



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

DARREN GRETLER
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

August 21, 2015

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

1. Title; Project Number(s); Environmental Log Number:
Harmony Grove Village South; PDS2015-GPA-15-002, PDS2015-SP-15-002,
PDS2015-TM-5600, PDS2015-REZ-15-003, PDS2015-MUP-15-008; PDS2015-ER-15-08-006
2. Lead agency name and address:
County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123-1239
3. a. Contact: Peter Eichar, Land Use/Environmental Planner
b. Phone number: (858) 495-5524
c. E-mail: Peter.Eichar@sdcounty.ca.gov
4. Project location:

The project includes four parcels on approximately 111 acres in the southeast quadrant of Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive, abutting Country Club Drive, in the southeastern-most portion of the Harmony Grove Valley area of the San Dieguito Community Planning Area, between the City of Escondido (immediately to the east) and the community of Elfin Forest (over 4 miles to the southwest), within unincorporated San Diego County; two and one-half (2.5) miles from Interstate 15 (I-15), and two and six tenths (2.6) of a mile from State Route 78 (SR-78).

Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1129, Grids C6 & 7; D6 & 7

5. Project Applicant name and address:

RCS Harmony Partners, LLC
David Kovach
2305 Historic District Road, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92106
david@kovachcompanies.com

6. General Plan
Community Plan: San Dieguito
Land Use Designation: Semi-Rural 0.5 (SR-0.5)
Density: 2 du/acre
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) N/A
7. Zoning
Use Regulation: A70 and RR
Minimum Lot Size: 0.5 acre
Special Area Regulation: N/A
8. Description of project

Summary

The project application proposes a General Plan Amendment, RPO (steep slopes) wavier, specific plan, rezone, major use permit and site plan to develop 453 single- and multi-family residential units within 229 structures and a 5,000 square foot facility (the Center House) that will support recreation and community uses in addition to commercial space on 111 acres. The Center House could accommodate a coffee shop or café as well a small (up to four bed B&B facility) overnight facility. A substandard crossing of Escondido Creek that is subject to flooding will be improved to allow for safe ingress and egress to the subject and surrounding properties. A water treatment/water reclamation facility (WTWRF), park/community garden uses, and recreational trail connections to existing and planned trail facilities open to the public are proposed. The project would result in approximately 36 acres of primarily residential development including streets, and approximately 75 acres of undeveloped uses such as landscaping, gardens or biological open space.

Land Uses

The current Land Use Designation category is Semi-Rural 0.5 (SR-0.5), and the zoning is A70 (Limited Agriculture) and RR (Rural Residential). The applicant proposes a mixed Land Use Designation of Semi-Rural 0.5 (SR 0.5) and Village Residential 10.9 (VR 10.9) and rezoning to Specific Plan (S88). Access would be provided by private roads connecting to Country Club Drive. The project has been designed to maximize open space by clustering development, resulting in the preservation of open space in the southern portion of the property, containing approximately 32 contiguous acres of high quality biological resources. Dedication of biological open space areas would occur prior to grading activities.

Construction

A total of 229 residential structures, roads and pathways and a single multi-purpose building (the Center House), stormwater control and on-site utilities will require earthwork consisting of balanced cut and fill of approximately 850,000 cubic yards of material. Home sites would be graded to reflect the natural topography, where feasible. Sharp or abrupt grade transitions that do not appear natural would be avoided.

Roadways and a continuous network of multi-use trails and pathways would conform to the natural topography, and incorporate curvilinear elements.

The project would be served by an on-site water treatment/water reclamation facility (WTWRF) that, once constructed, could be operated by the San Diego County Sanitation District. Water utilities (both potable and reclaimed water) would be provided by Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District (Rincon MWD).

The existing at-grade, concrete pavement crossing of Escondido Creek, underlain by culverts and supported by substantial rip-rap, would be removed and replaced with a three-span bridge, in coordination with and complementary to the San Diego County Capital Improvement Program. Conceptual design of the bridge estimates a 250 feet long and approximately 60 feet wide bridge which would accommodate three auto-travel lanes, a 10-foot wide multi-use trail and 5-foot sidewalks on either side. The bridge would be tall enough to accommodate wildlife crossings within the riparian zone while not notably redirecting or impeding 100-year flood flows. Removal of the existing bridge may improve flooding conditions and restore the riparian habitat. The site contains remnants of a prior residential use as well as a cistern that would be removed. A chimney remnant known to the community would be restored and retained in a nearby location on site.

Off-site utility improvements include the installation of potable and reclaimed water line extensions west and/or north of the site in Country Club Drive, including new project sewer line(s), and potentially new sewer lines in Country Club Drive and Harmony Grove Road. Circulation improvements between Harmony Grove Road and the bridge over Escondido Creek include the northbound approach of Country Club Drive to Harmony Grove Road with one through lane, one dedicated right-turn lane, and one dedicated left-turn lane in addition to a southbound lane. The project would implement three-lane improvements from the bridge to the southern Project entrance, as well as shoulder and sidewalk on the east side of Country Club Drive along the project frontage. The center lane would simultaneously provide for southbound left turns at the project entrances, and as a through lane for its total length in an emergency situation (e.g., during a major fire event).

Phasing

The project would be implemented in phases, with the first phase focusing on overall on-site mass grading, and is expected to require approximately three months. On-site infrastructure installation during the second phase (roads and utilities) would follow over a period of six months, followed by the third phase to finish grading of lots over an additional three months. Entry planting, Country Club Drive frontage, interior roads and graded slopes would all be planted when finish grading is completed. The final phase would consist of “vertical” development of the project, which is expected to take up to three years, and some residents could be on site during completion of buildout. Off-site infrastructure (utility upgrades) would be initiated during the second phase and would continue through finish grading on site (third phase). Existing bridge demolition and

new bridge construction is expected to take approximately one year and could begin commensurate with the first phase.

Project Design Features

The Project proposes numerous design features that would be implemented to avoid and/or minimize environmental impacts; the Project includes design features related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, energy, geologic hazards, greenhouse gases, hazards (including fire protection) and hazardous waste, hydrology/water quality, noise, public services and utilities, and transportation/traffic.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is located in a semi-rural area that is topographically separated from the City of Escondido by Escondido Creek and some hills and knolls, but within only a few minutes of drive time. Escondido Creek is located just north of the project, south of Harmony Grove Road. The project site is surrounded on all sides except to the immediate northwest by a continuing series of hills and canyons. These range from approximately 600 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to a high point of 1,736 feet amsl at the top of Mt. Whitney, located to the west-northwest. Large expanses of natural open space are located southerly of project parcels, associated with Del Dios Highlands Preserve (DDHP) and Elfin Forest Recreational Reserve (EFRR).

