counted as biological open space for the purpose of determining onsite or offsite credit toward mitigation requirements; exceptions may be granted in consultation and with concurrence of the wildlife agencies (e.g., *Opuntia* spp. planted as cactus wren habitat).

5.2.5 Clustering Standards for New Development

Because this plan has the potential to decrease the allowable development area on a parcel relative to existing city ordinances and policies, the city will consider ways to offset adverse economic effects on landowners, such as (1) clustering to increase development densities on the developable portion of the property, and (2) relaxation of zoning development standards (increasing maximum allowable building heights and floor area ratios [FARs], or reducing setbacks). Such actions may require amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

5.3 FUNDING AND FINANCING OF THE PLAN

5.3.1 Funding Needs of Plan Implementation

In implementing the subarea plan, current commitments and/or expenditures for the management of city-owned habitat and open space lands will be continued.

Management, operation, and maintenance functions required for the city's preserve lands include the following:

1. Field operations, or a baseline set of field activities, including trail and fencing maintenance, vegetation control, security, and visitor services.
2. Biological monitoring, or biological field studies necessary to meet the conditions of wildlife agency permits.
3. Program administration required for preserve assembly and coordination, financing, legal and administrative support.

In implementing the subarea plan, current commitments and/or expenditures for the management of city-owned habitat and open space lands will be continued.

Under the Daley Ranch conservation agreement, the city has committed to manage the bank lands, with management expenses not to exceed \$80,000 per year, or an average of \$28 per acre per year. The city will also establish, from the sale of conservation credits,

an endowment to pay annual management expenses and a second endowment for restoration activities (not to exceed a total of \$1 million). For purposes of this plan, therefore, habitat management and restoration needs of the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank are assumed to be fully funded.

Habitat lands owned by the city near Valley Center Road and Lake Wohlford are currently maintained by the Parks and Recreation Department. The city's budget does not currently itemize expenditures for the management of these properties, which are funded from the city's general fund and from utility revenues. The city will continue these expenditures and levels of management activity in the future; no additional funding requirements are anticipated.

Ongoing costs for biological monitoring and program administration for city-owned habitat lands are estimated to be less than \$100,000 per year, measured in 2000 dollars, and could be covered through the general fund.

Under the subarea plan, the city would require private developers and landowners, who set aside habitat as mitigation for impacts from land development, to also establish funds for the management of those lands in perpetuity. Public funds will not be used to manage or maintain privately dedicated habitat lands.

5.3.2 Sources of Funds

The city's funding needs for implementing the subarea plan are primarily those associated with the management and maintenance of the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank and of lands near Lake Wohlford. Existing funding sources for these activities (i.e., revenues from the sale of conservation credits and appropriations of city funds) will continue in the future. Funding for management of privately dedicated preserve lands will be provided as part of the mitigation obligations for development impacts.

If a regional or subregional funding source is established for habitat conservation in the MHCP study area, any funds allocable to the city should be expended for one or more of the following purposes:

1. Acquire and restore privately owned habitat lands in the south sector of the subarea plan area.
2. Supplement existing funding sources for the management and/or restoration of habitat lands in the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank, lands near Lake Wohlford, or other preserve lands in the subarea plan area.
3. Purchase outstanding conservation credits in the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank, if it is determined that future demand for credits will fall short of credits available for sale.