

Appendix B
Initial Study/Notice of Preparation

INITIAL STUDY

AGRICULTURE PROMOTION PROJECT

PREPARED FOR:

County of San Diego Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
Contact: Joseph Farace, AICP, Planning Manager
(858) 694-3690

PREPARED BY:

ICF International
525 B Street, Suite 1700
San Diego, CA 92101
Contact: Devon Muto
(858) 444-3960

June 2015



ICF International. 2015. Initial Study, Agriculture Promotion Project. June 2015. (ICF 54.15.) San Diego, CA. Prepared for County of San Diego Planning and Development Services, San Diego, CA.

Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	iii
	Page
Chapter 1 Introduction and Overview	1-1
Overview	1-1
Authority	1-1
Impact Terminology	1-1
Environmental Issues Addressed.....	1-2
Initial Study Organization	1-2
Chapter 2 Project Description and Environmental Setting	2-1
Overview	2-1
Existing Setting	2-1
County of San Diego.....	2-1
Project Location	2-1
Project History	2-1
Proposed Project Description.....	2-2
Chapter 3 Environmental Checklist.....	3-1
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	3-2
Determination	3-2
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	3-3
I. Aesthetics	3-4
II. Agricultural and Forestry Resources	3-7
III. Air Quality	3-9
IV. Biological Resources	3-11
V. Cultural Resources	3-14
VI. Geology and Soils.....	3-16
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	3-19
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3-20
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality	3-23
X. Land Use and Planning.....	3-27
XI. Mineral Resources	3-28
XII. Noise	3-29
XIII. Population and Housing.....	3-31

XIV. Public Services 3-32

XV. Recreation 3-34

XVI. Transportation/Traffic 3-35

XVII. Utilities and Service Systems 3-37

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance..... 3-40

Chapter 4 References 4-1

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BMO	Biological Mitigation Ordinance
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
County	The County of San Diego
EIR	environmental impact report
I-	Interstates
IS	initial study
LPC	light Pollution Code
MND	mitigated negative declaration
MSCP	Multiple Species Conservation Program
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCCP	Natural Community Conservation Plan
ND	negative declaration
project	Agricultural Promotion Project
RPO	Resource Protection Ordinance
SR-	State Route
WPO	Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance

This page intentionally left blank.

Overview

During the August 6, 2014 Board of Supervisors meeting, the Board directed the County of San Diego Planning and Development Services Department to develop the Agriculture Promotion Project, which includes updating the County's Zoning Ordinance in effort to foster greater economic opportunities for agricultural operations and properties throughout unincorporated San Diego County. The County of San Diego (County) as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) has caused to prepare this initial study (IS) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the proposed Agricultural Promotion Project (project), to be implemented within the unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego, California.

This chapter includes a brief overview of the requirements pursuant to CEQA, the scope of the environmental analysis, the document's organizational structure and content, and a list of the required discretionary approvals needed to implement the project.

Authority

The project is subject to the requirements of CEQA. The lead agency is the County of San Diego. The purpose of this initial study is to provide a basis for deciding whether to prepare an environmental impact report (EIR), a mitigated negative declaration (MND), or a negative declaration (ND) for this project. This initial study is intended to satisfy the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code, Division 13, Sections 21000–21177) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Sections 15000–15387). CEQA encourages lead agencies and applicants to modify their projects to avoid significant adverse impacts. Section 15063(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines states the content requirements of an initial study, as follows.

Section 15063(d) Contents. An initial study shall contain in brief form:

- (1) A description of the project, including the location of the project;
- (2) An identification of the environmental setting;
- (3) An identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other method, provided that entries on a checklist or other form are briefly explained to indicate that there is some evidence to support the entries;
- (4) A discussion of the ways to mitigate the significant effects identified, if any;
- (5) An examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls; and
- (6) The name of the person or persons who prepared or participated in the initial study.

Impact Terminology

The terminology listed below is used to describe the level of significance of impacts.

- A finding of *no impact* is appropriate if the analysis concludes that the project would not affect the particular topic area in any way.
- An impact is considered *less than significant* if the analysis concludes that it would cause no substantial adverse change to the environment and require no mitigation.
- An impact is considered *less than significant with mitigation incorporated* if the analysis concludes that it would cause no substantial adverse change to the environment with the inclusion of environmental commitments or other enforceable measures that have been agreed to by the applicant.
- An impact is considered *potentially significant* if the analysis concludes that it could have a substantial adverse effect on the environment. For the proposed project, no impacts were determined to be potentially significant.

Environmental Issues Addressed

This IS evaluates the proposed project's effects on the following resource topics.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and forestry resources
- Air quality
- Biological resources
- Cultural resources
- Geology and soils
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Hazards and hazardous materials
- Hydrology and water quality
- Land use and planning
- Mineral resources
- Noise
- Population and housing
- Public services
- Recreation
- Transportation and traffic
- Utilities and service systems
- Mandatory findings of significance

The environmental setting and impact analysis discussion for each of these topics is provided in Chapter 3, *Environmental Checklist*.

