



County of San Diego

APRIL F. HEINZE, P.E.

Director

(858) 694-2527

FAX (858) 467-9283

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

5560 OVERLAND AVE., STE. 410, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1204

FACILITIES OPERATIONS
FLEET MANAGEMENT
MAIL SERVICES
PROJECT MANAGEMENT
REAL ESTATE SERVICES

October 2014

Revised December 23, 2014

4.0 CEQA Initial Study

CEQA Initial Study – Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G)

1. **Title:** North Inland Crisis Residential Facility; Project Number 1005490

2. **Lead agency name and address:**
County of San Diego, Department of General Services
5560 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, California 92123

3. **a. Contact:** Marc Cass, Project Manager
b. Phone number: 858.694.2047
c. E-mail: Marc.Cass@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. **Project location:**

The project site consists of a single parcel [Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) (230-091-007)] located within the City of Escondido in northern San Diego County, California, (Figure 2-1, Regional Map). Regional access is provided to the site via Interstate 15 (I-15). The site is located at 606 East Valley Parkway, Escondido, California, 92025 (Figure 2-2, Vicinity Map).

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1109, Grid J2

5. **Project Applicant name and address:**

County of San Diego, Department of General Services
5560 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, California 92123

6. **General Plan:** City of Escondido
Community Plan: N/A
Land Use Designation: General Commercial
Density: N/A
Floor Area Ratio (FAR): 0.5
7. **Zoning:** City of Escondido
Use Regulation: CG
Minimum Lot Size: N/A
Special Area Regulation: East Valley Parkway Area Plan

8. **Description of project:**

The project is a North Inland Crisis Residential Facility to be located on a portion of the HHSA –North Inland Campus (600-620 East Valley Parkway) that would include the demolition of a 3,060 square-foot North Inland Public Health Center (606 East Valley Parkway), a 22,080 square-foot Family Resource Center (620 East Valley Parkway) and a 13,010 square-foot Regional Administrative Office of HHSA (600 East Valley Parkway) and the construction of a 6,500 square-foot, 14-bed mental health facility to be located at 606 East Valley Parkway within the City of Escondido in the North Inland Region of San Diego County. All three functions will move to a new leased location at 649 W. Mission Avenue. The facility would be built on a 0.53-acre portion of the 2.75-acre lot with the remaining land to either be used for another public purpose or considered surplus public land and sold. The facility would be staffed by approximately 15 persons including a psychiatrist for the management of medication.

The County's Health & Human Services Agency (HHSA) program currently has six (6) sites throughout the County that provides 24 hour crisis residential services 365 days a year for adults ages 18 and over with acute and serious mental illness for stays up to 9 days. This includes individuals with a co-occurring substance use condition who reside in San Diego County. The program provides integrated mental health and alcohol and drug services. The facility would allow the County's Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) to increase their capacity and access to community based mental health crisis services that are focused on wellness, resiliency, and recovery oriented in the least restrictive manner possible. The program supports a social rehabilitation model, which is designed to enhance an individual's social connection with their family and/or community so they can move back into the community and reduce the risk of inpatient hospitalization. The program aims to offer an environment where they are supported as they examine and evaluate their own life experience.

The proposed architectural style of the new facility would be designed to resemble a large residential structure so as to provide a home like setting for the patients. The configuration of the structure would likely be u-shaped or the structure would surround a courtyard in order to provide staff a central vantage point to allow observation of the entire facility. Adequate parking would be provided on site as surface parking.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting (briefly describe the project’s surroundings):**

Lands surrounding the project site consist of Escondido Creek and Residential Urban III (up to 18 du/acre) to the north, Office (O) and Downtown Specific Plan Area #9 to the south and General Commercial to the east and west.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Conditional Use Permit	City of Escondido

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or a “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of General Services finds that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of General Services finds 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.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of General Services finds that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.



Signature



Date

April F. Heinze

Printed Name

Director

Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON 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 Incorporated, 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. “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.
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 Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that 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. 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 – Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

Less Than Significant Impact: A site visit was conducted on August 7, 2014 to assess the site and the surrounding area. The proposed project is not located near or within a view shed of a scenic vista. The 2.75-acre site consists of three separate structures with surface parking and landscaping fronting Grape Street and East Valley Parkway.

The proposed project involves the demolition of a 3,060 square-foot North Inland Public Health Center, a 22,080 square-foot Family Resource Center and a 13,010 square-foot Regional Administrative Office and the construction of a 6,500 square-foot residential crisis center. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality because no viewshed would be impacted and the project would be consistent with the urban nature and mass of the surrounding area. Additionally, the proposed project would be consistent with the site’s existing land use. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present, and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. The new facility would be similar in mass and character to the surrounding development. Therefore, the project would not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a state scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist’s line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

No Impact: The site is not located adjacent to any state designated scenic highways and is developed with three existing structures, surface parking, and associated landscape and hardscape. The project would result in the demolition of a 3,060 square-foot North Inland Public Health Center, a 22,080 square-foot Family Resource Center and a 13,010 square-foot Regional Administrative Office and the construction of a 6,500 square-foot crisis residential facility. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a state scenic highway.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project is not adjacent to any designated viewshed. The project site is not located within the vicinity of an officially designated scenic highway. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project- or cumulative-level effect on a scenic resource within a state scenic highway.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer’s perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity, and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings can be characterized as an established, developed community. The established community consists of the following land uses: Escondido Creek and Residential Urban III (up to 18 du/acre) to the north, Office (O) and Downtown Specific Plan Area #9 to the south and General Commercial to the east and west and Palomar Medical Center-East Campus to the south.

The project would result in the demolition of a 3,060 square-foot North Inland Public Health Center, a 22,080 square-foot Family Resource Center and a 13,010 square-foot Regional Administrative Office and the construction of a 6,500 square-foot crisis residential facility, surface parking, and associated landscape and hardscape. The proposed facility would be delivered through either a Design-Build Entity or a Construction Manager At-Risk procurement method. Either project delivery method involves some overlap of the design and construction process. As a result, at this time project schematics have not been complete. However, as part of the project delivery method the project would be designed to replicate a residential treatment facility to the extent possible.

Construction may cause short-term visual impacts to users of East Valley Parkway and possibly the residents across the channel. However, construction equipment would be screened as far away as possible from residential uses. Due to the temporary nature of changes in visual character and quality resulting from construction, the proposed project would not significantly degrade the existing visual character of the project site.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present, and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. The cumulative projects would contribute to the urban environment in the viewshed and they would not result in additional disturbed vacant/undeveloped sites. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project- or cumulative-level effects on visual character or quality on site or in the surrounding area.