In the northwest quadrant of the Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive intersection, is the Harmony Grove Village (HGV) project that includes 742 homes, recreational, and commercial development, supported by a Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) located at the northeast corner of Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive. Existing residences and fire station are located within the northeast quadrant of the project site.

Surrounding residential development is located on a wide variety of lot sizes; ranging from the smallest at approximately 1,300 square feet (s.f.) in the Harmony Grove Spiritualist Association (HGSA) located approximately 0.25 mile west of the site, to acreage that allows horse-keeping and grazing or agricultural operations such as groves. Denser housing and subdivisions exist approximately 0.5 mile to the east. Lot sizes in this area are much smaller, with approximately eight residences to an acre. Mobile home parks and apartments are also present to the east (within approximately 0.8 mile of the project). Palomar Medical Center is located approximately two miles to the north and Stone Brewery is located approximately one and a half miles to the north as a crow flies. The Escondido Energy and Technology Center (ERTC), an industrial/commercial, employment and services locus, is also located within a mile north-northeast of the project, accessed by Harmony Grove Road. Other commercial uses include the big box uses at Valley Parkway and I-15 and along Auto Park Way.

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

Permit Type/Action	Agency
General Plan Amendment (GPA)	County of San Diego
RPO Wavier (steep slopes)	County of San Diego
Habitat Loss Permit (4[d])	County of San Diego
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Reclamation Plan	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego
Specific Plan	County of San Diego
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Annexation to a Special District (water, sewer, fire districts, as necessary)	Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
1602 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
Section 7 - Consultation or Section 10a Permit – Incidental Take	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
Air Quality Permit to Operate – Title V Permit	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District (Rincon MWD)
Sewer District Approval	County Sanitation District (CSD), Rincon MWD, or other public district as necessary
New or Amended Master Water Reclamation Permit	CSD, Rincon MWD, or other public district as necessary.
Fire District Approval	San Diego County Fire Authority
School District Authorization	Escondido Union School District (EUSD) Escondido Union High School District (EUHSD)

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development 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, Planning & Development 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, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.



8/21/15

Signature

Date

Peter Eichar
Printed Name

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is located approximately 200 feet south of Escondido Creek, which is immediately south of Harmony Grove Road. There are several other public vantage points in the vicinity, including the Del Dios Highlands Trail in Del Dios Highlands Preserve, and trails including the "Way Up" trail in Elfin Forest Recreational Reserve. In addition, there are more distant public streets such as Seeforever Drive, which overlooks the Eden and Harmony Grove valleys from the northwest, including the project site.

A Visual Resources Report for the proposed project is being prepared, and full discussion will be provided in the EIR for both direct and cumulative impacts. Based on the results of the visual resources analysis, the project may be required to incorporate avoidance, mitigation or design features to be compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a designated State scenic highway and therefore will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The proposed project is, however, located near to a County-identified scenic highway - Harmony Grove Road - that has lateral views onto the project site. The project's potential impacts related to effects on a County scenic corridor will be addressed in the EIR and in the Visual Resources Report for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. The existing visual character and quality of the project site can be characterized as disturbed, but open and undeveloped.

The project proposes development of 229 structures and associated infrastructure at village densities, requiring approximately 850,000 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill. The proposed change in density and volume of earthwork requires full discussion of the site's existing and future visual character and quality, as well as viewer groups (motorists, residents and recreationalists) and their respective sensitivity and exposure to the site. These will be addressed in the EIR and in the Visual Resources Report for the project. The cumulative effect of the project and others in the vicinity will also be analyzed.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (LPC), approximately 25 miles from the Palomar Observatory. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the LPC (Section 51.201-51.209), including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

The project's outdoor lighting will be controlled through Site Plan conditions. The potential for new sources of substantial light or glare will be addressed in the EIR and in the Visual Resources Report for the project.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: A portion of the project site has land designated as Farmland of Local Importance according to the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). However, based on a site visit and a review of historic aerial photography, as well as a prior agricultural report prepared for the property (RECON 2006), there is no evidence of

agricultural use on the project site for over 65 years. Given the lack of agricultural use on the site within at least the past 65 years, the Farmland of Local Importance designation of this area according to the State is incorrect. The Farmland designation is likely misapplied as a result of the large scale of the Statewide mapping effort which assigns Farmland designations based on aerial photography and limited ground verification. Project parcels do not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Only Farmland of Local Importance and "Other" are present, at approximately 20 and 91 acres, respectively. Therefore, due to the lack of historic agricultural use at the project site, the site does not meet the definition of an agricultural resource and no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is zoned RR (Rural Residential), and A70 (Limited Agriculture), which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not result in a significant conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because the site is designated as Semi-rural Residential 0.5 in the County’s General Plan. The project will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no significant conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or any conflict with an existing 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))?

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

No Impact: The project site and off-site improvement areas do not contain forest lands or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of forest resources. 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

No Impact: The project site and off-site improvement areas do not contain any forest lands as defined in 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?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The area surrounding the project site has limited agricultural uses (grove trees associated with an estate residential use) within 0.25 mile of the project. The proposed project was determined not to have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance or active agricultural operations associated with those uses to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons:

- Active agricultural operations consisting of avocado and/or citrus orchards commonly operate among residential uses and create minimal land use conflicts due to the nature of the agricultural use; and
- Active agricultural operations are separated from proposed land uses on the project site and by other developed residential parcels

Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

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)?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The current 2009 RAQS (SDAPCD 2009) are based on projections for residential, commercial, industrial and recreational land uses contained in the

County's 1979 General Plan (County 1979), which was in place at the time the RAQS were adopted in 2009. The current General Plan, adopted in 2011, allows more dense residential development for the project site than was planned in 1979 based on apparent land use designations for the parcels of Impact Sensitive and Multiple Rural Use, with associated varying residential densities from one dwelling unit per 4, 8 or 20 acres. The current project involves a GPA and is proposing to increase the total number of residential units from 220 units, as allowed under the current 2011 General Plan Land Use Designation, to 453 dwelling units. Because the project is proposing a more dense development than was planned in 2011, it is correspondingly also proposing an increase of units over that proposed in the 1979 General Plan, and therefore the RAQS. This issue will be addressed in the EIR and in the Air Quality Impact Analysis for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: In general, air quality impacts from projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

The project proposes the construction of an anticipated 229 residential structures (453 total residential units), as well as a recreational/community building, and a WTWRF, which will result in temporary vehicular emissions during construction. Blasting also may be required during the initial phases of construction, resulting in additional emissions of particulate matter. Project construction is anticipated to take for year to complete. Once the project is operational, emissions will result from area sources (such as natural gas fireplaces, landscaping, and maintenance use of architectural coatings), energy sources, mobile sources, and the proposed WTWRF. The vehicle trips generated by the project are projected to total 4,530 Average Daily Trips (ADTs).