Initial Study Organization

The content and format of this report are designed to meet the requirements of CEQA. This initial study identifies the potential environmental impacts of the project to support a decision to prepare an EIR, MND, or ND. The report contains the following sections:

1. Chapter 1, *Introduction and Overview*, identifies the purpose and scope of the initial study and the terminology used in the report.
2. Chapter 2, *Project Description and Environmental Setting*, identifies the location, background, and planning objectives of the project and describes the proposed project in detail.
3. Chapter 3, *Environmental Checklist*, presents the checklist responses for each resource topic. This section includes a brief setting section for each resource topic and identifies the impacts of implementing the proposed project.

Chapter 2

Project Description and Environmental Setting

Overview

The proposed project entails amendments to the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance to include more opportunities for agricultural ventures in the unincorporated areas of the County. The amendments consist of revisions to the current Zoning Ordinance to allow the development of new agriculturally based ventures such as microbreweries, cheese-making and dairy operations, onsite food production, mobile butchering, packing and processing, onsite retail, horticulture sales, animal raising, roadside sales of agricultural products, agricultural tourism, and agricultural homestays on agricultural lands. Minor amendments are proposed to various definitions and to the Animal Regulations related to the keeping of animals. The amendments would also streamline the permitting process for certain agricultural operations.

The project's setting, history, and purpose are provided below.

Existing Setting

County of San Diego

The unincorporated portion of San Diego County encompasses approximately 3,570 square miles, of which 35% is privately owned. The unincorporated area consists of 20 distinct communities that vary in land use and density and include local commercial uses, services, schools, public facilities, and residences, and are often surrounded by agricultural lands and open spaces (County of San Diego General Plan).

Project Location

The project covers all of the unincorporated areas of the County, which is in Southern California and bound by the counties of Orange and Riverside to the north, the County of Imperial to the east, the United States–Mexico international border to the south, and the Pacific Ocean to the west.

Regional access throughout the project area is provided by interstate highways and local state routes (SRs). Primary north/south transportation facilities in the County include Interstates (I-) 5, 15, and 805, all of which are focused in the western part of the County. Major east/west corridors are Interstate 8 and SR-54, -76, -78, and -94, which are dispersed throughout the County. Other north/south state routes are SR-67, -79, -125, and -163.

Project History

Agriculture is a leading industry in the region. In 2012, the value of agriculture in the County totaled \$1.75 billion (AWM_2012). Despite its importance as an economic driver, local farming faces a host of challenges that are threatening its viability. These include the high price of land on which to establish new or maintain existing agricultural uses, labor issues, water cost, and regulatory issues.

The resources that support agriculture are unique because the County is dependent upon the region's unusual microclimates and less reliant on the quality of its soils. Farming is characterized by small farm size and high value agriculture. Much of the climate supports a year-round growing season that facilitates a vibrant and multi-faceted agricultural industry with small farms and crop diversification producing over 200 agricultural commodities, including high value specialty crops, nursery products, and a variety of fruits.

Proposed Project Description

The project consists of amending the County's Zoning Ordinance to provide an updated set of definitions, procedures, and standards for review and permitting of agriculture-related accessory uses throughout the unincorporated County. The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment would allow for the development of accessory agricultural uses such as microbreweries, cheese-making and dairy operations, onsite food production, mobile butchering, packing and processing, onsite retail horticulture sales, animal raising, roadside sales of agricultural products, agricultural tourism, and agricultural homestays on agricultural lands that are zoned Agriculture (A70 and A72), Rural Residential (RR), Specific Plan (S88), and General Rural (S92), consistent with the County's General Plan. Amendments to the Animal Regulations would apply to the keeping of animals in all zones.

Chapter 3

Environmental Checklist

1. **Project Title:** Agriculture Promotion Project
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Diego Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Joseph Farace, AICP, 858-694-3690
4. **Project Location:** County of San Diego
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Same as lead agency
6. **General Plan Designation:** Rural Lands (RL-20, RL-40 and RL-80), Semi-Rural Lands (SR-1, SR-2, SR-4, and SR-10)
7. **Zoning:** Agriculture (A70 and A72), Rural Residential (RR), Specific Plan (S88), and General Rural (S92)

8. Description of Project:

The project consists of amending to the County's Zoning Ordinance to provide an updated set of definitions, procedures, and standards for review and permitting of agriculture-related accessory uses throughout the unincorporated County. More specifically, the project would apply to properties that are zoned Agriculture (A70 and A72), Rural Residential (RR), Specific Plan (S88), and General Rural (S92). Changes to the Animal Regulations would apply to the keeping of animals in all zones. See Chapter 2, *Project Description and Environmental Setting*, for a complete description of the proposed project.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Rural Agriculture

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

None

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project (i.e., the project would involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact”), as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have an impact on the environment that is “potentially significant” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Title

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 if 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 offsite as well as onsite, 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, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-than-Significant Impact”. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses”, may be cross-referenced.)
5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to 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 earlier analyses 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, when appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

I. Aesthetics	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Scenic vistas include areas of aesthetic quality that are considered valuable because of their visual resources. The County identifies a number of scenic vistas in its General Plan and associated community plans. Three distinctive geographic regions that are considered scenic environments are the Low-lying Coastal Plain, the Mountainous Peninsular Range, and the Desert Salton (Imperial Basin). These distinctive geographic provinces provide open space and visual relief from the built-environment. Examples include the U.S. Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (Coastal Plain), the Cleveland National Forest (Peninsular Range), and the Anza Borrego Desert State Park (Desert region). Further, County Resource Conservation Areas are identified within each community planning area and are considered valuable visual resources.