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is within an illuminated area as the surrounding area is an urban area. The proposed project would include outdoor lighting; however, any lighting would have to comply with the applicable building codes and County ordinances. The overall appearance of the facility would be consistent with the existing setting. Introduction of some amount of nighttime lighting is needed due to safety requirements.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated | |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain any agricultural resources, lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency (SANDAG 2007a). Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated | |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned CG – Commercial General (City of Escondido), which is not an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract (SANGIS 2007b). Therefore, the project does not 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)), or timberland (as defined by Public

Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is developed within an urban environment and does not contain forest land or timberland. The City of Escondido does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project is consistent with existing zoning as the substantially the same use is proposed and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones.

- d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain any forest lands as defined in California Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of off-site forest resources.

- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and the immediate surrounding area does not contain any active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland,

or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency (California Department of Conservation 2013). Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Regional planning efforts to improve air quality include a variety of strategies to reduce emissions from motor vehicles and minimize emissions from stationary sources. The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) is the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in San Diego County. The SDAPCD develops rules and regulations, establishes permitting requirements for stationary sources, inspects sources, and enforces measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary. The applicable air quality plan for San Diego County is the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS). The RAQS is based on San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth forecasts for the region and incorporates measures to meet state and federal requirements. Under this threshold, the significance of air quality impacts is based on the degree to which the project is consistent with SANDAG’s growth forecasts. If a project is consistent with growth forecasts, its resulting impacts were anticipated in the RAQS and are considered to be less than significant. Growth forecast in the RAQS are based on approved general plans, community plans, and redevelopment plans.

The project would result in the demolition of a 3,060 square-foot North Inland Public Health Center, a 22,080 square-foot Family Resource Center and a 13,010 square-foot Regional Administrative Office and the construction of a 6,500 square-foot crisis residential facility. Additionally, as discussed below, emissions during project demolition would be less than the County’s thresholds of significance. The types and quantities of construction equipment that would be used for the proposed project would be typical of demolition and construction activities and would not be of sufficient magnitude or

quantity to exceed the assumptions used in the preparation of construction equipment emissions in the RAQS. Because the RAQS has accounted for construction-related emissions of ozone precursors, construction emissions generated by the proposed project would be consistent with those included in the emissions inventory of the RAQS; therefore, they would be consistent with construction-related emissions projected in the RAQS. Hence, the threshold of significance (i.e., conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan) would not be exceeded and no impact would result.

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

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Emissions resulting from demolition and construction activities would be short term and temporary and would be generated by heavy equipment, construction-related trips by workers, material-hauling trucks, and associated fugitive dust generation. The principal pollutants of concern would be particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀) and ozone precursors, reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x).

However, given that the project is relatively small in scale and that implementation of standard construction best management practices (e.g. dust suppression methods, restrictions on construction idling, etc.) and compliance with SDAPCD's regulations, the project emissions would be less than the County's air quality thresholds of significance (County of San Diego 2007).

Vehicular Traffic

The project would result in the demolition of a 3,060 square-foot North Inland Public Health Center, a 22,080 square-foot Family Resource Center and a 13,010 square-foot Regional Administrative Office and the construction of a 6,500 square-foot crisis residential facility. During the operational phase of the project, there would be an expected net decrease in daily trips because the facility would accommodate 14-beds for short term overnight stays whereas the existing use provides health services to many patrons on a daily basis. In addition, the two other structures which make up the Family Resource Center are relocating and would also contribute to a net reduction in average daily trips. Furthermore, according to SANDAG's "Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region" a Congregate Care Facility would result in 2.5 trips per dwelling unit. While the proposed facility does not include dwelling

units as a Congregate Care Facility would, the use is the most similar and would be appropriate to use as a proxy. As such, without factoring in the reduction of ADT due to the relocation of the FRC facility, the proposed facility would result in approximately 35 ADT, which is well below the 200 ADT significance thresholds for LOS F. However, by factoring in the reduction of daily trips due to relocation of the FRC facility, a net reduction of ADT is expected to occur as a result of project implementation.

Furthermore, the administration of health services by the FRC served a larger pool of users that would involve daily trips whereas the facility would involve trips for short-term stays. As such, the project is expected to result in a net reduction of daily trips. Therefore, project implementation would not be expected to contribute to an existing air quality standard or violation.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project's cumulative impacts are primarily based on an analysis of the consistency of the project with the local general plan and the applicable air quality plan for the region. As discussed previously, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any federal, state, or local air quality attainment plans and the project would be not be inconsistent with the City of Escondido's General Plan. As a result, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

In addition, the new structure would operate at higher energy efficiency levels than the existing building as it would incorporate sustainable design and energy reduction measures. Therefore, it is anticipated that implementation of the proposed LEED Silver certified project would not substantially increase operational criteria air pollutant emissions resulting from energy use relative to that associated with the existing structure. Moreover, as the project would be consistent with the existing land use as anticipated in the current local air quality plans, the increase in energy efficiency of the new building due to LEED certification, the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in criteria air pollutant emissions. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (preschool–12th grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, daycare centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly. The nearest sensitive receptors to the proposed project include residential to the north, hospital/medical uses to the south, and a mix of general commercial uses to the east and west.

Fugitive Dust

The building demolition and subsequent cleanup activities would result in generation of fugitive dust (i.e., PM₁₀). The project must comply with SDAPCD Rule 55, which applies to “any commercial construction or demolition activity capable of generating fugitive dust emissions.” Accordingly, compliance with Rule 55 would minimize visible fugitive dust emissions beyond the property line. Appropriate measures, including use of water sprays during demolition and wetting of disturbed soil, would be applied during the project.

M-AIR-1: Prior to the commencement of demolition activities, all residences located within 1,000 feet of the project site shall be notified of the anticipated demolition schedule and daily hours of demolition activities.

Air Toxics

Diesel exhaust particulate matter would be emitted from heavy equipment and trucks used in the demolition process. Because diesel exhaust particulate matter is considered to be carcinogenic, long-term exposure to diesel exhaust emissions could result in adverse health impacts. Demolition of the proposed project would result in short-term, temporary emissions of diesel exhaust from construction equipment. The emissions would not occur 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, but would be more likely to occur during daytime working hours with varying uses over that time of equipment and vehicles dependent on diesel fuel. Because of the temporary, short-term nature and frequency of demolition emissions, diesel exhaust particulate matter would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; therefore, exposure to sensitive receptors due to emissions of air toxics would be a less-than-significant impact. With respect to operations, impacts would be less than significant as the project

would consist of the replacement of the county health building, and would not introduce new sources of operational emissions from those under existing conditions.