Construction and operation of the proposed project could therefore lead to emissions that could violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Air emissions from the project will be evaluated through a technical analysis to quantify maximum daily emissions that can be compared to the appropriate screening

level thresholds, and identify mitigation measures, as necessary. These issues will be fully addressed in the EIR and in the Air Quality Impact Analysis for the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour and 8-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) and Particulate Matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, as well as increased traffic operations. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 4,530 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). These project factors could contribute to adverse air quality conditions in San Diego County, especially considering the non-attainment status of the region for the pollutants noted above. These issues will be addressed in the EIR and in the Air Quality Impact Analysis for the project.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care 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.

Sensitive receptors abutting or within a quarter mile of the proposed project include residences to the west and east of the project. There are no schools, hospitals, or other sensitive receptors within this distance of the project site. The project will involve construction over a four-year period, as well as increased traffic once operational. Emissions from construction and operational traffic could result in impacts to nearby sensitive receptors, with a focus on CO and diesel particulate matter.

Additionally, the project will introduce new sensitive receptors into the project area. All these on- and off-site receptors could potentially be exposed to toxic air contaminants in case of accidental release from the potential on-site WTWRF. These issues will be addressed in the EIR and in the Air Quality Impact Analysis for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project could produce objectionable odors, which will result from the proposed on-site WTWRF. Odors are typically associated with particular steps in the wastewater treatment process. Although odor control design will be incorporated into the design of the WTWRF to minimize affects to nearby sensitive receptors or other sensitive receptors, the potential for odor impacts will be addressed in the EIR and in the Air Quality Impact Analysis for the project.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on 2014 surveys by HELIX Environmental Planning (HELIX) the project site includes the following habitats that contain sensitive plant species and/or support sensitive animal: Diegan coastal sage scrub, coastal sage-chaparral transition, granitic southern mixed chaparral, mafic southern mixed chaparral, coast live oak woodland, and non-native grassland. In addition, where project improvements will cross Escondido Creek, there is southern (willow) riparian forest and mule fat scrub. Species known to use these habitats include California coastal gnatcatcher (Federally listed as Threatened, a State Species of Special Concern, and County Group 1 animal; one pair was seen during 2014 surveys) and least Bell’s vireo (Federally listed as Endangered, State listed as Endangered, and a County Group 1 animal; known to forage in Escondido Creek based on 2014 surveys).

Additionally, individuals of summer holly (a County List A plant) and wart-stemmed ceanothus (a County List B plant) are known to be on site. A red-shouldered hawk (County Group 1) was observed perched near Escondido Creek. Yellow breasted chat and yellow warbler, both State Species of Concern and County Group 1 and 2 animals, respectively, were in Escondido Creek riparian habitat. Green heron and great blue heron (County Group 2 species) were observed foraging in Escondido Creek. Spiny rush and ashy spike moss (County Group D plants) were observed.

Based on the fact that the site has the potential to support several endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats; potentially significant adverse direct and indirect, as well as potential cumulative effects to these endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats will be addressed in the EIR and in the Biological Technical Report for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: As described in IV(a), the project site contains Diegan coastal sage scrub, coastal sage-chaparral transition, granitic southern mixed chaparral, mafic southern mixed chaparral, coast live oak woodland, and non-native grassland. Each of these habitats could be impacted during project grading and construction activities.

The site contains a number of drainages (ephemeral streambed), that bisect the project site and are ultimately tributaries to Escondido Creek. On-site construction could result in on-site impacts to ephemeral streambed, in addition to coast live oak woodland associated with the ephemeral streambed. Southern (willow) riparian forest and mule fat scrub is located adjacent to the "Arizona" crossing of Escondido Creek. Project-related access construction could also result in off-site impacts to both of these vegetation communities. Altogether, the project could result in impacts to wetlands and/or waters of the U.S. and non-wetland waters of the U.S. subject to USACE jurisdiction; vegetated streambed and unvegetated streambed subject to CDFW jurisdiction; and RPO wetland subject to County jurisdiction. These issues will be fully addressed in the EIR and in the Biological Technical Report for the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: Project-related construction could result in impacts to mule fat scrub and southern willow riparian forest associated with the crossing of Escondido Creek. Specifically, this will have to do with grading to re-contour the streambed to a more natural flow (eliminating culverts and portions of rip-rap that currently support an approximately five-foot drop-off between roadbed and creek bed west of the current “Arizona” crossing [resulting from scour associated with culverts]), as well as potential placement of fill. This will result in impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. and non-wetland waters of the U.S. subject to USACE jurisdiction. The impacts will be temporary for resident access/egress, equipment maneuvering, and staging during bridge construction. Permanent impacts will be limited to potential bridge abutments, footings, and bank stabilization.

Project-related impacts, therefore, may result in significant alterations to known watersheds or wetlands identified as jurisdictional wetlands or waters by USACE and will require a 404 Permit. USACE jurisdictional waters and potential impacts will be fully addressed in the EIR and in the Biological Technical Report for the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: In the context of the Draft North County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Plan, the study area occurs within lands identified as potential pre-approved mitigation area (PAMA) in the vicinity of core area, outside of any linkage area. With respect to wildlife movement in the region, conservation targets generally include conserving a contiguous riparian corridor in Escondido Creek, and conserving a large core area of upland habitat around DDHP and EFRR. Related to these are conserving regional movement within core area associated with DDHP and EFRR, and conserving access to the Escondido Creek corridor from the core area.