The project would allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures throughout the unincorporated areas of the County. Small-scale agricultural expansions would be subject to all applicable size, height, and setback limitations for the appropriate zoning property. Further, the project would be subject to San Diego’s Scenic Area Regulations, which preserve and enhance scenic resources of adjacent land uses (San Diego County Zoning Ordinance, Sections 5200–5212).

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because each future development in the project area would be subject to the same development regulations and would be required to comply prior to project approval. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project- or cumulative-level effects on a scenic vista.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. State scenic highways are roadways that are officially designated by the California Scenic Highway Program, under the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The California Scenic Highway Program first adopts a scenic corridor protection program and then applies to Caltrans for scenic highway approval and a designation determination. If the highway receives approval from Caltrans, it is designated as an official Scenic Highway. The County currently has two officially designated scenic highways (SR-78 through the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and SR-125 from SR-94 in Spring Valley to I-8 in La Mesa), and a number of potentially eligible designated highways (Caltrans 2015). Viewsheds of scenic highways are considered to be areas that are visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The project would include agricultural program expansions near state scenic highways near land that is adjacent to viewsheds within the County. However, the agricultural expansions under the project would be compatible with the existing visual character and quality of scenic environments because they would require compliance with all applicable size, height, and setback limitations for the subject properties.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on a State Scenic Highway because each future development in the project area would be subject to the same development regulations and would be required to comply prior to project approval. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project- or cumulative-level effects on a scenic vista.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Visual character in the County is characterized by diverse natural vistas and scenic environments that range from the ocean to the desert. The existing visual character and quality of lands throughout the unincorporated areas of the County and within the project boundaries vary.

The project would amend the zoning ordinance to allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures. The proposed uses would be consistent with currently existing and allowable uses and, would limit the level of activity allowed in the respective zones; including size, height, and setback limitations. The project would allow uses that are accessory to the agricultural uses, which would be consistent with current agricultural developments and would not result in a major land use change or affect the visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on a visual character or quality because each future development in the project area would be subject to the same development regulations and would be required to comply prior to project approval. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project- or cumulative-level effects on the existing visual character or quality of a project site or its surroundings.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future projects under the agricultural program expansion may include the introduction of new light sources. All projects under the agricultural program expansion would be subject to the provisions of the County's zoning ordinance Outdoor Lighting Regulations (Section 6300) and the County's Code of Regulatory Ordinances Sections 59.101–59.115, Light Pollution Code (LPC), in order to minimize impacts of new light pollution on nighttime views. The LPC, also known as the *Dark Sky Ordinance*, regulates projects involving outdoor light fixtures within

a 15-mile radius of Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories. As such, projects implemented under the proposed Ordinance would be required to be compliant with applicable regulations prior to approval and would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because each future development in the project area would be subject to the same development regulations, including the LPC, and would be required to comply with applicable regulations prior to project approval. Therefore, the project would 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.

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

Would the project:

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

No Impact. The project would allow for an expansion of agricultural uses, which would permit the growth and preservation of agricultural uses within the County. In addition, the project uses—such as microbreweries, microdistilleries, and creameries—require that a percentage of their ingredients be grown either on site or within the County, which will further contribute to local agricultural uses. Therefore, no potentially significant project- or cumulative-level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use would occur as a result of the project. No impact would occur.

- b. *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?***

No Impact. The project would update the County's Zoning Ordinance to allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures. The project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use and would maintain compatibility and consistency with currently zoned agricultural uses. Additionally, projects implemented in accordance with the proposed Ordinance within the project area may be subject to, or adjacent to, land that is included as a part of a Williamson Act contract, in which case the proposed project would be required to be consistent with the contract. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

- c. *Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?***

No Impact. The project would expand agricultural uses in existing agricultural zones. Therefore, implementation of the project would not be in land zoned as forest land or timberland. No forest land or timberland exists within the proposed project boundaries. Thus, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland. No impact would occur.

- d. *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

No Impact. As discussed in II.c, no land zoned as forest land or timberland exists within the proposed project boundaries. The project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland. No impact would occur.

- e. *Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Existing agriculture land may be converted to allow for crops or operations that support microbrewery, microdistilleries and other agriculturally supported operations under the project. However, the conversion would not convert existing agriculture land to a non-agricultural use. As such, existing agriculture land would not be converted to a non-agricultural use and impacts would be less-than-significant.