With regard to demolition activities and the potential release of asbestos, the SDAPCD’s Regulation XI, Subpart M, Rule 361.145 requires that the SDAPCD be notified in writing at least 10 days prior to the start of any demolition or renovation activities involving the presence of asbestos-containing material. The existing on-site building is 50 years old, originally built in 1964. An Asbestos/Lead Survey will be conducted by the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health - Community Health Division, Occupational Health Program, to confirm the presence of regulated asbestos-containing material within the existing building. Subpart M of SDAPCD’s Regulation XI requires that all regulated asbestos-containing material be removed prior to demolition activities. The proposed project would comply with this regulation. In addition, the County would comply with Rule 631.145 by providing notification to the SDAPCD in writing at least 10 days before the start of the demolition of any buildings. Compliance with Rule 361.145 would reduce asbestos-related impacts to a level that is less than significant.

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

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Demolition activities could generate airborne odors associated with the operation of construction vehicles (e.g., diesel exhaust). Total demolition could take up to 8 weeks. Demolition emissions would be isolated to the immediate vicinity of the project site and would be limited to a finite period of time that would be relatively short. As noted previously, operational emissions would resemble those under existing conditions and the project would not introduce new odor-generating uses to the site; thus, the project would not create objectionable odors in the long term. As such, impacts related to creation of odors during demolition of the project would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project site is not known to contain habitat for 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 (CDFW)¹ or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), due to the disturbed and urban nature of the project site. The majority of on-site vegetation is composed of ornamental landscaping. Additionally, wildlife on site is limited to common species typically found in urban environments. The site is already developed with three buildings and surface parking. The area around the site has been primarily developed for General Commercial and Hospital/Medical uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact associated candidate, sensitive, or special-status species as identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the CDFW or the USFWS.

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

~~**No Impact**~~ **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** The project would result in the demolition of a 3,060 square-foot North Inland Public Health Center, a 22,080 square-foot Family Resource Center and a 13,010 square-foot Regional Administrative Office and the construction of a 6,500 square-foot crisis residential facility. The proposed project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as defined by any local or regional plans, policies, or regulations. **However, the project site does provide possibly nesting habitat for nesting and migratory birds. Therefore, mitigation has been included to reduce potential indirect impacts to below a level of significant.** ~~In addition, the project does not propose any off-site improvements, and hence would not contribute to off-site impacts related to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.~~

¹. As of September 2012, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has changed its name to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). In quoted material and when citing documents published before the official name change, the original name is retained; in original text and for documents published after the official name change, CDFW is used.

Mitigation Measures

MM Bio-1: Trees, shrubs, and the bare ground in and surrounding the project area may provide nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MTBA). If project construction cannot be conducted outside of the nesting season (typically February 1 to August 30), then preconstruction surveys for nesting raptors and migratory birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist 30 days in advance of any earth disturbing activities, and continued weekly with a final survey no more than 3 days prior to the start of construction activities, including vegetation clearing. The qualified biologist shall survey the construction zone and a 500-foot radius surrounding the proposed construction zone in suitable habitat to determine whether the proposed construction has the potential to disturb or otherwise harm nesting birds.

If an active raptor nest is located within a 500-foot radius around the proposed construction zone, including staging areas, or if an active migratory bird nest is located within a 300-foot radius and construction must take place during the breeding season, a buffer zone (300-feet for non raptors, 500-feet for raptors) shall be established by a qualified biologist and confirmed by the appropriate resource agency. A qualified wildlife biologist shall monitor the nest to determine when the young have fledged and submit monthly monitoring reports to the County Department of General Services throughout the nesting season on the status of the nest. The biological monitor shall have the authority to cease construction if there is any sign of distress to the raptor or migratory bird. Reference to this requirement and the MBTA shall be included in the construction specifications.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is currently developed with three buildings comprising of the Family Resources Center, a surface parking lot, and associated landscape and hardscape areas. The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool,

stream, lake, river, or water of the United States, that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion, or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts would occur to wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is currently developed with three buildings, a surface parking lot, and associated landscape and hardscape areas. Due to the developed nature of the project site, there is limited biological value and no impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridor, or the use of native wildlife nursery sites expected as a result of the proposed project.

e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: According to the City’s General Plan, most of the open space in the City consists of public lands as well as other open spaces, neither of which are supported on site or are adjacent to the property. Due to the urbanized nature and the project site being developed, existing significant wildlife habitats within such areas are nonexistent. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Nature Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved

local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, or any other local policies or ordinances that project biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: In order to assess the potential historical significance of the Regional Administrative Office (600 East Valley Parkway), North Inland Public Health Center (606 East Valley Parkway), and the Family Resource Center (620 East Valley Parkway), a Historical Resources Technical Report (November 2014) was prepared by ASM Affiliates. The county health building None of the buildings would not be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the City of Escondido Historical Criteria, the Count of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, CEQA and the San Diego County Local Register of Historical Resources (Local Register) for the following reasons:

- The county ~~health~~ **buildings is are** not representative of the theme of community development;
- No specific, important, or significant individuals were found to be closely associated with the ~~propertyies~~;
- The county ~~health~~ **buildings is are** not representative of distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction that would distinguish it architecturally;
- The county ~~health~~ **buildings is are** a common property type that would not have potential to provide information about history or prehistory.

The county ~~health~~ buildings were constructed in 1954, 1958, and 1968 as part of the county regional public health center in Escondido. The buildings were evaluated for construction and use, the history of the surrounding public health campus and 600, 606, and 620 East Valley Parkway’s historical context within the construction of other public health facilities in the county; potential association with important people or events; and evaluation of the buildings potential work of a master architect, craftsman, artists, or landscapers. The buildings fails to meet any definitions of a significant historic resource under the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). It is and are not considered a locally or regionally unique resource, individually or as contributors to a potential district. As such, the buildings are not historical resources for the purposes of CEQA compliance.