The project could impede wildlife access to on- and off-site areas that may be used for foraging, breeding, or obtaining water. Although wildlife will be expected to have unobstructed access around work areas by moving along the eastern boundary of the project site, through the open space proposed for conservation in the southern portions of the site, and finally to the downstream reach of Escondido Creek further to the west of the site; access along the small reach of Escondido Creek that occurs at the Country Club Drive crossing will be temporarily interrupted during construction. Issues related to corridors and linkages, artificial corridors, adequate visual continuity, indirect effects, etc. on both a project direct and potential cumulative basis will be addressed in the EIR and in the Biological Technical Report for the 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is being reviewed for consistency with the Natural Communities Conservation Plan (Habitat Loss Permit [HLP] Ordinance and Planning Agreement), Habitat Management Plans (HMPs), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), and the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). The potential for the project to affect future NCCP planning even though it is outside an approved/adopted MSCP area will also be addressed in the EIR and the Biological Technical Report for the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: No standing structures are located on the site, but prior on-site survey and testing of resources in 2006 by RECON identified remnants of an old cistern and residential uses. These remnants of an abandoned farm complex were documented as CA-SDI 18,320. No information was found to associate the site uses with a significant event in California's history or cultural heritage. The owners of the land were known in the Escondido area, but nothing could be found to link them to significant events in Harmony Grove, Escondido, San Diego County, or California's past. Additionally, because none of the structural remains associated with the site was intact and there were no distinctive characteristics associated with those remnants, no valuable information could be discerned regarding the history of the region. If historic buried features are present in the project area, there is a potential that they could provide insight into life during the late Mexican and early American periods in San Diego County. This will be addressed in the EIR and Cultural Resources Technical Report prepared for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: A number of archaeological resources have been identified within a mile radius of the site. No prehistoric archaeological resources were identified during 2006 surveys by RECON or 2014 site surveys by ASM Affiliates Inc. There is, however, a potential for prehistoric archaeological deposits to lie buried below the site alluvium, and/or that the discovery of sites has been hampered by dense vegetation. Therefore, there is potential for grading activities associated with construction of the proposed project to result in the discovery of previously unrecorded, potentially significant archaeological resources; and for the project to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of those resources. There is a similar potential for prehistoric archaeological deposits to lie buried below the surface in areas identified for off-site project improvements. A significant direct (and possible cumulative) impact is therefore possible, that will be addressed in the EIR and the Cultural Resources Technical Report for the project.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

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

No Impact: San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which 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 does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site 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?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock (cretaceous-age granitic rocks) with no potential for producing fossil remains, or alluvium/colluvium (with a low, but possible, potential for direct and/or cumulative impacts.) The project area is outside the area identified for paleontological monitoring on the County's Paleontological Resources Potential and Sensitivity Map (County 2009). These issues will be addressed in the project EIR.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: During the current archaeological evaluation, no evidence of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, was identified during the records search, literature review, field survey, or site testing and evaluation program. A number of archaeological resources have been identified within a mile radius of the site, however. A grading monitoring program will be included in the mitigation monitoring and reporting program which includes California State law requirements should human remains be identified during ground disturbing activities. For all of these reasons, discovery of human remains is considered unlikely. If, however, human remains were to be unexpectedly unearthed during grading activities, impacts could be significant. This issue will be addressed in the EIR and the Cultural Resources Technical Report for the project.

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 |

Less Than Significant Impact: No known active or potentially active faults, or associated Alquist-Priolo/County Special Study Zones, are mapped or known to occur within or adjacent to the project site, with the closest active fault located approximately 13 miles to the west along the Newport-Inglewood and Rose Canyon Fault Zone. The closest fault zone designations include an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zone approximately 18 miles to the southwest along a section of the Newport-Inglewood and Rose Canyon Fault Zone in La Jolla, while the closest County Special Study Zone is located along the Elsinore Fault Zone approximately 20 miles to the northeast (California Geological Survey 2010, 2007; County 2007). Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project. This issue will be addressed in the EIR and Geotechnical Report prepared for the project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: Although the project site is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, the project site can be subject to ground shaking from seismic activity. To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and

structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, standard engineering and construction practices, and required compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code, will ensure the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking. This issue will be addressed in the EIR and Geotechnical Report prepared for the project.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards (2007). This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. It should also be noted, however, that two areas of potentially shallow, seasonal groundwater were identified during site investigation by GEOCON. A number of standard design and construction measures have been identified that will address any associated liquefaction potential in these (or other) areas, including efforts such as installation of subdrains in appropriate areas to avoid near-surface saturation, removal of unsuitable (e.g., compressible) deposits in areas proposed for development, and replacement of unsuitable materials with engineered fill. In addition, these standard remedial efforts associated with liquefaction and related hazards will be verified through plan review and site-specific geotechnical observations and testing during project excavation, grading, and construction activities. Implementation of standard engineering and construction practices, as well as conformance with applicable regulatory/industry standards, will avoid or reduce potential project-related impacts associated with seismically induced liquefaction and related hazards to less than significant levels. This issue will be addressed in the EIR and Geotechnical Report prepared for the project.

iv. Landslides?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is not within a “Landslide Susceptibility Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within

Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project will have a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides. Additionally, implementation of standard engineering and construction practices, as well as conformance with applicable regulatory/industry standards and use of drought-tolerant landscaping and irrigation controls, will additionally avoid or reduce potential project-related impacts to less than significant levels. This issue will be addressed in the EIR and Geotechnical Report prepared for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS 2007, 1973), the soils on-site are identified as Cieneba, Escondido, Huerhuero, Las Posas, Visalia, and Wyman. These soil types have soil erodibility ratings ranging from “low” to “high.” In general, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

It is understood, however, that while graded, excavated and filled areas associated with construction activities will be stabilized through efforts such as compaction and installation of hardscape and landscaping, erosion potential will be higher in the short-term than for existing conditions. Developed areas will be especially susceptible to erosion between the beginning of grading/construction and the installation of pavement or establishment of permanent cover in landscaped areas. While erosion and sedimentation are not considered to be significant long-term concerns for the proposed project because developed areas will be stabilized through installation of hardscape or landscaping, and the project will incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to County and NPDES guidelines, including measures that will avoid or reduce off-site sediment transport through use of detention/water quality basins, energy dissipators, irrigation controls and drainage facility maintenance (i.e., to remove accumulated sediment), the short-term water quality effects from project-related erosion and sedimentation could potentially affect downstream waters and associated wildlife habitats, with such impacts considered potentially significant. These issues will be addressed in the EIR and Storm Water Management Plan prepared for the project. Erosion and sedimentation controls implemented for the project will be further defined during the NPDES/County Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan process, with the resulting BMPs taking priority over the more general types of standard industry measures.