III. Air Quality	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
When 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 applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would be subject to the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy Plan and the San Diego portion of the California State Implementation Plan. The project would expand agricultural operations within the County, which could result in an increase of air pollutants associated with agricultural operations. Therefore, impacts related to air quality may be potentially significant and require additional technical consideration. As such, a technical study will be prepared, and the results will be provided in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would increase daily vehicle trips associated with an increase in activities related to agriculture operations and would have the potential to result in significant impacts. Therefore, impacts related to air quality standards and violations may potentially be significant and require additional technical consideration. As such, a technical study will be prepared, and the results will be provided in the EIR.

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality

standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Potentially Significant Impact. The project could increase emissions from grading activities as a result of project construction activities and vehicle trips during operational activities. Therefore, impacts related to air quality emissions may be potentially significant and require additional technical consideration. As such, a technical study will be prepared, and the results will be provided in the EIR.

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Potentially Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors include schools, hospitals, resident care facilities, daycare centers, or other facilities that house individuals that would be adversely impacted by a change in air quality, including residences. The project proposes an expansion of agricultural uses as accessory to legally existing agricultural uses, which could result in the generation of air pollutants and subsequent exposure of sensitive receptors. Therefore, the project could expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants. As such, a technical study will be prepared, and the results will be provided in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project could create odors associated with agricultural uses including animal smells, brewing and distilling, cheese-making, and mobile butchering, which could generate significant levels of objectionable odors. Therefore, the project could result in the creation of objectionable odors. As such, a technical study will be prepared, and the results will be provided in the EIR.

IV. Biological Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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, marshes, vernal pools, coastal etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would amend the County’s Zoning Ordinance to allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures throughout the County. The expansion of agricultural uses would involve operation in existing or new buildings and currently developed or

undeveloped land. Therefore, expansion of agricultural operations would potentially involve future agriculture-related projects to be constructed on land that contains native habitat and possibly even candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.

Future development under the project would be subject to the County's Clearing Regulations (subject to Section 87.501 et seq.), which requires a clearing permit issued by a County official prior to any clearing. However, removal of these species may result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would amend the Agricultural Zoning Ordinance to allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures throughout the County.

The expansion of agricultural uses would involve operation in existing or new buildings and currently developed or undeveloped land. Therefore, expansion of agricultural operations would potentially involve future agriculture-related projects to be constructed on land that contains riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as defined by the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), and Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP); the California Fish and Game Code; California Endangered Species Act; federal Clean Water Act; and other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations. Therefore, the project may result in substantial adverse effects on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services. Additionally, future development under the project would be subject to the County's Clearing Regulations (subject to Section 87.501 et seq.), which requires a clearing permit issued by a County official prior to any clearing.

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, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would amend the County's Agricultural Zoning Ordinance to allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures throughout the County. The expansion of agricultural uses would involve operations in existing and new buildings and currently developed and undeveloped land. Therefore, expansion of agricultural operations would potentially involve future agriculture-related projects to be constructed on federally protected wetlands. Therefore, the project may result in substantial adverse effects on federally protected wetlands and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

Future development under the project would be subject to the County's Clearing Regulations (subject to Section 87.501 et seq.), which requires a clearing permit issued by a County official prior to any clearing.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would amend the County's Agricultural Zoning Ordinance to allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures throughout the County. The expansion of agricultural uses would involve operation in existing and new buildings and currently developed and undeveloped land. Therefore, expansion of agricultural operations would potentially involve future agriculture-related projects to be constructed on lands that contain native habitats and possibly migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, the proposed project may result in a significant impact regarding 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, and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

Additionally, future development under the project would be subject to the County's Clearing Regulations (subject to Section 87.501 et seq.), which requires a clearing permit issued by a County Official prior to any clearing.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. The protection of biological resources in the County is outlined in the MSCP, RPO, Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO), and Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance. Developments under the project would be subject to compliance with these policies prior to implementation, and proposed amendments or additions to the existing ordinance would not conflict with any local policies. Therefore, no impact would not occur.

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The County has a number of conservation plans in place, including the MSCP (combined HCP and NCCP), the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines, and the BMO plan, which implements the south County Subarea Plan. All future development would be required to comply with the MSCP, the BMO, and the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines. However, the project consists of an update to the zoning ordinance and is not a land development project and would not be subject to other ordinances. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. No impact would occur.