Therefore, Ddue to the county **health** buildings being ineligible for listing in the CRHR, not included in the Local Register, and is not otherwise identified as a significant historical resource of California; the property **ies was were** determined not to be historically significant. Therefore, project implementation, including demolition activities, would not result in a significant impact to a historic resource.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: See response a) above. The project would not impact archaeological resources since prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to buried archaeological resources.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes that generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County. The site is currently developed and does not support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Project implementation would not impact paleontological resources since prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to buried paleontological resources.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would not disturb any human remains since prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for the presence of interred human remains.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

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

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not located within a fault-rupture hazard zone as identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42 (SP 42), Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California or within an area with substantial evidence of a known fault. As the site is not within a fault hazard zone, the potential for fault rupture is low. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: While the project site is located in San Diego County, which is susceptible to strong seismic ground shaking, the project would be designed to resist seismic forces in accordance with the criteria contained in the California Building Code guidelines. Therefore, the project would not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located outside of liquefaction zones as identified in the San Diego County “Potential Liquefaction Areas” Map (San Diego County 2011). This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, the site is not located within a floodplain. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The City of Escondido is relatively flat with areas of higher elevation to the north and east. The project site is not within a liquefaction zone as identified in the San Diego County “Liquefaction Susceptibility Areas” Map (San Diego County 2011). Therefore, the project would not result in significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as urban land. Urban land consists of “closely built-up areas in cities. Buildings, streets, and sidewalks cover almost all of the surface. The soil has been so altered by urban works that identification is not feasible” as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The project site has been previously graded and supports urban development, including three county health buildings, surface parking, hardscape, and landscape areas. Short-term construction activities could have the potential to result in erosion of soils. However, the proposed project would include erosion and siltation control features pursuant to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, as well as adhering to all applicable local, state, and federal regulations.

Mitigation Measure

M-GE-1: The County shall prepare an erosion control plan for the project site. The erosion control plan shall provide site-specific best management practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion both during demolition and construction activities, including but not limited to sediment control, wind erosion control and stormwater management.

- 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 an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would not result in a significant impact from on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI, Geology and Soils, Question a, iii and iv.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on site are identified as urban land; due to the urban environment, further identification of the soils is not feasible. The project site is not located within a potential expansive soil area as identified in the San Diego County “Potential Expansive Soil Areas” Map (San Diego County 2011). Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or property to a potential risk to life or property as a result of expansive soils.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No septic tanks exist on the project site. The site and surrounding area are served by an extensive, existing infrastructure system, including sewer collection. The proposed project would connect to the existing sewer systems and would not involve other, alternative wastewater disposal methods.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be associated with the demolition and construction of the proposed project through use of construction equipment and vehicle trips.

For the purposes of analyzing GHG impacts as a result of the proposed project, the project was analyzed under the updated County of San Diego *Guidelines for Determining Significance – Climate Change* which includes a 2,500 metric ton CO₂E per year “bright line” screening threshold (County of San Diego 2013). The County developed screening criteria for a range of project types and sizes to identify smaller projects that would have less-than-cumulatively considerable GHG emissions effects (Table 4-4). If a proposed project is the same type and equal to, or smaller than the project size listed, it is presumed that the operational GHG emissions for that project would not exceed 2,500 MT CO₂E per year, and there would be a less-than-cumulatively considerable impact (County of San Diego 2013). Use of the 2,500 metric ton “bright line” threshold only applies to a project’s operational emissions and does not require construction emissions be annualized and added to the operational emissions. Because the proposed facility includes 14-beds to accommodate a short-term stay up to 9 days, the use would most closely resemble a Congregate Care Facility in the table below, which has a screening threshold of 239 dwelling units. As such, the proposed project would result in much less emissions than the uses outlined in the screening thresholds; therefore, project implementation would have a less than significant impact with respect to GHG emissions.

**Table 4-4
Screening Criteria**

Project/Plan Type	Screening Threshold
Single-Family Housing	86 dwelling units
Low-Rise Apartment Housing	121 dwelling units
Mid-Rise Apartment Housing	136 dwelling units
High-Rise Apartment Housing	144 dwelling units
Condominium or Townhouse Housing	120 dwelling units
Congregate Care (Assisted Living) Facility	239 dwelling units
Elementary or Middle School	91,000 square feet
High School	103,000 square feet
University/College (four years)	336 students
Library	81,000 square feet
Restaurant	12,000 square feet
Hotel	106 rooms
Free-Standing Retail Store	31,000 square feet
Shopping Center	33,000 square feet
Convenience Market (24-hour)	2,000 square feet
Office Building	61,000 square feet

**Table 4-4
Screening Criteria**

Project/Plan Type	Screening Threshold
Office Park	56,000 square feet
Hospital	47,000 square feet
Warehouse	141,000 square feet
Light Industrial Facility	74,000 square feet

Source: County of San Diego 2013

Notes: Land use types outlined in the table above are intended to correlate with those presented in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual (8th Edition). Proposed project land use types will be compared with the land use types included in the screening table above to determine applicability. Low-rise apartments have one or two stories, such as garden apartments. Mid-rise apartments have between 3 and 10 stories. High-rise apartments are normally rental units in buildings with more than 10 stories. A shopping center includes a group of commercial establishments that is developed as a unit. A free-standing retail store (also known as "free-standing discount store") is a free-standing store with off-street parking that offers a wide range of customer services and would typically be open 7 days per week with relatively long hours. Office parks are normally in a suburban context and contain office buildings and support services arranged in a campus-type setting, whereas an office building would accommodate multiple tenants in a single structure. Light industrial facilities would typically involve assembly of processed or partially processed materials into products and would have an energy demand that is not substantially higher than office buildings of the same size and scale. Light industrial facilities would not typically generate dust, other air pollutants, light, or noise that is perceptible beyond the boundary of the subject property.

To effectively analyze operational GHG emissions associated with the proposed project, two scenarios were evaluated. The first scenario represents project emissions under a "business as usual" approach, which estimates project emissions absent federal, state and local measures and without project features intended to reduce GHG emissions. The second scenario represents project emissions with implementation of applicable federal, state and local GHG reduction measures and project features. Statewide emission reduction measures proposed in CARB's *Scoping Plan* (CARB 2008) that are applicable to the proposed project as well as the percent reduction from "business as usual" are indicated in Table 4-5 below.