- 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 |

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project involves 850,000 cubic yards of grading that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. In order to assure that any proposed buildings are adequately supported a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant. This issue will be addressed in the EIR and Geotechnical Report prepared for the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: Expansive (or shrink-swell) behavior in soils is attributable to the water-holding capacity of clay minerals, and can adversely affect the integrity of facilities such as foundations, pavement and underground utilities. On-site conditions from very low expansive silty sands, to potentially highly expansive topsoil, alluvium and/or colluvium containing clay materials. Accordingly, a number of standard measures will be required to address potential expansion impacts. Specifically, these include efforts such as: (1) removing and replacing expansive soils with engineered fill exhibiting very low or low expansion potential (per IBC/CBC or other applicable regulatory/industry criteria); (2) use of appropriate foundation design (including post-tensioned slabs), reinforcement and footing depths; (3) implementation of appropriate concrete placement methodology and design, including proper installation/curing and moisture conditioning, doweling (anchoring) of exterior flatwork and driveways to building foundations, and use of crack-control joints; and (4) use of subdrains in appropriate areas to avoid near-surface saturation. These standard recommendations will be verified through plan review and site-specific geotechnical observations and testing during project excavation, grading and construction activities. Implementation of such design and construction recommendations, as well as conformance with applicable County, IBC/CBC, Greenbook or other pertinent guidelines (e.g., improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils), will ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create

substantial risks to life or property. This issue will be addressed in the EIR and Geotechnical Report prepared for the project.

- 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 |

No Impact: The project will include either an on-site WTWRF or connection to an adjacent WTWRF (located within 550 feet of the project) to serve the project needs. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

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

Potentially Significant Impact:

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. A regional GHG inventory prepared for the San Diego Region¹ identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

In the County’s guidance document, *Recommended Approach to Addressing Climate Change in CEQA Documents* (January 2015), the County recommends using a 900 MT of CO₂e per year screening threshold. The size of a typical single-family residential project that would exceed that threshold is 50 units. Because the proposed project consists of 453 units, the project will potentially exceed the County’s threshold. These issues will be explored in the EIR and the Greenhouse Gas Analyses Report prepared for the project.

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

¹ San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory: An Analysis of Regional Emissions and Strategies to Achieve AB 32 Targets. University of San Diego and the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC), September 2008.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The County of San Diego’s General Plan incorporates various climate change goals and policies. These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions.

The project is above the County of San Diego recommended screening criterion for single-family housing developments and could have a cumulatively considerable impact with regard to GHG emissions. Development projects that could have cumulatively considerable GHG emission need to meet Performance Thresholds to reduce emissions from “business as usual” by a minimum of 16 percent in order to not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. These issues will be addressed in the EIR and Greenhouse Gas Analyses Report prepared for the project.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a Wastewater Treatment/Water Reclamation Facility (WTWRF) which could require the routine use and storage of hazardous materials. However, the project will not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because all storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances will be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520.

The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, 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 onsite. The plan also contains an emergency response plan which 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 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 preventative 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 and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections will occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulation; the project will not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances or related to the accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances. This will be addressed in the EIR and the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the 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 type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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 |

Less than Significant Impact: Based on a site visit and regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the Federal RCRA-Small Quantity Generators (SQG) list, State Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup (SLIC Program), Historical Underground Storage Tank (Hist UST) Regulatory Database, Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System (SWEEPS) UST Database, or the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database). 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 (FUDS), and is not known to be located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project is not known to create a significant hazard to the public or environment. This will be addressed in the EIR and the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the project.

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 |

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. 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 will 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 |

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will 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 |

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:

Less Than Significant 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, 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 will not interfere with this plan because it will 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 will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, 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. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will 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

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

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

Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. The project is, however, subject to strict regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Fire Code designed to lower exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

The Maximum Travel Time allowed for the project’s proposed land use designation pursuant to the County Safety Element is five minutes. Fire Service will be provided by the new fire station approved as part of the Harmony Grove Village project. This fire station will be less than 1.3 miles from the site, with an estimated travel time of less than three minutes to the most distant on-site structure. Confirmation of this time, as well as details regarding limited building zones, fuel management, street turn radii, water pressure and fire hydrant locations, building standards, etc. will be addressed in the EIR and Fire Protection Plan provided for the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes an on-site WTWRF. This type of facility has been associated with attracting vectors, and may contribute to a cumulative issue given the proximity of the Harmony Grove facility within 550 feet. This issue will be addressed in the EIR and Sewer Master Plan prepared for the project.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project would include grading in order to support site development and would include potential implementation of a WTWRF or specific elements thereof. It is required to comply with all waste discharge requirements; however, additional analysis is required to demonstrate compliance. A discussion of special site design considerations, source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) and treatment control BMPs, under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001) as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), and

compliance with any other waste discharge requirements will be discussed as a part of the EIR, Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) and CEQA Preliminary Hydrology/Drainage Study, (Hydrology/Drainage Study) prepared for the project, as appropriate.

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project lies in the Escondido Creek hydrologic area (HA) and the Escondido hydrologic subarea (HSA), within the Carlsbad hydrologic unit - that is impaired for Coliform bacteria, nutrients, heavy metals, and pesticides. The project could result in an increase of pollutants for which the water body is already impaired through sedimentation into downstream waters during construction. Construction-related hazardous materials could also be subject to accidental release which could potentially result in significant impacts if pollutants reach downstream receiving waters (particularly petroleum compounds that are potentially toxic to aquatic species in low concentrations). Disposal of any extracted shallow groundwater into local drainages could also result in an increase in impacts related to the occurrence of potential pollutants in local groundwater aquifers. Long-term operation and maintenance impacts could result from project trash and debris, oil and grease, bacteria, pesticide use, etc. Construction BMPs and controls, as well as LID/Site design BMPs (to avoid, minimize and/or control post-development runoff, erosion potential and pollutants generation by mimicking the natural hydrologic regime) and source control BMPs (to avoid or minimize the introduction of pollutants into storm drains and natural drainages) as well as LID and treatment control BMPs (to remove pollutants from urban runoff from a storm event through filtering, treatment or infiltration), as well as monitoring/maintenance BMPs will all be incorporated into the project. The applicant will be required to design the project to meet the performance standards of the County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) for flow control and erosion, and surface and ground water quality. These issues will all be addressed in the EIR, SWMP, Hydrology/Drainage Study prepared for the project, as well as the NPDES/County SWPPP process, and NPDES Groundwater and Municipal Permits, as appropriate.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit. The project lies in the Escondido Creek HA and the

Escondido HSA, within the Carlsbad 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 service supply; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; commercial and sport fishing; aquaculture; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; shellfish harvesting; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project will include a number of required features that would minimize project-related runoff that would cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives. Applicable surface or groundwater water quality objectives and project controls will be addressed in the EIR, SWMP, Hydrology/Drainage Study prepared for the project, as well as the NPDES/County SWPPP process, and NPDES Groundwater and Municipal Permits, as appropriate.

