



GARY L. PRYOR
DIRECTOR
(858) 694-2962

DPLU
PROJECT MANAGER
SAMI RAYA

837

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD- SUITE B- SAN DIEGO- CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017

SAN MARCOS- CA 92069-2620
(760) 471-0730

EL CAJON OFFICE
200 EAST MAIN ST. - SIXTH FLOOR
EL CAJON- CA 92020-3912
(619) 441-4030

ORIGINAL

NOTICE OF PREPARATION DOCUMENTATION

DATE: August 28, 2003
PROJECT NAME: Hoskings Ranch Subdivision
PROJECT NUMBER(S): TM 5312
PROJECT APPLICANT: Genesee Properties, Inc.
ENV. REVIEW NUMBER: Log No. 03-10-005

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project proposes a Tentative Map (TM 5312) within the Julian Community Planning Area that will subdivide 1, 416.5 acres into 33 lots ranging in size from 40 to 62 gross acres. At present, the project site is currently subject to Agricultural Contracts for livestock and designated as an Agricultural Preserve. Primary access for the project will be taken from Pine Hills Road, south of Hwy 78/79. Secondary access will be directly from Hwy 78/79 onto Daley Flat Rd. All lots will be served by individual wells and septic systems.

As proposed, the earthwork involves graded pads measuring approximately 15,000 sq. feet, associated drives, and seven access roads. The volume of cut and fill for the project, including the seven access roads, private drives, and all pads is balanced at approximately 235,500 cubic yards, 72,000 cubic yards for the building pads, 43,500 cubic yards for the private drives, and 119,000 cubic yards for the access roads.

Refer to attached tentative map (TM 5312) dated August 20, 2003 for further information.

PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located east of Wynola Road, west of Pine Hills Road, south of SR 78/79 and approximately 2 miles southwest of the Julian Community Planning Area within the northeastern portion of San Diego County. The project site is located

adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest and the area surrounding the project site is developed with residential and agricultural land uses.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1135, Grids E-J/7

Refer to the attached regional location map and USGS map for additional location information.

PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The probable environmental effects associated with the project are detailed in the attached Environmental Initial Study Environmental Analysis Form. All questions answered "Potentially Significant Impact" will be analyzed further in the Environmental Impact Report. All other questions answered "Less Than Significant" or "Not Applicable" will not be analyzed further in the Environmental Impact Report.

The following is a brief summary of the subject areas to be analyzed in the EIR and the particular issues of concern:

Land Use and Planning Including Community Character

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policies 2.6 Special Purpose Designation and 2.5 Agriculture Designation of the General Plan. Lots 31, 30, 29, 28, 27, 26, 25 and 20 are located within the (23) National Forest and State Parks Land Use Designation of the General Plan which requires minimum lot sizes of 40 acres and a maximum residential density of one dwelling unit per lot shall apply. Lots 1-12 and 18 are located within the (19) Intensive Agriculture Land Use Designation of the General Plan which requires minimum lot sizes of 4, 8, or 8 acres depending on the average slope of the lot. Portions of Lots 13-17, 19, 21-22, 23-24, and 32-33 are located within both the (23) and (19) Land Use Designations of the General Plan. The project proposes a major subdivision of 1,416.5 acres into 33 lots measuring between 40 and 62.4 acres. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes that are consistent with the General Plan.

The current zone is A72, General Agriculture Use Regulation that requires a net minimum lot size of 8 and 40 acres. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size because the project proposes minimum net lot sizes not less than 40 acres.

The project is subject to the policies of the Julian Community Plan. The communities plan states that extensive, unsightly or severe grading for development shall be prohibited and that natural features of the area such as hillsides, meadows, and rock-outcroppings shall be retained in their natural state. The Circulation Goal of states that road designs are to follow natural contours, and minimize cuts and fills and the disturbance of natural rock-outcroppings and trees whenever possible and that roads

shall be blended into the natural terrain. The Scenic Highway Goal states that any grading or earth moving shall be planned and executed so as to blend with the existing terrain both on and adjacent to the site, and vegetation cover shall be provided to hide scars on the land resulting from such operations. The Agriculture Goal encourages agriculture, particularly cattle grazing, to provide and conserve open space. The proposed project is not consistent with the policies of the Julian Community Plan. Therefore, as proposed, the project is not in conformance with the Julian Community Plan or Agricultural Goal. Also, the EIR and land use/community character analysis must evaluate the project's consistency with the surrounding area in terms of bulk, scale and coverage (physical structures), and evaluate impacts to the surrounding community character in terms of project operations.

There may be potential conflicts with environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, the Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department of Health Services, and the County Department of Environmental Health. The EIR should address all applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project and discuss all potentially significant conflicts.

Agricultural Resources

The project site contains lands that are within an Agricultural Contract and designated as an Agricultural Preserve. Most of the parcels adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest and the area surrounding the project site are developed with residential and agricultural land uses. A majority of the lots located to the north of the project site are within an Agricultural Preserve and are subject to a contract. Those lots to the north of the project site measure between 8 and 60 acres and are developed with single-family residences and agricultural land uses. Two of the lots located north of Highway 79 measure 131 and 414 acres and are developed with residential and agricultural land uses. Additionally, lots to the south and west of the project site measure between 40 and 120 acres and are developed with agricultural land uses. Based on these circumstances, the development of the project site will need to complete an Agricultural Analysis to determine its effect on off-site as well as on-site agricultural resources and must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

Population and Housing

Although it is not anticipated that the project will induce substantial growth that is inconsistent with County planning goals, the project involves substantial extensions of utilities such as electrical and new roads systems into previously unserved areas. The improvements of off-site roadways proposed by the project may potentially induce growth either directly or indirectly. As a result, the associated growth inducing impacts from extended roadways must be evaluated in the EIR.