**Table 4-5
State Measures Addressing Reduction of GHG Emissions**

Measure	Sector	Percent Reduction from Business as Usual
AB 1493 – Pavley Standards	Transportation	19.71%
Energy Efficiency	Energy Consumption (Electricity)	10.92%
Renewable Portfolio Standard (33% by 2020)	Energy Consumption (Electricity)	15.30%
Natural Gas Efficiency	Energy Consumption (Natural Gas)	9.54%
Renewable Portfolio Standard (33% by 2020)	Energy Consumption (Water Supply)	15.30%

Source: CARB 2008.

Vehicular Traffic

The proposed project would impact air quality through the vehicular traffic generated by the proposed project. However, as previously discussed, the project is expected to result in a net reduction of daily trips compared to the existing use. As such, GHG emissions resulting from vehicular traffic are also expected to result in a net reduction.

Water Supply

Water supplied to the proposed project requires the use of electricity. Accordingly, the supply, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of water would indirectly result in GHG emissions through use of electricity. The estimated electrical usage associated with supply, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of water was obtained from a CEC report on electricity associated with water supply in California (CEC 2006).

GHG emission reduction measures identified above in Table 4-5 would reduce emissions associated with electricity used for water supply by approximately 15%.

Solid Waste

The proposed project would generate solid waste, and would therefore result in CO₂E emissions associated with landfill off-gassing. Solid waste generation rates for the proposed project were obtained from the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery waste generation data (CalRecycle 2013), and CO₂E conversion factors were obtained from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s Greenhouse Gas Model, Version 1.1.9 Beta (BAAQMD 2010).

As shown in Table 4-5, the project aims to include some of the following sustainable features into the project design in order to reduce its overall emissions. Sustainable goals are set to ensure that the building would achieve LEED Silver certification and would likely include some of the project design features:

**Table 4-5
Project Design Features**

Feature	Specifications
Energy	Cool Roof – standing seam metal roof with reflective coating
Energy	Day Lighting – Clerestory – Photovoltaic glazing at windows

**Table 4-5
Project Design Features**

Feature	Specifications
Water Conservation	Low-flow fixtures, xeriscape landscaping (drought-tolerant landscaping)
Indoor Air Quality	Materials with low VOC content
Waste Reduction	Recycled/Renewable Material –
Material Sourcing	Recycled/Renewable Material –
Other	Building Commissioning – monitoring of water use, mechanical, and electrical consumption

The identified project design features reflect the types of emissions reduction measures recommended by public agencies to contribute to reducing the intensity of GHG emissions and helping California achieve its economy-wide goals. Additionally, the project aims to achieve LEED Silver certification and would incorporate additional design features including energy and water conservation measures, designed to further reduce GHG emissions once operational. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The County of San Diego adopted the *County of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP)* in June 2012, which documents the County’s long-term strategy for addressing the adverse effects of climate change (County of San Diego 2012). The CAP outlines various mechanisms and measures for reducing GHG emissions at the County level, including those specific to water conservation, waste reduction, land use, and adaptation strategies to fulfill the obligations delineated in Assembly Bill 32. The CAP includes County goals previously established under the County General Plan and County Strategic Energy Plan, and establishes reduction targets at 15% below 2005 levels by 2020 and 49% below 2005 levels by 2035. The proposed project does not involve any new uses that would be subject to the CAP. Therefore, there would be no conflict and impacts would be less than significant.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project proposes to demolish a 3,060 square-foot North Inland Public Health Center, a 22,080 square-foot Family Resource Center and a 13,010 square-foot Regional Administrative Office and which were constructed in the in the 1950's and 1960's and pending the outcome of a lead/asbestos survey, contain lead-based paint (LBP) and asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) (County of San Diego 2013). Lead is a highly toxic metal that was used up until 1978 in paint used on walls, woodwork, siding, windows, and doors. LBP shall be managed by applicable regulations including, at a minimum, hazardous waste disposal requirements (22 CCR, Division 4.5), worker health and safety requirements (8 CCR 1532.1), and state lead accreditation, certification, and work practice requirements (17 CCR, Division 1, Chapter 8). Asbestos was used extensively from the 1940s until the late 1970s in the construction industry for fireproofing, thermal and acoustic insulation, condensation control, and decoration. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has determined that there is no "safe" exposure level to asbestos. It is therefore highly regulated by the federal EPA, the California EPA, and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA). Demolition operations that involve asbestos-containing materials must conform to SDAPCD Rules 361.140–361.156. Prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of on-site structures and prior to commencement of demolition activities, lead and ACM abatement is required. As discussed previously in Section III, Air Quality, Subpart M of SDAPCD's Regulation XI requires that all regulated asbestos-containing material be removed prior to demolition activities. The proposed project would comply with this regulation. In addition, the County would comply with Rule 631.145 by providing notification of the SDAPCD in writing at least 10 days before the start of the demolition of any buildings. Due to the presence of nearby sensitive receptors, the project would also notify residences prior to the start of demolition. Compliance with Rule 361.145 would reduce asbestos-related impacts to a level that is less than significant.

In addition, the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the

Certified Unified Program Agency, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The hazardous materials business plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity, and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of on site. The plan also contains an emergency response plan that describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the DEH HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local fire agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations, to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release, and to suggest preventive measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-HZ-1 through M-HZ-9, the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above, and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections would occur in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations would ensure project implementation would not result in potentially significant impacts from the project related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances or related to the accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

Mitigation Measures

M-HZ-1: The contractor should assume that all other surfaces contain lower levels of lead and that all employees shall be protected accordingly. For paint-disturbing activities on lower-lead-concentration components, general precautions shall be taken to minimize the release of chips, dust, and debris to the ground surface, vegetation, and inside the buildings.

M-HZ-2: The contractor shall submit a lead work plan indicating the proposed demolition methods and measures they will use to address the lead-containing components above. The contractor shall have, at a minimum, completed and satisfied the Cal/OSHA lead training requirements. Prior to commencement of the project, the County shall review and approve the lead work plan. In addition, the Occupational Health Program (OHP) will provide monitoring of activities and other County of San Diego ordinance tasks required.

M-HZ-3: If the project will disturb 100 square feet or more of lead-containing material, the County shall notify Cal/OSHA.

M-HZ-4: An asbestos abatement contractor who is registered with Cal/OSHA shall perform asbestos-related work, shall perform all disturbance and/or removal of ACM or asbestos-containing construction material (ACCM). Cal/OSHA requirements for removal work and other applicable regulations pertaining to ACM or ACCM shall be followed during demolition activities.

M-HZ-5: The contractor shall submit an asbestos work plan indicating the proposed abatement methods and control measures they will use to remove the asbestos materials. Prior to commencement of the project, the County shall review and approve the asbestos work plan.