- 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)?

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

No Impact: The project will obtain its water supply from the Rincon MWD that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. 0.25 mile). Therefore, no substantial depletion or interference with recharge would occur and no impact to groundwater resources is identified.

- 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?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is expected to continue to drain primarily to the north and west, and to retain overall existing drainage features, including the use of similar outlet points for flows discharged from the site. The potential exists for alteration of the

existing drainage pattern of the area in a manner which could result in substantial erosion or siltation because of the level of proposed grading. The applicant will be required to design the project to meet the performance standards of the County WPO for flow control and erosion, and surface and ground water quality. Conformance to the WPO will be addressed in the EIR, SWMP and Hydrology/ Drainage Study prepared for the project, as appropriate.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is expected to continue to drain primarily to the north and west, and to retain overall existing drainage features. The project proposes 850,000 cubic yards of cut and fill which could affect flow patterns, as well as construction of addition new impervious surfaces, including pavement and structures. These latter areas would increase both the rate and amount of runoff within the site by reducing infiltration capacity and concentrating flows. Proposed on-site storm drain facilities include a series of curb/gutter inlets and two hydromodification/water quality basins (basins), all of which would be tied to an underground storm drain system of pipelines and related structures. Confirmation that drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities, that project facilities will accommodate peak 100-year storm flows pursuant to County guidelines, and that the proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern or substantially increase the rate or amount of runoff in a manner that could result in on- or off-site flooding will be provided in the EIR and SWMP prepared for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes construction of impervious surfaces, including pavement and structures. These areas would increase both the rate and amount of runoff within the site by reducing infiltration capacity and concentrating flows. Proposed on-site storm drain facilities include a series of curb/gutter inlets and two hydromodification/water quality basins (basins), all of which would be tied to an underground storm drain system of pipelines and related structures. Confirmation that drainage facilities will accommodate peak 100-year storm flows pursuant to County guidelines, and that runoff from the proposed project will not exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems will be provided in the EIR and SWMP prepared for the project.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project may involve potential sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the project must incorporate site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable. These issues will be addressed in the EIR and SWMP prepared for the project.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Most portions of the Project site, including all proposed habitable structures, are not located within a mapped 500- or 100-year floodplain area as depicted on the associated FEMA FIRM panel (FEMA 2009), County Floodplain Map or County Alluvial Plain Map. The northernmost portion of the site includes areas mapped as Zone AE and "other flood areas" (Zone X), with associated Project facilities located within these designations including the potential on-site WTWRF/sewer elements and the portion of the off-site improvements along Country Club Drive extending across Escondido Creek. This issue will be addressed in the EIR and Hydrology/Drainage Study prepared for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The potential on-site WTWRF/sewer elements and the portion of the off-site improvements along Country Club Drive extending across Escondido Creek are planned to be located within FIRM-identified floodplain. Preliminary analysis of hydraulics associated with the proposed bridge over Escondido Creek by Project Design Consultants indicates that the proposed bridge would not be subject to flood-related hazards or notably redirect/impede flood flows. Preliminary design for potential on-site sewage facilities identifies a pad elevation higher than mapped 100-year flood elevations in this portion of the site. Accordingly, the potential treatment plant site would be elevated above the 100-year flood level under the proposed design, and is not anticipated to notably redirect/impede flood flows. The preliminary bridge and WTWRF design criteria used in this analysis will be verified or refined based on a project-specific HEC-RAS analysis to be conducted as part of the

ongoing project design process. These issues will be analyzed in the EIR, Hydrology/Drainage Study, and HEC-RAS analysis prepared for the project.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed residential lots are located at an elevation that would prevent exposure of people or property to 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?

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

No Impact: The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of levee or dam failure.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

Potentially Significant Impact: Mudflow is a type of landslide. The project site is not within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining

Significance for Geologic Hazards. As described for VI(a)(iv), above, however, this issue will be addressed in the EIR and Geotechnical Report prepared for the project.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <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 |

Less than Significant Impact: The site is mostly vacant at this time, 453 dwelling units, limited commercial, institutional and open space are proposed. The proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community for the following reasons:

- No public services are located in the project vicinity that would be blocked by the project, and
- Through access would be provided via retained access easements to landlocked neighbors to the east and would be improved via additional pavement and roadway width.

In addition, community interaction would be improved via road improvements to existing roads that would enhance the existing vehicular and non-vehicular linkages between community members by:

- Improving the intersection of Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive;
- Contributing to (or implementing with future fair share contributions by others) the bridge over Escondido Creek which would allow community members to access (or leave) areas south of the creek during flood conditions;
- Marking cross-walks across Country Club Drive from the HGV-approved multi-use trail to the east side of Country Club Drive; and
- Installing a pathway along the east side of Country Club Drive from the intersection with Harmony Grove Road to the southern project entrance that could be used by all existing and future community residents.

As a result, the project will not result in physical division of an existing community, but would rather enhance the ability of community residents to interact.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes extension of the contiguous HGV Village designation to the project parcels, in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan. A GPA is proposed to change approximately 111.1 acres from Semi-rural Residential (SR-) 0.5 and Rural Lands (RL-) 20 to a combination of SR-0.5 and Village Residential (VR-) 10.9 in the General Plan, and a rezone is proposed to change zoning from A-70 and Rural Residential to S88 (Specific Plan). The proposed land use designations of SR-0.5 and VR-10.9 and zoning would allow a more dense development, with 2 to 10.9 dwellings per acre.

Land Use Element: Changes in land use designations must be reviewed in the context of all relevant goals and policies of the General Plan. A preliminary list of goals and policies that will be examined in the context of the EIR for direct or cumulative issues includes:

General Plan Goal LU-1: A land use plan and development doctrine that sustain the intent and integrity of the Community Development Model and the boundaries between Regional Categories

General Plan Policy LU-1.4: Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met:

- Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding.
- Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network.
- Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents.
- The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly contiguous growth of a Village area.