V. Cultural Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Project implementation would include uses that may be operated out of existing or new buildings on properties that would not require modifications to structures that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. However, some operations could include alteration of a significant historical resource. Further, alteration of buildings that were constructed over 50 years ago would require discretionary actions under CEQA and further investigation for permit approval. The future development would be required to comply with the RPO, which requires the evaluation of cultural resources and prohibits development, trenching, grading, clearing and grubbing, or any other activity or use damaging to significant prehistoric or historic site lands (County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Sections 86.601–86.608). The project may result in a significant impact on a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Project implementation would include uses that may be operated out of existing or new buildings on properties that would not require the significant alteration of land that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. However, some operations could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource through construction activities such as grading for new structures. In this instance, the project would be required to notify the Permit Compliance Coordinator and comply with Section 87.429 of the County’s Grading and Clearing Ordinance. The project may result in a significant impact on an archaeological resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Potentially Significant Impact. Project implementation would include uses that may be operated out of existing or new buildings on properties that would not require significant alteration of land that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features. However, some operations could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a paleontological resource through construction activities such as grading for new structures. In this instance, the project would be required to notify the Permit Compliance Coordinator and comply with Section 87.429 of the County's Grading and Clearing Ordinance. As such, the project may result in a significant impact on paleontological resources, as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Project Implementation would include uses that may be operated out of existing or new buildings on properties that would not require significant alteration of land that would disturb human remains. However, some operations could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of lands containing human remains through construction activities such as grading for new structures. As outlined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, in the event that human remains are discovered during grading or construction of a project, the County will work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as provided in Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, to ensure that all human remains will be appropriately addressed as identified by the NAHC. As such, potential impacts associated with amendments to the zoning ordinance would be less than significant.

VI. Geology and Soils	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

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

a1. 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.

Less-than-Significant Impact. Project implementation would likely result in development within a fault-rupture hazard zone as identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42 (SP 42), revised text in 1997 and maps in 2012, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California or within an area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Additionally, many of the faults in the County are classified as potentially active.

Structures built under the project would be required to comply with the California Building Code requirements, which include considerations for seismic events through engineering requirements prior to issuance of a building permit. Additionally, future developments under the project would be required to comply with the *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California* (SP 177A). Further, buildings within San Diego County must conform to Seismic Design Category D and E requirements. Therefore, as the California Building Code requirements would account for seismic events, the project does not have the potential to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, and impacts would remain less than significant.

a2. Strong seismic groundshaking?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future structures built as a result of the project may be located within an area of a known active-fault zone. These structures would be required to conform to the Seismic Design Category D and E requirements. Additionally, they would be required to comply with the *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California* (SP_177A). Therefore, there would be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of the project.

a3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future structures built as a result of the project may be located on soils subject to liquefaction. San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan mapped the liquefaction hazards in the County, which are mostly related to areas with loose sandy soils. Primary areas for potential liquefaction hazard include the lower San Dieguito, Sweetwater, and San Luis Rey River Valleys; Jacumba; Borrego Valley near the Borrego Sink; and parts of Ramona community planning area (County 2011).

Future development in the County would address hazards relating to liquefaction with building standards under the California Building Code, Seismic Design Category E and F requirements. Additionally, future developments under the project would be required to comply with the *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California* (SP 177A). Therefore, there would be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, as a result of the project.

a4. Landslides?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures throughout the unincorporated areas of the County. Future structures built as a result of the project may be located on soils subject to landslides and would be required to comply with the *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California* (SP 177A). Within these parameters, there would be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides as a result of the project.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would encourage agriculture ventures in the County, which could result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, modifications to soil, such as grading, would require a grading permit and further environmental review. Additionally, future developments under the project would be required to comply with the *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California* (SP 177A). Therefore, within these limits, there would be no significant impact that would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of top soil as a result of the project.

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-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See VI.a, i-iv, above.

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future developments under the project may be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). However, all new projects would be required to comply with 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*, which would ensure structure safety. Therefore, the project would not be located on expansive soil that would create substantial risks to life or property.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future developments under the project may or may not need to rely on public sewer for the disposal of wastewater. Septic system requirements would be regulated by the RWQCB's applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. Under the California Water Code, the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health has authority to issue certain On-Site Wastewater Systems permits. This would require the project to demonstrate that soils are capable of adequately supporting the proposed use of septic tanks, or alternative wastewater disposal systems, according to the local authority. Further, projects would be required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Division. 8, Chapter 3, *Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits*.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*
- b. *Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

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 Region 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. Impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions may potentially result in a significant impact and require additional consideration. As a result, Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the proposed project will be quantified and analyzed with respect to appropriate significance thresholds in the EIR and a Greenhouse Gas Emissions technical report.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

- a. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would allow agricultural tourism, microbreweries, animal raising, fish markets, creameries, food production, horticulture retail, and mobile butchering. The transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials is typically associated with limited impact, medium impact or high impact industrial development and commercial agriculture uses. Future projects under the project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulatory requirements, including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, Hazardous Materials Transportation Act Title 22, CCR Title 27, and the County Consolidated Fire Code, which regulates the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. However, hazardous materials associated with commercial agricultural development could create a hazard to the public or the environment through their routine transport, use or disposal. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

- b. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?***

Potentially Significant Impact. See discussion above in VIII. a. The project would involve handling hazardous materials. Therefore, a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials could occur and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would introduce agricultural uses in unincorporated areas of the County, and possibly within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Agricultural activities could include the use of pesticides, herbicides, fuel, and other chemicals. Therefore, the potential for the project to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school will be further analyzed in the EIR.