Geologic Issues

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as follows:

Soil Type		Erosion Index
HmD	Holland fine sandy loam, 5-15% slopes	Severe 16
HnE	Holland stony fine sandy loam, 5-30% slopes	Severe 16
HnG	Holland stony fine sandy loams, 30-60% slopes	Severe 1
Lu	Loamy alluvial land	Severe 16
RkC	Reiff fine sandy loam, 5-9% slopes	Severe 16
SpG2	Sheephead rock fine sandy loam, 30-65% slopes, eroded	Severe 1
CuE	Crouch rocky coarse sandy loam, 5-30% slopes	Severe 16
HmE	Holland fine sandy loam, 15-30% slopes	Severe 16
CtE	Crouch coarse sandy loam, 5-30% slopes	Severe 16
CuG	Crouch rocky coarse sandy loam, 30-70% slopes	Severe 1

All of these soils have a severe erodibility index and as proposed the project may result in unprotected erodible soils; may alter existing drainage patterns; may be located a wetland or significant drainage feature; and may develop steep slopes. Even though, the project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations, as proposed the project might result in potentially significant erosion. Due to these factors, erosion potential from the project must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

The project site is subject to severe ground shaking from seismic activity on the Elsinore Fault zone. A Geotechnical Evaluation must be completed in order to determine the potential impacts created by the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, rockfall, or landslides. Additionally, the project site may contain unique geological features. Due to these factors a Geotechnical report is required and the results will be discussed in the context of the EIR.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The project lies in the Ramona hydrologic subarea, within the San Diego hydrologic unit - that is impaired for *Coliform bacteria*. As proposed, the project could contribute additional pollutants to the San Diego hydrologic unit. Therefore, the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan must discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs that will be employed as required by the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO). Also, the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan

must discuss how potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters.

In addition to the Stormwater Management Plan, a supporting Hydrology analysis must be prepared and discuss the following: any substantial drainage impacts that may occur as a result of the project including but not limited to erosion, siltation, and runoff, both on-site and off-site; and any substantial drainage impacts that may occur as a result of the project including but not limited to hydraulics/hydrology, flooding, and runoff, both on-site and off-site.

Groundwater Resources

The project is groundwater dependent and thus falls under the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance #7994 NS. In order to determine if the project will have a potentially significant adverse effect on the available groundwater water resources, a Hydrogeologic investigation must be completed and discussed in the context of the EIR. The investigation must be completed by a California Registered Geologist and be approved by the County Groundwater Geologist and will include both a water budget analysis and aquifer testing.

Air Quality

The project has the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of an air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation from the project's construction operations, diesel toxins and automotive emissions. Therefore, the project is required to discuss the project's potential impacts to in an air quality analysis.

The proposed project is not anticipated to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants; however, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants must be discussed in the EIR and supporting air quality analysis.

Transportation/Circulation

The existing Level of Service near the project along SR78/79 and Pine Hills Rd. is currently at 3900 ADT, LOS A and 1,400 ADT, LOS A, respectively (based on a two-way SANDAG count in 2000). The threshold to the next level on each roadway 4,296 LOS B and 1,796 LOS A for SR 78/79 and Pine Hills Road, respectively. Additionally, the proposal may result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way).

The increase in the volume of traffic on Pine Hill Road and SR 78/79 may create hazards or barriers to the large amount of bicyclists as well as pedestrian hikers that use these roads. A focused traffic analysis is required and will incorporate an

assessment of all potential impacts to the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain existing conditions as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists.

Based on this information the proposal could result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity. Therefore, the EIR and supporting traffic analysis must evaluate level of service, sight distance, existing signage and striping, hazards and barriers for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Biological Resources

The site is known to support several sensitive habitats, which support and have the potential to support endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species. The site supports the following sensitive habitats: Native and perennial grassland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, wet montane meadows, southern mixed chaparral, and riparian/wetland habitats, pine forest, oak woodland (engelmann, mixed, and coast live). The site also supports drainages that may qualify as a State and/or Federal jurisdictional resource/waters. Additionally, drainages, ridges, valley or linear-shaped patches of native vegetation that connect areas of native vegetation or natural open space were identified on the site. These wildlife corridors may be vital in linking off-site open space preserves. The project has direct and indirect impacts to all these habitats/resources. All biological impacts must be completely evaluated in the EIR and supporting biological report and surveys.

Hazards

The project may significantly increase the fire hazard if the project is unable to comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. The project has a number of requirements that must be incorporated into the project design to ensure that the project will be in compliance with relevant Fire Codes. Compliance with all the fire requirements and specific details of the project's design consideration must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

The proposed project could expose people or property to flooding. Exposure of people or property to flooding could occur through the development in a floodway, floodplain or stream channel. Therefore, the EIR and supporting hydrology analysis must address any substantial flooding impacts that may occur as a result of the project.

Public Services

The project could result in the need for new or significantly altered services related to Campo CSA 112 Volunteer Fire Department if adequate secondary access is not

provided. Also, the project may require altered services from the Sheriff's Department. Therefore, the EIR must discuss whether the project will result in the need for new or significantly altered services or facilities.