General Plan Policy LU-1.12.1: A rural residential lifestyle built in a fashion that is compatible with and sensitive to its natural setting; unspoiled views of intact hills, valleys and creeks.

General Plan Goal LU-3.1: The continued preservation of Harmony Grove's sensitive and endangered habitats.

General Plan Policy LU-3.1.1: Encourage the restoration and maintain the watershed, creeks, and riparian areas.

General Plan Goal LU-3.3: A community where significant prehistoric and historic cultural resources will be preserved. (Harmony Grove)

General Plan Policy LU-3.3.1: Require development to incorporate the prehistoric and historic rural theme of this community.

In addition, because the project is outside of the existing County Sanitation District boundary, it will require annexation and approval by LAFCO. LAFCO is a CEQA "Responsible Agency" and will make its annexation determinations relying upon the project's certified EIR. Therefore, the EIR must consider appropriate LAFCO policies and impact analysis related to the provision of services under LAFCO's purview.

The EIR must also discuss compliance with ordinances and regulations applicable to the project, including but not limited to:

- County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance
- County of San Diego Stormwater and Watershed Protection Ordinances
- County of San Diego Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance (NCCP)
- County of San Diego Noise Ordinance
- State and local fire regulations.

All of these issues will be addressed in the EIR for the project.

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 |

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, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by existing and proposed residential areas which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible surrounding 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 |

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is a large residential development that would involve major grading and construction activities. The surrounding area supports residential and open space land and the project may expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards.

Impacts could occur on a direct and/or potentially cumulative basis. These issues and conformance to the Noise Element and applicable ordinances will be addressed in the EIR and Acoustical Analysis Report prepared for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: 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 groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area. During construction, however, the project proposes potential blasting as well as pile-driving and/or vibratory rollers. Each of these could adversely affect off-site uses. These issues will be addressed in the EIR and Acoustical Analysis Report prepared for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes a potential WTWRF, which may result in noise generation impacts, as well as additional vehicular activity that could increase ambient noise levels. The nature of any project-associated direct (or contribution to a cumulative) permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity will be addressed in the EIR and Acoustical Analysis Report prepared for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: Although construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation, potential impacts may occur if construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409) are exceeded. Also, as noted, the potential WTWRF would contain emergency generator(s). The nature of any project-associated direct (or contribution to a cumulative) temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity in the EIR and Acoustical Analysis Report prepared for the project.

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

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

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 |

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related 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)?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: Growth is not considered positive or negative in itself, but is an element of the project that must be analyzed through the physical environmental changes it causes. The project proposes 453 dwelling units; a GPA; transportation improvements along existing roadways to upgrade local access, and utility upgrades that include extension of water, sewer, and reclaimed water lines, as well as potential installation of an on-site WTRWF. These physical and regulatory changes could induce substantial population growth in an area, because the changes could support additional increases in adjacent parcel density or intensity of land uses that are inconsistent with the General Plan. This will be addressed in the EIR prepared for the project.

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

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

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace existing housing since the site is currently vacant. The addition of 453 dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing.

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

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

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project would receive fire protection from the San Diego County Fire Authority. The fire station primarily serving the project must meet County standards for emergency travel time to the site. This is expected to be the Harmony Grove fire station currently under construction as part of Harmony Grove Village. Per the Project Availability Form, the project is in the district and eligible for service and the station will be available to provide that service. The project will be conditioned to provide fair share payments to the facility. Additional conditions requiring construction are all associated with project development (e.g., fuel management, on-site roads width and turn radii, structural requirements, etc.) and are being addressed in the EIR and Fire Protection Plan (FPP) prepared for the project.

The provision of sheriff department personnel is funded through the County’s general fund, revenues which come largely from property taxes. The station serving the project area is located in San Marcos. Service demand would likely increase with implementation of the project. It is anticipated that expanded police protection services would be funded, as necessary, from increased property taxes and other revenues to the County resulting from the project, and that any additional staff would be absorbed by the San Marcos Sherriff’s office with no additional facilities required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR prepared for the project.

The project is located within the Escondido Union School District and the Escondido Union High School District and it is eligible for service. Project Availability Forms provided by the districts indicate that the project is within their service areas and is eligible for service, but that the project will result in overcrowding. Impacts to school facilities will be addressed through the payment of fees pursuant to State Law prior to the issuance of Building Permits. This issue will be addressed in the EIR prepared for the project.

No new off-site parks are proposed to be constructed by the project.

The project proposes to receive water service from the Rincon MWD. Per the Project Availability Form provided by the district, facilities to serve the project are reasonably expected to be available within the next five years.

The project proposes to annex to the County Sanitation District for operation and maintenance of the proposed wastewater treatment facility. The project is required to provide an infrastructure study, as well as a policy analysis to determine the feasibility of the proposal for sewer service. These issues will be addressed in the EIR and Sewer Master Plan provided for the project.

The sewer service annexation and the ability of the districts to serve the project must be evaluated in the EIR and be adequate for the LAFCO and the serving districts to use for their environmental determinations.

Physical environmental changes that could result from extending service to the project site may result in significant environmental impacts. As a result, footprint issues associated with each of the relevant technical analyses for the provision of public services, as well as related contributions to cumulative effects potentially requiring new facilities, will be analyzed in the EIR and the project and technical analyses as appropriate.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves a residential subdivision that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The project is proposing private parks within the project site which would qualify for partial credit (up to 50 percent of the acreage). The remaining requirement would be satisfied through the payment of in lieu fees. In addition to the active parkland, the project proposes over 70 acres of other open space, which includes a restored drainage with pathways and biological open space areas with unimproved primitive trails. Specifics on the project recreational facilities, as well as in lieu fee payment, will be addressed in the EIR prepared for the project.