- d. *Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites that complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future developments under the project may be on sites listed on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, properties on the list are remediated by the Department of Environmental Health prior to development occurring on site. Therefore, due to remediation efforts prior to development, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and would not contribute cumulatively.

- e. For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?***

No Impact. Future developments under the project may be located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan for airports. However, the developments allowed under the project are small-scale agriculture improvements that would be subject to all applicable size, height, and setback limitations and would not result in hazards with respect to airport safety. Therefore, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f. 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?***

No Impact. See discussion under VIII. e.

- g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would increase agricultural uses and development in areas of the County that did not account for the type of agricultural growth in existing emergency response and evacuation plans. Future proposed sites would be required to comply with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. However, future proposed sites could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

- h. 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?***

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would allow agricultural uses agricultural zones in the County, which could include both rural and urbanized areas. Therefore, the project could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving hazardous wildfires and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or- off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. 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 that would result in flooding on-or- off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

a. *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

Potentially Significant Impact. Future development under the project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local measures, including San Diego RWQCB Order R9-2007-01; the County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Sections 67.801–67.814, Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO).

Additionally, future developments would be required to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (San Diego RWQCB Order No. R9-2007-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan. Nonetheless, there may be water quality or waste discharge impacts associated with the increased processing of agricultural goods, as well as the production of beer, alcohol, and dairy products. Impacts will be analyzed in the EIR.

b. *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would allow for an expansion of agricultural uses that would be located in various hydrologic subareas and various hydrologic units in the County, some of which are included in the federal Clean Water Act as a water body that is impaired. Therefore, further analysis is warranted to determine whether the project would contribute to pollutants in groundwater supplies. Impacts will be analyzed in the EIR.

c. *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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site?*

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would allow for an expansion of agricultural uses and activities associated with agricultural expansion. For example, grading, construction of new buildings or foundations, and agricultural landscaping would likely result in the alteration of drainage patterns and potential erosion or siltation. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

d. *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 that would result in flooding on site or off site?*

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would allow for an expansion of agricultural uses and construction activities.. For example, grading, construction of new buildings or foundations, and agricultural landscaping would likely result in the alteration of drainage patterns and potential flooding on site or off site. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Potentially Significant Impact. Future development under the project has the potential to include activities related to grading and excavation, construction of new foundations, roads, driveways, and trenches, which could result in localized alteration of drainage patterns. Construction activities on sites larger than 1 acre would be required to prepare Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans and identify best management practices to reduce the likelihood that of exceeding existing stormwater facilities. Additionally, all ground-disturbing activities would be required to comply with the WPO. However, the project has the potential to provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Potentially Significant Impact. See discussion under IX. e. The project has the potential to provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff as a result of implementation, and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

g. 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would allow agricultural homestays to occur as accessories to agricultural uses, which may be within a 100-year flood hazard area. However, proposed development of structures would require building permits and would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations related to placing structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, including: National Flood Insurance Act, National Flood Insurance Reform Act, Cobey-Alquist Floodplain Management Act, Board of Supervisors Policy I-45, County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, the County Grading Clearing and Watercourses Ordinance, County Subdivision Ordinance, and RPO. Therefore, compliance with these regulations would ensure that placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard zone would not occur.

h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project may be located on properties that are considered being within 100-year flood hazard areas. However, proposed development of structures would require building permits and would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations related to placing structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, including: National Flood Insurance Act, National Flood Insurance Reform Act, Cobey-Alquist Floodplain Management Act, Board of Supervisors Policy I-45, County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, the County Grading Clearing and Watercourses Ordinance, County Subdivision Ordinance, and RPO. Therefore, compliance with these regulations would ensure structures constructed under the project would not impede or redirect flood flows.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project may be located within a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within the County. However, emergency response plans, such as Dam Inundation Maps or the County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, address emergency and evacuation plans. The project would not interfere with these plans and

therefore would not 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.

j. Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project would be concentrated in the unincorporated areas of the County, which are more than 1 mile inland and therefore are not likely to experience tsunami or seiche. However, mudflows are the most common disaster in San Diego (County 2007). Future structures developed under the project within areas for high risk of experiencing mudflow would contribute to inundation. However, mudflow hazards are addressed through flood hazard regulations and would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

X. Land Use and Planning	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

a. *Physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The project would expand agricultural uses in the County and would not introduce new infrastructure, such as major roadways that would divide established communities in San Diego. Therefore, the project would not significantly disrupt or divide the established community. No impact would occur.

b. *Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would expand agricultural uses in agriculturally zoned areas in the County. The project would amend the County’s Zoning Ordinance to allow for accessory agricultural uses. Despite anticipated conformance with policies and regulations of the County, the potential for impacts on neighborhood character from the unique operations of uses proposed under the project will be further analyzed in the EIR.

c. *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

No Impact. The County has a number of conservation plans in place, including the MSCP (combined HCP and the NCCP) plans as well as the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines, and the BMO Plan, which implements the south County Subarea Plan. All future development would be required to comply with the MSCP Plan, the BMO, and the Coastal Sage Scrub NCCP Process Guidelines. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans.