Utilities and Services

The project may result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities: subsurface septic systems, groundwater, and storm water conveyance systems. The Department of Environmental Health must approve the project's subsurface septic systems and the adequacy of the proposed septic system design must be discussed in the EIR. The project is groundwater dependent and as such will need to demonstrate compliance with the County Groundwater Ordinance. The adequacy of groundwater supply and distribution must be discussed in the EIR and supporting groundwater investigation/study.

Aesthetics (includes Landform Modification)

The proposed project will require significant alteration of the existing landform. The project site has an existing average slope of less than 25 percent gradient. Grading is proposed for the creation of 7 access roads, 33 building pads and associated private drives. The Preliminary Grading Plan dated May 1, 2003 indicates that the project will result in a balanced cut and fill volume of 234,449 cubic yards; 71,851 cubic yards for building pads, 43,585 cubic yards for private drives, and 119,013 cubic yards for the seven access roads. The project proposes graded pads measuring approximately 15,000 square feet, which is inconsistent with the residences within the Julian community which are built without a graded pad. Furthermore, the road will require the blasting of an area containing rock outcroppings and result in a fill slope measuring approximately 140 feet. Therefore, the resultant development will have a visual impact from landform modification and grading. Therefore, as proposed, all adverse visual impacts shall be discussed within the context of the EIR. Additionally, a discussion regarding the projects conformance with the community character and goals and policies of the Julian Community Plan is a required section of the EIR.

Cultural Resources

The site has several significant drainages and riparian areas that are considered high probability to contain archaeological or cultural resources. Additionally, there are a number of archaeological sites located within the vicinity of the project.

Therefore, based on the above information, all potentially significant adverse impacts to any archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, site, or structure must be addressed in the context of the EIR and supporting Archeological Survey.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

As detailed in the Environmental Initial Study the project may cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels and may threaten to eliminate a plant or

animal community. The project may reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The project may eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project may cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The project may create incremental impacts that may be cumulatively considerable or may not satisfy long-term environmental goals. Therefore, an EIR is required to discuss all the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Attachments:

Project Regional Location Map
Project Detailed Location Map
Plot Plan Exhibit(s)
Environmental Initial Study

ND0803\031005-NOP;tf

GARY L. PRYOR
DIRECTOR
(858) 694-2962



County of San Diego

SAN MARCOS OFFICE
338 VIA VERA CRUZ - SUITE 201
SAN MARCOS- CA 92069-2620
(760) 471-0730

EL CAJON OFFICE
200 EAST MAIN ST - SIXTH FLOOR
EL CAJON- CA 92020-3912
(619) 441-4030

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD- SUITE B- SAN DIEGO- CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017

August 28, 2003

INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

TM 5312; Log No. 03-10-005; Hoskings Ranch Tentative Map

2. Description of Project:

The project proposes a Tentative Map (TM 5312) that will subdivide 1, 416.5 acres into 33 lots ranging in size from 40 to 62 gross acres. The project site is currently subject to Agricultural Contracts for livestock and designated as an Agricultural Preserve. Primary access for the project will be taken from Pine Hills Rd., south of Hwy 78/79. Secondary access will be directly from Hwy 78/79 onto Daley Flat Rd. All lots will be served by individual wells and septic systems.

As proposed, the earthwork involves graded pads measuring approximately 15,000 sq. feet, associated drives, and seven access roads. The volume of cut and fill for the project, including the seven access roads, private drives, and all pads is balanced at approximately 235,500 cubic yards, 72,000 cubic yards for the building pads, 43,500 cubic yards for the private drives, and 119,000 cubic yards for the access roads.

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Genesee Properties, Inc, P.O. Box 63
Berthoud, CO 80513

4. Project Location:

The project site is located east of Wynola Rd, west of Pine Hills Road, south of State Route 78/79 and approximately 2 miles southwest of the Julian Community Planning Area within the northeastern portion of San Diego County.

5. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The project site is located adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest and the area surrounding the project site is developed with residential and agricultural land uses.

A majority of the lots located to the north of the project site are within an Agricultural Preserve and are subject to a contract. Those lots to the north of the project site measure between 8 and 60 acres and are developed with single-family residences and agricultural land uses. Two of the lots located north of Highway 79 measure 131 and 414 acres and are developed with residential and agricultural land uses.

Most of the lots to the south of the project site are subject to the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) and located within the Cleveland National Forest. The lots to the south of the project site are devoted to single-family residences whereas few parcels are utilized for agricultural purposes. The lots immediately to the south of the project site measure between 40 and 120 acres and are developed with agricultural land uses. Pine Hills development is located approximately 3,000 feet to the south of the project site and is devoted to single-family residences on lots measuring between .5 and 17 acres in size.

The land to the west of the project site is known as the Cleveland National Forest. Few privately owned lots measuring between 40 and 120 acres lay to the west of the project site and are devoted to agricultural land uses. All privately owned lots located west of the project site are subject to the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI).

The land to the east of the project site is developed with residential land uses. The lots located north of Highway 79, east of the project site are developed with residential land uses on lots that measure approximately 1 acre in size. The lots east of Pine Hills Road are developed with residential land uses on lots that measure between 2 and 50 acres in size; few lots east of Pine Hills Road are utilized for agricultural land uses.