With regard to regional recreational facilities, there are over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive acreage of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation, the project will not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated

deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant amount of regional recreational facilities will be available to County residents.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes new recreational facilities that would be located on the project parcels and would require land currently in an undeveloped state. The new facilities will potentially result in adverse direct and cumulative physical effects on the environment. These facilities will be evaluated as part of the overall project footprint, and will be addressed in the EIR prepared for the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact:

The proposed project is calculated to generate 4,530 ADT, with a total of approximately 360 trips during the a.m. peak hour (108 inbound/252 outbound trips) and 450 total trips during p.m. peak hour (315 inbound/135 outbound), and it may have impacts related to performance measures and measures of effectiveness of the circulation system, as adopted by the Mobility Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Therefore, the project would have a direct impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

The project's added traffic is expected to result in cumulative impacts to Country Club Drive in the County and to both direct and cumulative effects in the City of Escondido. Intersections in both the County and City are also expected to be impacted. The project will also add traffic to Caltrans facilities (westbound SR-78 west of Nordahl) that are projected to operate at an unacceptable LOS.

The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County.

This program was created as a mechanism to proportionally fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from planned future development. The TIF was based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts as analyzed in the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model and projected to build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing Mobility Element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Since the project is a GPA and would increase the ADT that would occur in the future, the project will also be required to contribute to an update of the TIF program to include the project and its increased density. In the City of Escondido, the project would be required to implement improvements and/or make fair share payments, as applicable.

The significance of direct and cumulative project-related impacts on all of these facilities, as well as the appropriate mitigation, will be fully addressed in the EIR and Traffic Impact Study prepared for the project.

- 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?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project’s traffic exceeds the threshold of 2,400 ADT and may result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposal could result in a potential degradation of the level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. These issues will be addressed in the EIR and Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the project.

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

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

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in 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)?

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

Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The project must demonstrate safe and adequate sight distance of driveways and intersections to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. All road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. Operational and construction traffic must be analyzed for traffic hazards and adequate sight distance. These issues will be addressed in the EIR and Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the project.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The San Diego County Fire Authority must approve the proposed project and associated emergency access roadways to determine that access to the project does not exceed the maximum cumulative dead-end road length specified in the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code. The fire station or stations serving the project also must meet County standards for emergency travel time to the site. These issues will be addressed in the EIR and Fire Protection Plan prepared for the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: There is no existing public transit, or dedicated bicycle or pedestrian facilities in the project vicinity that would be affected by the project. The project is expected to generate increased travel demand for such transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. The project would provide a pathway along the west side of the project and on the east side of Country Club Drive that would accommodate pedestrians (and potentially bicyclists) until the multi-purpose trail on the west side of Country Club Drive associated with Harmony Grove Village is implemented. The issues of compatibility with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be addressed in the EIR prepared for the project.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

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

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

Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes potential utilization of a new package sewage treatment system, or alternatively to link into the Harmony Grove Water Reclamation Facility 550 feet north of the project for effluent treatment/disposal. Processed and discharged wastewater must conform to the RWQCB's applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. Issues associated with wastewater treatment requirements will be addressed in the EIR and Sewer Master Plan prepared for the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project would require expansion of potable water pipelines within Country Club Drive, both to the west and north. The project also proposes to potentially construct a new package sewage treatment system for effluent treatment/disposal, which would also require construction of a new on-site influent pump station. In addition, sewage and reclaimed water pipelines would be required in Country Club Drive and potentially in Harmony Grove Road. Processed and discharged wastewater must conform to the RWQCB's applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. These footprint impacts and direct and cumulative planning issues will be addressed in the EIR, the Sewer Master Plan, and other technical studies prepared for the project as appropriate.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project includes new stormwater drainage facilities. Moreover, the project involves landform modification including source treatment and structural Best Management Practices for storm water. These new facilities comprise part of the project footprint and would be placed on lands which are currently undeveloped. They may therefore result in adverse direct and cumulative physical effects on the environment. Potential environmental impacts will be addressed in the EIR and the Biological Technical Report and CEQA Preliminary Hydrology/Drainage Study prepared for the project.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project site is included in the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) boundary line. The site is within the Rincon MWD service district. The Project Facility Availability Form received from the district indicated that facilities to serve the project site are expected to be available within five years. The accompanying letter stated that it is currently eligible to receive water for fire and normal domestic use following completion of those facilities. It also stated however, that ongoing drought issues may result in re-evaluation of water availability. This issue will be addressed in the EIR prepared for the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to annex into the San Diego County Sanitation District and either build a WTWRF, to provide wastewater treatment and reclamation service or to tie into the existing Harmony Grove Water Reclamation Facility. The Project Facility Availability Form provided by the district stated that the capacity will be available subject to a series of attached conditions. Those conditions will be addressed in the EIR and Sewer Master Plan prepared for the project.

- 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 |

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. 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 (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et 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.

g) 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 |

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. 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 (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant 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 were 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 projects potential for significant cumulative effects. As a result of this evaluation, the project was determined to have potential significant direct effects related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources (loss of sensitive habitat, adverse impacts on sensitive species, jurisdictional waters, migration corridors), cultural resources (historic resources, and archaeological resources), greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems. While mitigation can be developed in some instances that reduce would these effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear at this

time. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: A total of 65 projects in the vicinity of the proposed project, as well as the proposed project, are being considered in the analysis of cumulative impacts. The list consists of projects that are pending or recently approved within the County, as well as adjacent jurisdictions (the City of Escondido and City of San Marcos). Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were 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 were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise, public services, recreation, transportation/ traffic and utilities and service systems. While mitigation can be developed in some instances which may reduce these cumulative effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear at this time. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, XII. Noise, XIII. Population and Housing, and XVI. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects related to each of the listed categories. While mitigation can be developed in some instances that reduce these significant effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear at this time. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

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/scpr.htm>)
- County of San Diego, Planning & 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/legsregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE 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.sdcounty.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

- CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)
- County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Regional Air Quality Strategy Revisions, 2009. (<http://www.sdapcd.org/planning/2009-RAQS.pdf>)
- County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego General Plan, adopted January 3, 1979.
- Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFW 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 Wildlife 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 Wildlife, Sacramento, California, 1986.
- Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), 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.
- Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.
- RECON Environmental, Inc. Results of Cultural Resources Survey for the Harmony Grove Meadows Project. October 17, 2006.
- 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 & 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)
- California Geological Survey (CGS). Fault Activity Map of California. Geologic Data Map No. 6, 2010.

California Geological Survey (CGS). Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California. Interim revisions current through 2007.

(<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sp/Sp42.pdf>)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks 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.sdcountry.ca.gov)

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

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Geologic Hazards. 2007

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

HAZARDS & 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.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.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 & 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.sdcountry.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)

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 & 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)

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 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 & 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/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.sdcountry.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.