XI. Mineral Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

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?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project may be located on land classified as having mineral resources. The County’s Mineral Resources Map would indicate whether the site would be located within a region where geologic information indicates significant mineral deposits are present.

The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments would allow development that would not result in future inaccessibility for recovery of mineral resources in the County. These developments would be subject to Sections 2820 through 2825 of the County’s Zoning Ordinance, which preserves areas with valuable mineral deposits and defines the screening process for the potential loss of availability of mineral resources. Additionally, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance, Mineral Resources and County decision makers can limit the encroachment of incompatible land uses in areas containing mineral resources. Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and residents of the state would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

- 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?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. See discussion under XI.a.

XII. Noise	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

a. *Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would amend the County's Zoning Ordinance to allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures throughout agriculture zones in the County. However, implementation of individual projects would introduce uses that are not currently allowed (such as agricultural processing), vehicles, and people, and the amount of noise may result in significant impacts. Therefore, the project may expose persons to, or generate noise levels in excess of, standards established in the General Plan or County Noise Ordinance. Impacts will be analyzed in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would introduce an expansion of agricultural uses in areas zoned for agricultural development. Implementation of proposed projects could expose persons to groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. Future projects would be required to

comply with the County's regulatory standards for Groundborne Vibration and Noise Standards. Potential sources of groundborne vibration associated with future projects have the potential to cause new sources of groundborne vibration and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. As discussed above in XII.a, implementation of individual projects would introduce uses that are not currently allowed (such as agricultural processing), vehicles, and people, and the amount of noise may result in significant impacts. Future projects are not expected to increase noise levels over 10 dB CNEL (community noise equivalent level decibels) above existing ambient noise levels. However, the potential exists for a permanent increase in ambient noise levels, and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would amend the County's Zoning Ordinance to allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures throughout agricultural zones in the County. Implementation of these uses would introduce new noise sources in agriculturally zoned areas throughout the County. As such, the project may result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels, and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

e. *For a project located within an airport land use land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?*

Potentially Significant Impact. Future uses under the project may be located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan for airports, or be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Primary noise-sensitive land uses include residential, public and private educational facilities, hospitals, convalescent homes, hotels/motels, daycare facilities, and passive recreational parks. Agricultural tourism and homestays would be considered uses under the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments that could potentially be noise-sensitive and impacted by noise generated by an airport. Therefore, the project may expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise on a project or cumulative level, and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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?*

Potentially Significant Impact. See discussion under XII. e. Future uses under the project may be located within a mile of a private airstrip. The project may expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise on a project or cumulative level, and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

XIII. Population and Housing	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would support agricultural development and may introduce new or expanded infrastructure in agricultural areas. Any increase in population would be negligible. The project does not propose regulatory changes that would encourage population growth. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would allow for the expansion of agricultural uses in currently zoned agricultural land. The project does not include expansion into residential zones that would take away from existing residential housing, nor would it replace housing with agricultural uses. Therefore, the project would not displace a substantial number of housing units, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would allow for the expansion of agricultural uses in currently zoned agricultural land. The project would not alter the residential uses associated with current agricultural operations, such as farm housing on farms, and would not replace residents with agriculture. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, and impacts would be less than significant.

XIV. Public Services	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with:

a1. Fire protection?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Expansion of agricultural uses under the project would not likely result in the need for significantly altered fire protection services and would not require the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities, such as fire protection. Nonetheless, the potential for altered fire protection will be further analyzed in the EIR.

a2. Police protection?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Expansion of agricultural uses under the project would not likely result in the need for significantly altered police protection services and would not require the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities, such as police protection. Nonetheless, the potential for altered police protection will be further analyzed in the EIR.

a3. Schools?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project proposes an expansion of current agricultural uses and does not involve or require the construction of school facilities. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse physical impact associated with new or significantly altered educational services or school facilities.

a4. Parks?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project proposes an expansion of current agricultural uses and does not involve or require the construction of parks. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse physical impact associated with new or significantly altered services or facilities.

a5. Other public facilities?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project proposes an expansion of current agricultural uses and does not involve or require the construction of other public facilities. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse physical impact associated with new or significantly altered services or facilities.

XV. Recreation		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

- a. *Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project does not include the development of residential uses and would not require the construction of a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or single-family residences that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. *Include recreational facilities or require the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

No Impact. The project does not include the construction of, or expansion of, recreational facilities; therefore, there would be no physical impact on the environment.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

- a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Expansion of agricultural uses under the project would introduce uses that may induce the use of existing transportation systems. Further analysis of the effect on the circulation system in the County is needed and will be provided in a traffic impact report. The traffic impact analysis will model and forecast the potential traffic impacts throughout the unincorporated

communities of the County. Therefore, traffic generated by implementation of the project may cause an increase in traffic and subsequently reduce the capacity of the street system. Potential impacts related to traffic and circulation will be further analyzed in the EIR.