M-HZ-6: The County shall notify Cal/OSHA and the SDAPCD prior to asbestos-related activities. The SDAPCD requires a minimum 10 working days' notification before ACM can be removed.

M-HZ-7: Disposal and recycling issues regarding the identified ACMs and lead containing building materials will need to be addressed based on the final destination of the material. OHP and the contractor need to decide on a disposal/recycling plan for the ACMs and lead materials based on the best available environmental and cost-effective disposal option. The contractor's approach shall be consistent with the County's Construction and Recycling Ordinance.

M-HZ-8: If suspect ACM or LBP building materials not addressed in the pre-demolition survey are identified during the course of the demolition activities, all work must cease. In addition, the contractor shall contact OHP in order that the suspect materials can be identified prior to proceeding with project activities.

M-HZ-9: The contractor shall comply with the General, Asbestos, Lead and Other Considerations of the asbestos/lead pre-demolition survey prepared for the proposed project.

b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project is located within one-quarter mile of Classical Academy High School. Due to the age of the buildings and the possible identification of asbestos and lead substances in the structure, demolition of the structure would require compliance with Subpart M of SDAPCD's Regulation XI requires that all regulated asbestos-containing material be removed prior to demolition activities. In addition, the County would comply with Rule 631.145 by

providing notification of the SDAPCD in writing at least 10 days before the start of the demolition of any buildings. Compliance with Rule 361.145 would reduce asbestos-related impacts to a level that is less than significant.

The project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because the project would not involve the storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances.

The DEH HMD is the Certified Unified Program Agency for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the Certified Unified Program Agency, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The hazardous materials business plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity, and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of on site. The plan also contains an emergency response plan that describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the DEH HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local fire agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations, to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release, and to suggest preventive measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above, implementation of Mitigation Measures M-HZ-1 through M-HZ-9 and the fact that the project does not involve the handling of hazardous materials during operations, project implementation would be less than significant.

c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances (EnviroStor 2014). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill; is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash); is not on or within 1,000 feet of a formerly used defense site; does not contain a leaking underground storage tank; and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historical uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station, or a vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project site is not located within an Airport Influence Area. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not located within close proximity to an airstrip. As a result, the project would not constitute a safety hazard 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project’s consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

No Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process and identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives, and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan would not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, the location of the plant, and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. The project site is not located within 10 miles of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. Therefore, no impacts to the plan would result.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The San Diego County Operational Area Oil Spill Contingency Element of the Area Hazardous Materials Plan would not be interfered with because the proposed project would not introduce a new use to the site that would subject the project to greater risk than the existing FRC use. Additionally, the proposed project would not create a risk to existing onshore pipelines or fuel farms that may result in an oil spill event. No impact would occur.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan would not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located within the inundation zones of both Lake Dixon Dam and Lake Wohlford Dam; however, implementation of the project would not interfere with the Dam Evacuation Plan.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is located within a developed area, largely surrounded by an urbanized environment, and is not adjacent to any Wildlands. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Moreover, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present, and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the applicable fire codes.

h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats, or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g., artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that would produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies, etc.), solid waste facilities, or other similar uses. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase current or future residents’ exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats, or flies.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). In addition, the project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff or land use activities that would require special site-design considerations, source-control BMPs, or treatment-control BMPs under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (RWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001). Prior to demolition and construction, collaboration with the RWQCB would ensure all waste discharge requirements would be met by the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would not discharge into a 303 (d) listed water body. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, this watershed is impaired for fecal coliform (proposed completion in 2005), low dissolved oxygen, phosphorus, and total dissolved solids (RWQCB 2007). However, the project does not propose any known sources of pollutants or land use activities that might contribute these pollutants.

c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: All hazardous materials identified in the existing facility would be remediated prior to demolition activities. The project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff. In addition the project does not propose new stormwater drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff off site.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: . The project would result in the demolition of a 3,060 square-foot North Inland Public Health Center, a 22,080 square-foot Family Resource Center and a 13,010 square-foot Regional Administrative Office and the construction of a 6,500 square-foot crisis residential facility. However, the site is currently served by water/sewer and the proposed project is not expected to increase the water demanded due to removal of the FRC and Regional Administrative Office. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impact to groundwater supplies.

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would result in a crisis center on a previously developed site. Impervious surfaces are expected to essentially be the same. In addition, the project would utilize existing storm drainage facilities and not alter the course of any stream or river. The project site is completely developed, and the proposed demolition of the existing facility and construction of the proposed facility would not substantially alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on or off site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Impervious surfaces are expected to essentially be the same. In addition, the project would utilize existing storm drainage facilities and not alter the course of any stream or river. The project site is completely developed, and the proposed demolition of the existing facility and construction of the proposed facility would not substantially alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on or off site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The replacement of the county health building would occur on land that is already developed and is adjacent to an impervious surface parking lot. The project would also not convert any pervious surfaces to impervious surfaces, altering the amount of potential runoff from the site. While the immediate drainage pattern could potentially alter, the project would utilize existing storm drainage facilities and would not be expected to exceed their capacities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would demolish the existing structure at the project site. All demolition activities would follow strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined under Section VIII, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial sources of polluted runoff. No known sources of polluted runoff would be generated during the operational phase of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)-mapped floodplains or City-mapped floodplains or drainages were identified on the project site. In addition, the project does not propose the placement of housing on site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact would occur.

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies within Zone X as shown on FEMA’s FIRM Panel #814G. Appropriate design and project engineering would not increase the risk of flooding for people or structures. Therefore, the project would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to Dam Failure Map drafted as part of San Diego County’s *Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan* (San Diego County 2010), a large portion of the City of Escondido would be inundated by a dam failure. The project site lies inside the inundation zone; however, the project would not impact the mitigation plan. Therefore, impacts related to dam failure would be less than significant.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, it would not be inundated by a seiche and impacts would be less than significant.

ii. TSUNAMI

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located approximately ten miles from the coast. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

iii. MUDFLOW

Less Than Significant: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Landslides are not considered a significant hazard within the City of Escondido due to the generally flat topography. Though the project does propose land disturbance that would expose unprotected soils during demolition and construction, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project would expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow and impact would be less than significant.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated | |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project entails the demolition of a county health building and the construction of a crisis center facility. The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure, such as major roadways or water supply systems or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific

plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would be allowed by the City’s Zone and General Plan with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The project would result in the cessation of an office use with the introduction of a short term health facility. A consistency determination with the General Plan would also be made. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production–Consumption Region, 1996) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the project site is currently developed and is surrounded by developed land uses, including residential development. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, and traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since availability of the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Demolition of the county health buildings and removal of associated surface parking, hardscape, and landscape areas would not result in the loss of availability of mineral resources. Furthermore, the project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands or is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s).

Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan would occur as a result of this project.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated | |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Lands surrounding the project site consist of Escondido Creek and Residential Urban III (up to 18 du/acre) to the north, Office (O) and Downtown Specific Plan Area #9 to the south and General Commercial to the east and west. The project site fall within a 65 dBA CNEL noise contour (2035) along East Valley Parkway; however, given the distance the structure would be set back from East Valley Parkway and the construction materials expected to be used, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the City of Escondido’s General Plan or the County of San Diego General Plan and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.

i. GENERAL PLAN – NOISE ELEMENT

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 address noise-sensitive areas and require an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise-sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA) for single residences (including senior

housing, convalescent homes), and 65 dBA CNEL for multifamily residences (including mixed-use commercial/residential). Moreover, if the project is excess of 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise-sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries, or similar facilities. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise-sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial, or other noise in excess of 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL. This is based on a review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dBA contours). Therefore, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

ii. NOISE ORDINANCE – SECTION 36.404

Non-transportation operational noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the City's General Plan or the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards of 50 dBA because the project does not involve any noise-producing uses or activities that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

iii. NOISE ORDINANCE – SECTION 36.409

Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. The project could potentially exceed the 75 dB standard between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. as delineated in Section 36.409 of the County's noise ordinance.

Construction equipment anticipated for project development includes only standard equipment that would be employed for any routine demolition and construction project of this scale. Construction equipment with substantially higher noise and vibration generation characteristics (such as pile drivers, rock drills, blasting equipment, etc.) are not anticipated for development of the project. Construction noise is difficult to quantify because of the many variables involved including the size of equipment used, percentage of time and number of pieces of equipment which will actually operate on the site. However, maximum construction noise levels at 50 feet would typically range from approximately 75 to 85 dB for the type of equipment anticipated to be used for construction of the project. The range of maximum noise levels associated with various pieces of construction equipment is depicted in Table 4-8.

The closest land uses to the site are commercial to the east and west and residential to the north across the Escondido Creek. However, there is a considerable distance, approximately 200 feet, separating the project site and the residential uses due the creek. As such, noise during the construction process would be temporary and not significant.

**Table 4-8
Construction Equipment Noise Emission Levels**

Equipment	Typical Sound Level (dB) 50 feet from Source
Air Compressor	81
Backhoe	80
Compactor	82
Concrete Mixer	85
Concrete Pump	82
Concrete Vibrator	76
Crane, Derrick	88
Crane, Mobile	83
Dozer	85
Generator	81
Grader	85
Impact Wrench	85
Jack Hammer	88
Loader	85
Paver	89
Pile-driver (Impact)	101
Pile-driver (Sonic)	96
Pneumatic Tool	85
Pump	76
Rail Saw	90
Rock Drill	98
Roller	74
Saw	76
Scraper	89
Truck	88

Source: Federal Transit Administration, May 2006, *Traffic Noise and Vibration Assessment*.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the following land uses that can be impacted by ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels:

Construction activities are not anticipated to result in continuous vibration levels that typically annoy people. Construction activities do not involve blasting or pile driving events that would generate perceptible groundborne vibration. Also, the project does not propose any major, new, or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways, or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels on site or in the surrounding area. Vibration impact would be less than significant.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would result in a new crisis facility in place of an existing county health building. The uses would substantially be the same; however, the facility is expected to result in fewer daily trips than the existing health building. Substantial operational noise and a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise would not be expected from normal operations of the facility due to the nature of the use. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

General demolition and construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409), which are derived from state regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project would operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity during demolition and construction phases.

As previously stated, short term mental health facilities are not considered to generate a lot of noise. The conceptual floor plan indicates that the majority of the proposed facility would be indoors. There may be outdoor patio spaces/open space areas; however, normal use of these areas is expected. Therefore, substantial temporary increases in ambient noise would not be expected from the project and impacts would be less than significant.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is not located within the Airport Influence Area and project implementation is not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in excess of the CNEL 60 dBA based on review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dBA contours), because the project would be consistent with the existing land use. The location of the project is outside of the CNEL 60 dBA contours for the airport (County of San Diego 2009).

In addition, based on the list of past, present, and future projects, there are no new or expanded public airport projects in the vicinity that may extend the boundaries of the CNEL 60 dBA noise contour. Refer to XVIII, Mandatory Findings of Significance, for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise on a project or cumulative level.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in close proximity to an airstrip. As a result, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would result in the demolition of a 3,060 square-foot North Inland Public Health Center, a 22,080 square-foot Family Resource Center and a 13,010 square-foot Regional Administrative Office and the construction of a 6,500 square-foot crisis residential facility. Furthermore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area, including but not limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure, new commercial or industrial facilities, large-scale residential development, accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multifamily use, or regulatory changes including general plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) annexation actions.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The property is currently developed with three county health buildings serving as and a surface parking lot. Since the existing facility does not include housing, the proposed project would not displace existing housing.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The property is currently developed with three county health buildings and a surface parking lot. Since the existing facility does not include housing, the proposed project would not displace existing housing.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The operation of the crisis facility would not result in an increase in fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

XV. RECREATION

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use, including but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile-home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities as a result of the project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC – Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to

intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines) establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. These Guidelines incorporate standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards and Mobility Element, the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program, and the Congestion Management Program. Additionally, the City of Escondido has published significance criteria for use in determining significance criteria for development projects. As with the County’s thresholds, the City’s thresholds consider a Level of Service “D” or better as acceptable for street segments and intersections, while LOS E and F are considered unacceptable. East Valley Parkway currently operates at an unacceptable LOS F. The County’s significance threshold for a four-lane road (200 ADT) equates to about one additional car per lane every 7.2 minutes.

Less Than Significant Impact: During the demolition and construction phase of the project, traffic would be generated by construction crews and construction equipment traveling to and from the project site. In addition, trucks would travel from the site to an appropriate landfill. Due to the small size of the project, a relatively small number of vehicles would be required to implement the demolition and construction phase. Therefore, increased traffic from the demolition and construction phase of the project would be short term and less than significant.