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	Julian
Land Use Designation:	See Below
Density:	See Below

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	
Density:	See Below

Special Area Regulation:

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policies 2.6 Special Purpose Designation and 2.5 Agriculture Designation of the General Plan. Lots 31, 30, 29, 28, 27, 26, 25 and 20 are located within the (23) National Forest and State Parks Land Use Designation of the General Plan which requires minimum lot sizes of 40 acres and a maximum residential density of one dwelling unit per lot shall apply. Lots 1-12 and 18 are located within the (19) Intensive Agriculture Land Use Designation of the General Plan which requires minimum lot sizes of 4, 8, or 8 acres depending on the average slope of the lot. Portions of Lots 13-17, 19, 21-22, 23-24, and 32-33 are located within both the (23) and (19) Land Use Designations of the General Plan. The project proposes a major subdivision of 1,416.5 acres into 33 lots measuring between 40 and 62.4 acres.

8. Environmental resources either significantly affected or significantly affected but avoidable as detailed on the following attached "Environmental Analysis Form".

Agricultural Resources

Land Use and Planning (includes Community Character)

Geological Issues

Water Resources

Air Quality

Transportation/Circulation

Biological Resources

Hazards

Aesthetics (includes Landform Modification)

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Mandatory Findings of Significance

9. Lead Agency Name and Address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B MS O650
San Diego, California 92123-1666

10. Lead Agency Contact and Phone Number:

Laura Maghsoudlou (760) 765-1148

11. Anticipated discretionary actions and the public agencies whose discretionary approval is necessary to implement the proposed:

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
Agricultural Preserve	County of San Diego
Amendment to the Preserve	County of San Diego
Cancellation	County of San Diego
Boundary Adjustment	County of San Diego
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits	County of San Diego
Construction Permit	County of San Diego
Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Excavation Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit Plan Change	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Remandment of Relinquished Access Rights	County of San Diego
Exploratory Borings, Direct-push Samplers, and Cone Penotrometers Permits	County of San Diego
Groundwater Wells and Exploratory or Test Borings Permit	County of San Diego
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego
Water Well Permit	County of San Diego
State Highway Encroachment Permit	CalTrans
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Section 7 - Consultation or Section 10a Permit – Incidental Take	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
School District Approval	Julian Elem., High School Districts

12. State agencies (not included in #11) that have jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project:

California Department of Fish and Game

13. Participants in the preparation of this Initial Study:

Laura Maghsoudlou, DPLU Analyst
Sami Raya, DPLU Project Manager
Ken Brazell, DPW Project Manager
TRS Consultants, Stormwater/Hydrology

14. Initial Study Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use believes that the proposed project MAY have a potentially significant effect on the environment. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.



LAURA MAGHSOUDLOU, Environmental Analyst
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
Resource Planning

Date: August 28, 2003

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FORM

DATE: August 28, 2003
PROJECT NAME: Hoskings Ranch Subdivision
PROJECT NUMBER(S): TM5312; Log No. 03-10-005

EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS:

The following questions are answered either "Potentially Significant Impact", "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated", "Less Than Significant Impact", or "Not Applicable" and are defined as follows.

"Potentially Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project has a potentially significant environmental effect and the effect is not clearly avoidable with mitigation measures or feasible project changes. "Potentially Significant Impact" means that County staff recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the resource. However, the incorporation of mitigation measures or project changes agreed to by the applicant has clearly reduced the effect to a less than significant level.

"Less Than Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion that the project may have an effect on the resource, but there is no substantial evidence that the effect is potentially significant and/or adverse.

"Not Applicable." County staff is of the opinion that, as a result of the nature of the project or the existing environment, there is no potential for the proposed project to have an effect on the resource.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with any element of the General Plan including community plans, land use designation, or zoning?

Potentially Significant Impact

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policies 2.6 Special Purpose Designation and 2.5 Agriculture Designation of the

General Plan. Lots 31, 30, 29, 28, 27, 26, 25 and 20 are located within the (23) National Forest and State Parks Land Use Designation of the General Plan which requires minimum lot sizes of 40 acres and a maximum residential density of one dwelling unit per lot shall apply. Lots 1-12 and 18 are located within the (19) Intensive Agriculture Land Use Designation of the General Plan which requires minimum lot sizes of 4, 8, or 8 acres depending on the average slope of the lot. Portions of Lots 13-17, 19, 21-22, 23-24, and 32-33 are located within both the (23) and (19) Land Use Designations of the General Plan. The project proposes a major subdivision of 1,416.5 acres into 33 lots measuring between 40 and 62.4 acres. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes that are consistent with the General Plan.

The current zone is A72, General Agriculture Use Regulation which requires a net minimum lot size of 8 and 40 (?) acres. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size because the project proposes minimum net lot sizes not less than 40 acres.

The project is subject to the policies of the Julian Community Plan. The communities plan states that extensive, unsightly or severe grading for development shall be prohibited and that natural features of the area such as hillsides, meadows, and rock-outcroppings shall be retained in their natural state. The Circulation Goal of states that road designs are to follow natural contours, and minimize cuts and fills and the disturbance of natural rock-outcroppings and trees whenever possible and that roads shall be blended into the natural terrain. The Scenic Highway Goal states that any grading or earth moving shall be planned and executed so as to blend with the existing terrain both on and adjacent to the site, and vegetation cover shall be provided to hide scars on the land resulting from such operations. The Agriculture Goal encourages agriculture, particularly cattle grazing, to provide and conserve open space. The proposed project is not consistent with the policies of the Julian Community Plan. Therefore, as proposed, the project is not in conformance with the Julian Community Plan or Agricultural Goal. An analysis and discussion of all impacts relating to the above conflicts is a required section of the EIR.

2. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project has the potential to be in conflict with environmental plans or policies

adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project. A preliminary listing of State and County plans and policies that need to be complied with is given below:

STATE LEVEL

- Natural Communities Conservation Plan program for protection of the State listed species, California gnatcatcher
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region Stormwater Permit
- Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program use under CEQA

COUNTY LEVEL

- Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance
- Resource Protection Ordinance (probably exempt)
- An Ordinance Amending Appendix II-A of the County Fire Code Relating to Wildland/Urban Interface Standards, Ordinance No. 9111
- APCD Air Quality Requirements for Construction
- Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance

A consistency analysis must be completed as part of the EIR that details the project's consistency with applicable environmental plans and policies including conformance with the plans and policies listed above.

3. Does the proposal have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed use will not have a harmful effect on the neighborhood character because the project site is located adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest and the area surrounding the project site is developed with residential and agricultural land uses.

A majority of the lots located to the north of the project site are within an Agricultural Preserve and are subject to a contract. Those lots to the north of the project site measure between 8 and 60 acres and are developed with single-family residences and agricultural land uses. Two of the lots located north of Highway 79 measure 131 and 414 acres and are developed with residential and agricultural land uses.

A majority of the lots to the south of the project site is subject to the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) and located within the Cleveland National Forest. The lots to the south of the project site are devoted to single-family residences whereas few parcels are utilized for agricultural purposes. The lots immediately to the south of the project site measure between 40 and 120 acres and are developed with agricultural land uses. Pine Hills development is located approximately 3,000 feet to the south of the project site and is devoted to single-family residences on lots measuring between .5 and 17 acres in size.

The land to the west of the project site is known as the Cleveland National Forest. Few privately owned lots measuring between 40 and 120 acres lay to the west of the project site and are devoted to agricultural land uses. All privately owned lots located west of the project site are subject to the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI).

The land to the east of the project site is developed with residential land uses. The lots located north of Highway 79, east of the project site are developed with residential land uses on lots that measure approximately 1 acre in size. The lots east of Pine Hills Road are developed with residential land uses on lots that measure between 2 and 50 acres in size; few lots east of Pine Hills Road are utilized for agricultural land uses.

TM 5312 is a major subdivision, which proposes the division of 1,416.5 acres into 33 lots measuring between 40 and 62 acres size. The proposed lots will be utilized for residential and agricultural land uses. Therefore, this project will be compatible with the existing character of development and planned land use.

4. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project is a major subdivision of 1,416.5 acres into 33 lots. One private road easement from Pine Hills Road is proposed which will serve as access to six additional private road easements. The project does not propose major roadways, physical barriers or other features that would have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the neighboring community.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

1. Would the proposal convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or have a potentially adverse effect on prime agricultural soils as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project site encompasses a relatively large acreage of land (1,416.5 acres) and is surrounded by existing agricultural operations. Based on these circumstances the development of the project site will need to complete an Agricultural Analysis to determine its effect on off-site as well as on-site agricultural resources and must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

2. Would the proposal conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project site and surrounding area are zoned for agricultural use types and the project site is under a Williamson Act Contract and within an agricultural preserve. Based on these circumstances the development of the project site may result in a potentially significant impact by altering the primary uses set forth under the Contract. Due to these factors, potential adverse impacts to agricultural lands resulting from conflicts with agricultural uses and contracts must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

3. Would the proposal involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The area surrounding the project site contains agriculture uses. The proposal involves changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use and result in a potentially significant impact. Due to these factors, potential adverse impacts to agricultural lands from the project must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

III. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Would the proposal potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project involves substantial extensions of utilities such as electrical and new roads systems into previously unserved areas and is consistent with the County General Plan and the adopted Specific Plan. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will induce substantial growth that is inconsistent with County planning goals, however growth inducement is a required section of the EIR and must be discussed in that context.

2. Would the proposal displace a potentially significant amount of existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project is a major subdivision of 1,416.5 acres into 33 lots. One private road easement from Pine Hills Road is proposed which will serve as access to six additional private road easements. The project does not propose major roadways, physical barriers or other features that would have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the neighboring community.

IV. GEOLOGIC ISSUES

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure (liquefaction), rockfall, or landslides?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: Although the project site is subject to ground shaking from seismic activity on the Elsinore Fault zone, it is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. A Geotechnical Evaluation must be completed in order to determine the potential impacts created by the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, rockfall, or landslides. The results of the geotechnical study must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant increased erosion or loss of topsoil?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as follows:

Soil Type		Erosion Index
HmD	Holland fine sandy loam, 5-15% slopes	Severe 16
HnE	Holland stony fine sandy loam, 5-30% slopes	Severe 16
HnG	Holland stony fine sandy loams, 30-60% slopes	Severe 1
Lu	Loamy alluvial land	Severe 16
RkC	Reiff fine sandy loam, 5-9% slopes	Severe 16
SpG2	Sheephead rock fine sandy loam, 30-65% slopes, eroded	Severe 1
CuE	Crouch rocky coarse sandy loam, 5-30% slopes	Severe 16
HmE	Holland fine sandy loam, 15-30% slopes	Severe 16
CtE	Crouch coarse sandy loam, 5-30% slopes	Severe 16
CuG	Crouch rocky coarse sandy loam, 30-70% slopes	Severe 1

All of these soils have a severe erodibility index and as proposed the project may result in unprotected erodible soils; may alter existing drainage patterns; may be located a wetland or significant drainage feature; and may develop steep slopes.