- 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. See discussion in XVI.a. Further examination is needed to determine the additional daily trips generated as a result of the project, and their impacts on the level of service standards established by the County. Potential impacts related to the congestion management program in the County will be addressed in the traffic impact analysis and further analyzed in the EIR.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future developments under the project may be located within an Airport Master Plan Zone, or adjacent to a public or private airport. However, any structure would be subject to size and height restrictions of the respective zones. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact on air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

- d. *Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project would not alter traffic patterns or roadway design, introduce incompatible uses, or create or place curves, slopes, or walls that impede safe usage. Therefore, the project would not increase hazards due to design features, and impacts would be less than significant.

- e. *Result in inadequate emergency access?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project would be required to meet the Consolidated Fire Code (2011). The Consolidated Fire Code is based on the County's 2011 Fire Code and is specific to 16 fire districts throughout the County that incorporate fire codes based on local climatic, geological, or topographical conditions specific to the district. It applies to both ministerial and discretionary permits in order to protect public health and safety. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts would be less than significant.

- 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?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project would be agriculturally oriented and would not include construction of new road design features that would result in interference with existing policies regarding alternative transportation. Impacts would be less than significant.

XVII. Utilities and Service Systems	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Would the project:

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project may or may not need to rely on public sewer for the disposal of wastewater. Discharged wastewater requirements would be regulated by the RWQCB's applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and California Water Code Section 13282. Under the California Water Code, the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health has authority to issue certain On-Site Wastewater Systems permits. As such, the project would be required to comply with wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would allow for more opportunities for agricultural ventures throughout the unincorporated areas of the County. These agricultural expansions would be supported by existing water or wastewater treatment facilities; however, additional water or wastewater infrastructure, such as pipelines, may be necessary to support expanded agricultural uses. As such, the project may require construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental impacts. Further discussion will be provided in the EIR.

- c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. The expansion of agricultural ventures could result in an increase in the amount of impermeable surface and runoff at project sites, which may require new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities. However, if a project involves the construction of new buildings and/or landform modification or grading, adequacy of stormwater drainage facilities would be evaluated during review of the building or grading permit and required by the County if determined to be necessary. Therefore, due to the evaluation and permitting process associated with construction and grading activities, the project will not result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities that would cause significant environmental effects.

- d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?***

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the project would likely either rely on groundwater, or use an existing water service or require new connections. Although the connection to a district water system would require water district approval, further analysis of the water demands of the various uses, particularly microbreweries, microdistilleries, and creameries needs to be conducted. Water supply availability will be further analyzed in the EIR in order to assess adequate water resources and supply prior to project approval.

- e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project would be required to receive approval from the water district prior to implementation. The required approval would satisfy requirements for adequacy of wastewater service for the proposed agricultural activity prior to project approval. Therefore, the project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment's existing commitments, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project would generate solid waste. There are seven permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. The County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board under the authority of

the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 214404 et seq.), which serve as implementation programs to assist with capacity issues relating to solid waste disposal. Therefore, the project would be served by a permitted landfill with sufficient capacity to accommodate the waste disposal needs, and impacts would be less than significant.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future development under the project would generate solid waste, which would be disposed of at a permitted landfill with sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated waste disposal needs (see discussion under XVII.f). Therefore, the project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The potential for the project 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 was discussed in responses IV., *Biological Resources* and V., *Cultural Resources*, of this Initial Study. As discussed, the project may impact biological and cultural resources. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Findings of Significance. An EIR will be prepared to analyze the potential impacts on both biological and cultural resources.

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.)?

Potentially Significant Impact. The project has the potential for adverse cumulative effects to occur and will be evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts on human beings were considered in response to questions in sections I., *Aesthetics*, III., *Air Quality*, IV., *Geology and Soils*, VII., *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, VIII., *Hydrology and Water Quality*, XI., *Noise*, XII., *Population and Housing*, and XV., *Transportation and Traffic*. The evaluation indicates that there may be adverse effects on human beings associated with the project. Impacts will be evaluated in the EIR.

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 4 References

California Department of Transportation. 2015. *Officially Designated State Scenic Highways and Historic Parkways. San Diego County*. Available: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm. Accessed: April 4, 2015.

County of San Diego. 2007. *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Hydrology*. Available: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/dplu/docs/Hydrology_Guidelines.pdf. Accessed: April 4, 2015.

County of San Diego. 2011. *San Diego County General Plan Update EIR, Geology and Soils*. Available: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_2.06_-_Geology_2011.pdf. Accessed: April 4, 2015.

County of San Diego. 2012. *Crop Statistics and Annual Report*. County of San Diego Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures. Available: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/reusable_components/images/awm/Docs/2012_Crop_Report.pdf. Accessed: April 4, 2015.

This page intentionally left blank.