During the operational phase of the project, there would be an expected net decrease in daily trips because the facility would accommodate 14-beds for short term overnight stays whereas the existing use provides health services to many patrons on a daily basis. In addition, the two other structures which make up of the Family Resource Center relocating and would also contribute to a net reduction in average daily trips. Furthermore, according to SANDAG’s “Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region” a Congregate Care Facility would result in 2.5 trips per dwelling unit. While the proposed facility does not include dwelling units, the use is the most similar and would be appropriate to use as a proxy. As such, without factoring in the reduction ADT due to the relocation of the FRC facility, the proposed facility would result in approximately 35 ADT, which is well below the 200 ADT significance threshold for LOS F. However, by factoring in the reduction of daily trips due to relocation of the FRC facility, a net reduction of ADT is expected to occur as a result of project implementation.

In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian, or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and no mitigation is required.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan, of which the Congestion Management Program is an element, to monitor transportation system performance, develops programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The Congestion Management Program includes a requirement for enhanced California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project’s impacts on Congestion Management Program system roadways, their associated costs, and appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System, and the North County Transit District is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on Congestion Management Program transit performance measures are identified. However, since the project is expected to generate a net decrease in daily trips the proposed project would not conflict with any congestion management program.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not located within close proximity to an airport or within an Airport Influence Area (AIA) and would comply with all applicable development regulations. As such, project implementation would not change air traffic patterns.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not alter traffic patterns or roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes, or walls that would impede adequate sight distance on a road.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project is expected to result in a net decrease of daily trips and is not expected to change circulation patterns. Therefore, any medical or police response to the site would essentially be the same.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Project implementation would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of

public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project would not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian, or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is likely to result in a negligible increase in wastewater requirements due to the net increase in square footage (e.g. existing 3,000 square foot building to be replaced by an approximate 6,500 square foot building and demolition of two other buildings) and the accommodation of overnight stays up to a maximum of 9 days. Because of the high number of daily visitors being relocated to a different site, the quantity of effluent from the project is expected to be similar or less than what is generated under existing conditions; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is not expected to result in the construction of a new facility for water or wastewater. In addition, the facility is considered to be neither a large consumer of water nor a large producer of wastewater under normal operational conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would not require the construction of additional storm water facilities as the project would utilize existing facilities. Before demolition and construction begins, coordination with RWQCB would occur to ensure that the project would be in proper compliance as it relates to storm water management. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would require water supplies during the demolition, construction, and operation phases. Demolition and construction would last approximately one year, only temporarily requiring water usage. As previously stated, the facility is not considered an intensive water user under normal operational conditions. As such, the project would not be expected to require substantial amounts of water such that current water supplies would be insufficient. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would generate wastewater as part of normal operations. As previously stated, the facility would not normally be considered to be an intensive wastewater generator under normal operating conditions. Consequently, the quantity of effluent from the project is expected to be similar to what is generated under existing conditions; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project would generate solid waste during demolition and construction activities as well as during operation of the project. Solid waste generated during operation of the project would not substantially increase relative to existing operations. All solid waste facilities, including landfills, require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency, issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board under the authority of the California Public Resources Code (Sections 44001–44018) and California Code of Regulations (27 CCR 21440 et seq.). There are five permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.

- d) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project would generate solid waste during demolition and construction activities as well as during operation of the project. All solid waste facilities, including landfills, require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency, issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board under the authority of the California Public Resources Code (Sections 44001–44018) and California Code of Regulations (27 CCR 21440 et seq.). The project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory was considered in the response to each question in Sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project’s potential for significant cumulative effects. No biological or cultural resources would be impacted by the project; as such, significant effects associated with biological and cultural resources would not result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a

project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant. Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects was considered in the response to each question in Sections I through XVIII of this form. In addition to project-specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project’s potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings was considered in the response to certain questions in Sections I, Aesthetics; III, Air Quality; VI, Geology and Soils; VIII, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; IX, Hydrology and Water Quality; XII, Noise; and XVI, Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determinations of less than significant with mitigation incorporated. As a result, mitigation was included. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XIX. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to federal, state, and local regulations are available on the Internet. For federal regulations refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For state regulations refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For county regulations refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "San Diego County Important Farmland Map 2010," 2013. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

City of San Diego, "City of San Diego Zoning Map," June 4, 2012.

SANDAG 2007a, "Agricultural Preserve," GIS layer, County of San Diego Assessor and Department of Planning and Land Use, April 2007.

SANDAG 2007b, "Agricultural Preserve Contracts," GIS layer, County of San Diego Assessor and Department of Planning and Land Use, April 2007.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways)

County of San Diego, Planning and Development Services. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

County of San Diego. Asbestos/Lead Survey: Imperial Beach Community Center, 1075 8th Street, Imperial Beach. December 27, 2013.

County of San Diego, County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements – Air Quality. 2007.

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program

Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Gorman, Jennifer, Castells, Shelby, Davis, Shannon, "Historical Resources Technical Report, November 2014.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

GREENHOUSE GASES

California Climate Action Registry, General Reporting Protocol, Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Version 3.1. 2009.

County of San Diego, Interim Approach to Addressing Climate Change In CEQA Documents. 2010.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Emission Facts: Greenhouse Gas Emissions from a Typical Passenger Vehicle." EPA420-F-05-004. EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL

- ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.
- California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>)
- County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)
- County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego. 2010. County of San Diego Hazard Mitigation Planning. Flood Map.
- County of San Diego. Asbestos/Lead Survey: Imperial Beach Community Center, 1075 8th Street, Imperial Beach. December 27, 2013.
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.
- Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.
- National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)
- National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)
- San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- LAND USE AND PLANNING**
- California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- City of Escondido, General Plan (<http://www.escondido.org/general-plan-update.aspx>)
- City of Escondido Zoning Code (<http://www.qcode.us/codes/escondido/view.php?topic=33>)
- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted August 3, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.
- Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.
- MINERAL RESOURCES**
- National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Subdivision Map Act, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)
- U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.
- U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.
- NOISE**
- California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. (www.buildersbook.com)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego. 2009. General Plan Noise Element. Existing Noise Contours.
- County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, effective August 3, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)
- Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)
- Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attach.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority ALUCP'S http://www.san.org/sdcraa/airport_initiatives/land_use/adopted_docs.aspx

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov) County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov) Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.