Even though the project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations, the project might result in potentially significant erosion. Due to these factors, erosion potential from the project must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) from excavation, grading, or fill?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified no soils on the site, which have a HIGH shrink-swell behavior. All mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior. Therefore, on-site soil conditions are stable and do not have adverse impact potential for development activity.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant adverse effect to unique geologic features?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: Based on a site visit completed by Laura Maghsoudlou the project site may have significant geological features. Due to these factors a discussion regarding the unique geology will be required within the requirements of the geologic reconnaissance report and must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project will not result in a loss of availability of a known significant mineral resource that would be of value to the region. The project is not located in a significant mineral resource area, as identified on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996). Also, on a site visit conducted by Laura Maghsoudlou on May 21, 2003 no past or present mining activities were identified on the project.

V. WATER RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal violate any waste discharge requirements?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: Although the project is not anticipated to violate any waste discharge requirements, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, the project's compliance with all waste discharge requirements must be discussed as a part of the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan.

2. 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?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project lies in the Ramona hydrologic subarea, within the San Diego hydrologic unit - that is impaired for *Coliform bacteria*. As proposed, the project could contribute additional pollutants to the San Diego hydrologic unit.

Therefore, the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan must discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs that will be employed as required by the WPO. Also, the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan must discuss how potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable.

3. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project is proposing individual wells for each parcel's water supply.

4. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Potentially Significant Impact.

V. WATER RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal violate any waste discharge requirements?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: Although the project is not anticipated to violate any waste discharge requirements, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, the project's compliance with all waste discharge requirements must be discussed as a part of the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan.

2. 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?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project lies in the Ramona hydrologic subarea, within the San Diego hydrologic unit - that is impaired for *Coliform bacteria*. As proposed, the project could contribute additional pollutants to the San Diego hydrologic unit.

Therefore, the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan must discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs that will be employed as required by the WPO. Also, the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan must discuss how potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable.

3. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project is proposing individual wells for each parcel's water supply.

4. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project is a thirty three-lot Tentative Map (TM 5312) consisting of large graded building pads, seven access roads, and private driveways within the Julian Planning Area. The plan is anticipated to comply with the WPO. However, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, compliance with the WPO must be discussed as a part of the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan. The EIR and Stormwater Management Plan must discuss design features that will meet the performance standards of the WPO for flow control and erosion, and surface and groundwater quality.

5. Would the proposed project 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?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project could 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. The project could have an adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff because it could propose to change or accelerate flow in the watercourse. Therefore, the EIR and supporting hydrology analysis must address any substantial drainage impacts that may occur as a result of the project including but not limited to hydraulics/hydrology, flooding, and runoff, both on-site and off-site.

6. Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project is not anticipated to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems, however, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, existing or planned storm water drainage systems must be discussed as a part of the EIR, Stormwater Management Plan and supporting hydrology analysis.

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

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: Water quality objectives have been designated for waters of the San Diego Region by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as outlined in chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Ramona hydrologic subarea, within the San Diego hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; commercial and sport fishing; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; shellfish harvesting; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

As proposed, the project could cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Therefore, the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan must discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs that will be employed as required by the WPO. Also, the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan must discuss how potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

8. Would the proposal provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff including but not limited to parking lots, roadways/driveways and construction activities.

Therefore, the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan must discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs that will be employed as required by the WPO. Also, the EIR and Stormwater Management Plan must discuss how potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable such that the project will not result in any substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

9. If the proposal is groundwater dependent, plans to utilize groundwater for non-potable purposes, or will obtain water from a groundwater dependent water district, does the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quantity?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The 33 homes and associated water uses will be greater than 20 acre-feet per year. This is considered to be a water intensive use within the County and as a result, the effects to the local groundwater system's safe yield must be discussed as a part of the EIR along with a supporting technical Groundwater Investigation.

10. Would the project 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?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: Each parcel will obtain its water supply from private wells. The water use will be greater than twenty acre-feet which is considered 'intensive' within the County's Groundwater Ordinance No. 7994 (New Series).

Although the amount of impervious surface created by the development is not expected to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge the water use may substantially deplete the groundwater storage system greater than the aquifer can recharge. Therefore, all effects to the recharge rate to the local groundwater aquifer must be discussed as a part of the EIR along with a supporting technical Groundwater Investigation.

VI. AIR QUALITY

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project has the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, primarily related to construction operations and diesel toxins. Therefore, the project is required to discuss the project's potential impacts to air quality in the context of EIR and an air quality analysis as appropriate.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project is not anticipated to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants; however, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants must be discussed as a part of the EIR and air quality analysis as appropriate.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in the emission of objectionable odors at a significant intensity over a significant area?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified within the proposed project. Thus, the project is not expected to generate any significant levels of objectionable odors.

VII. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

1. Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The existing Level of Service near the project along SR78/79 and Pine Hills Rd. is currently at 3900 ADT, LOS A and 1400 ADT, LOS A, respectively (based on a two-way SANDAG count in 2000). The threshold to the next level on each roadway 4296 LOS B and 1796 LOS A for SR 78/79 and Pine Hills Rd, respectively.

Based on this information the proposal could result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity. As a result, the EIR and traffic analysis are required to analyze the impact resulting from the traffic generated by the project on Pine Hills Rd., State Route 78/79, and any other affected roads.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way)?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposal may result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way). A sight distance analysis is required to assess all potential impacts to traffic safety. The sight distance analysis can be included, as a part of the traffic impact analysis. The analysis should address sight distance analyses affected intersections and proposed mitigation measures. The results of the sight distance analysis should also be discussed in the context of the EIR.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with The Zoning Ordinance.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project may have any significant increase in the volume of traffic on Pine Hill Road and SR 78/79. This may create hazards or barriers to the large amount of bicyclists as well as pedestrian hikers that use these roads. A focused traffic analysis is required and will incorporate an assessment of all potential impacts to the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain existing conditions as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists. The results of the traffic analysis are a required section of the EIR.

VIII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The site has the potential to sustain several sensitive habitats, which support and have the potential to support endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species. A preliminary listing of the sites sensitive habitat includes but is not limited to: Native and perennial grassland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, wet montane meadows, southern mixed chaparral, and riparian/wetland habitats, pine forest, oak woodland (engelmann, mixed, and coast live)

Pursuant to the CEQA, NCCP, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance (in addition to state and federal laws), impacts to listed, or otherwise rare species must be minimized and often avoided entirely. In order to evaluate these impacts, focused surveys must be completed during the appropriate time period for sensitive plant and wildlife species by biologist(s) with demonstrable knowledge in field detection of the subject species (focused surveys for Federally listed species shall be in compliance with USFWS protocol, when such protocol exists, and must be done by a USFWS permitted biologist).

Therefore, based on the above information, all potentially significant adverse effects impacts, including noise from construction or the project, to endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats must be addressed in the context of the biological technical study and within the EIR.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wetland habitats or wetland buffers?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The site has the potential to support a number of extremely sensitive habitat lands that warrant special attention pursuant to the Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Item 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance. These sensitive habitats may be significantly impacted by the proposed project and as proposed the project may not conform with Article IV, Item 6 of the Resource Protection Ordinance. Therefore, conformance with the Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Item 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance must be demonstrated and discussed in the context of a biological technical study and the EIR.

3. Does the proposed project have the potential to discharge material into and/or divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, lake, wetland or water of the U.S. in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The site contains a number of significant drainages and wetland habitats, which if impacted may result in significant alterations to known watersheds or wetlands that may be considered California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and would potentially require a Section 1603 "Streambed Alteration Agreement" and/or 404 Permit. Therefore, all significant drainages and wetland must be defined and addressed in a biological technical study and in the EIR.

4. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: Drainages, ridges, valley or linear-shaped patches of native vegetation that connect areas of native vegetation or natural open space were identified on the site. The wildlife corridors may be vital in linking off-site open space

preserves. The current may potentially impact these corridors and may create additional indirect impacts through increased noise and activity. Impact to the corridors may be significant with the current project design. Therefore, any potentially significant impacts to wildlife dispersal corridors must be discussed in the biological technical study and the EIR.

5. Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project site and locations of off-site improvements may contain habitats subject to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance. Therefore, the project must conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings or complete an Endangered Species Act - Section 7 or 10a with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Therefore, potential impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub must be discussed in the biological technical study and the EIR and if appropriate, conformance with the local, State and Federal laws relating to Diegan coastal sage scrub must be demonstrated.

IX. HAZARDS

1. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Not Applicable.

The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. In addition, an internal review of existing data and a field visit to the project site did not indicate the presence of any historic burnsites, landfills, or uses that may have contributed to potential site contamination. Therefore, no significant hazard to the public or the environment is expected to occur due to project implementation.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans?

Not Applicable.

The project lies outside any mapped dam inundation area for major dams/reservoirs within San Diego County, as identified on inundation maps prepared by the dam owners.

3. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the fire hazard in areas with flammable vegetation?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project is within a hazardous Wildland fire area and, as proposed will increase the for fire hazard potential. The project will have to comply with additional mitigation from the Julian Fire Protection District. Compliance with all the fire requirements and specific details of the project's design including a firebreak area must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

4. a. Would the proposal expose people or property to flooding?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposal involves significant amounts of grading and may potentially expose people or property to flooding. The potentially significant exposure of people or property to flooding must be discussed in the context of a technical study for drainage and flooding (hydrology analysis) and the EIR. Specifically, the hydrology analysis should indicate runoff quantities and conditions before and after development of the project, including analysis of existing and proposed drainage facility capacity and lines of inundation by the 100-year flood. Also, the study must include grading plans showing drainage patterns improvements to storm drain system, inlets, points of entry into natural drainage channels, energy dissipaters, etc.

- b. Does the project comply with the Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project does not need to comply since it is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource

protection ordinance, nor is it plotted on an official County floodway or floodplain map.

5. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

6. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

7. Is the project within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school that will emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste in a quantity equal to or greater than that specified in subdivision (a) of Section 25536 of the Health and Safety Code? Or, does the project involve the proposal of a school that is within one-quarter mile of a facility that exhibits the above characteristics?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

8. 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?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project is not located within any airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that has not adopted a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

9. For 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?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project is not located within the vicinity (1 mile) of a private airstrip. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

X. NOISE

1. Would the project result in 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?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not generate potentially significant adverse groundborne vibration or noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations based on a staff review.

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

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations based on a staff review.

5. 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?

Not Applicable.

Project implementation is not expected to expose people living and working in the project area to excessive noise levels, because the County Geographic Mapping Application shows that the project lies outside of the 60-decibel CNEL noise contour of the airport and its proposed allowed use does not generate any potentially significant noise levels based on a staff review of the project.

6. 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?

Not Applicable.

Project implementation is not expected to expose people living and working at the project site to excessive noise levels, because the County Geographic Mapping Application shows that the project lies outside of the

60-decibel CNEL noise contour of the airport and its proposed use would not generate any excessive noise levels based on a staff review of the project.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Fire protection?

Police protection?

Schools?

Parks?

Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Julian Union High School District, Julian Union School District, and Julian Cuyamaca Fire Protection District. The service letters are based on the project's ability to meet the requirements set by these agencies.

The schools indicate that the project is located entirely within the district and is eligible for service. To assist in the mitigation for any impacts to the school district, fees will be levied either in accordance with Government Code Section 53080 or 65970 prior to the issuance of building permits.

The fire district indicates that the project is located in the district and is eligible for service. Based on the capacity and capability of the district's planned and existing facilities, fire protection services are currently adequate or will be adequate to serve the proposed project. The expected emergency travel time to the proposed project is 20 minutes which is consistent with the 20 minute objective travel time established in the Public Facilities Element of the General Plan.

The property is accessed by Pine Hills Road to the east, State Highway 78/79 to the north and Daley Flat Road which crosses previously developed portions of Hoskings Ranch and eventually leads to the State Highway at Wynola. The major access point for the project will be on Pine Hills Road; therefore, emergency access is adequate.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICES

Would the proposal result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

Power or natural gas;
Communication systems;
Water treatment or distribution facilities;
Sewer or septic tanks;
Storm water drainage;
Solid waste disposal;
Water supplies?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project will not result in the need for new distribution systems or substantial alterations to existing systems because the existing utility systems listed above are available to serve the proposed project.

XIII. AESTHETICS

1. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

Less than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project is not visible from a designated scenic vista, overlook or viewpoint according to the Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan; therefore, a demonstrable potentially significant adverse effect is not foreseen on a designated scenic vista, overlook, or viewpoint.

2. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse visual effect that results from landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), or any other negative aesthetic effect?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The proposed project will require significant alteration of the existing landform. The project site has an existing average slope of less than 25 percent gradient. Grading is proposed for the creation of 7 access roads, 33 building pads and associated private drives. The Preliminary Grading Plan dated May 1, 2003 indicates that the project will result in a balanced cut and fill volume of 234,449 cubic yards; 71,851 cubic yards for building pads, 43,585 cubic yards for private drives, and 119,013 cubic yards for the seven access roads. The project proposes graded pads measuring approximately 15,000 square feet, which is inconsistent with the residences within the Julian community, which are built without a graded pad. Furthermore, the road will require the blasting of an area containing rock outcroppings and result in a fill slope measuring approximately 140 feet. Therefore, the resultant development will have a visual impact from landform modification and grading. Therefore, as proposed, all adverse visual impacts shall be discussed within the context of the EIR. Additionally, a discussion regarding the projects conformance with the community character and goals and policies of the Julian Community Plan is a required section of the EIR.

3. Would the project produce excessive light, glare, or dark sky impacts?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The project design has not proposed any structures or materials that would create a public nuisance or hazard. The project conforms to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101). Any future lighting would be regulated by the Code. The proposed project will not generate excessive glare or have excessive reflective surfaces.

XIV. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal grade or disturb geologic formations that may contain potentially significant paleontological resources?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations

that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources.

2. Would the proposal grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site which:
 - a. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions;
 - b. Has particular quality or uniqueness (such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type);
 - c. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person;
 - d. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historical Resources, National Register of Historic Places, or a National Historic Landmark; or
 - e. Is a marked or ethnohistorically documented religious or sacred shrine, landmark, human burial, rock art display, geoglyph, or other important cultural site?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER: The site has several significant drainages and riparian areas that are considered high probability to contain archaeological or cultural resources. Additionally, there are a number of archaeological sites located within the vicinity of the project. Therefore, based on the above information, all potentially significant adverse impacts to any archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, site, or structure must be addressed in the context of the EIR and supporting Archeological Survey.

XV. OTHER IMPACTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE

None.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species,

cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Potentially Significant Impact.

2. Impacts adequately addressed in earlier CEQA documents. The following effects from the above checklist that are within the scope of, and were analyzed in, an earlier CEQA document: None.
3. Mitigation measures: None.

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

Air in San Diego County, 1996 Annual Report, Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County

Bay Area Air Quality Management District - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, April 1996

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines 1997

California State Clean Air Act of 1988

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation Division
Sections 88.101, 88.102, and 88.103

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation, Division 7,
Excavation and Grading

County of San Diego Groundwater Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sections 67.701
through 67.750)

County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan (especially Policy 4b,
Pages VIII-18 and VIII-19)

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Chapter 4, Sections 36.401 through
36.437)

County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426, County Codes §§ 67801 et seq.), February 20, 2002

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Performance Standards, Sections 6300 through 6314, Section 6330-6340)

Dam Safety Act, California Emergency Services Act; Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code

General Construction Storm Water Permit, State Water Resources Control Board

General Dewatering Permit, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

General Impact Industrial Use Regulations (M54), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Groundwater Quality Objectives, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan

Health and Safety Code (Chapters 6.5 through 6.95), California Codes of Regulations Title 19, 22, and 23, and San Diego County Ordinance (Chapters 8, 9, and 10)

Resource Protection Ordinance of San Diego County, Articles I-VI inclusive, October 10, 1993

San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego Area, United States Department of Agriculture, December 1973

Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act, Title 14, Revised 1994

U.S. Federal Clean Air Act of 1990

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, 1996, Department of Conservation, Divisions of Mines and Geology