

# **APPENDIX A**

*Initial Study for the Warner Ranch Project,  
Notice of Preparation Comments*





ERIC GIBSON  
DIRECTOR

## County of San Diego

### DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666  
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960  
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017  
[www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu)

### NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

April 29, 2010

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use will be the Lead Agency and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act for the following projects. The Department is seeking public and agency input on the scope and content of the environmental information to be contained in the Environmental Impact Report. A Notice of Preparation document, which contains a description of the probable environmental effects of the project, can be reviewed on the World Wide Web at [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/ceqa\\_public\\_review.html](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/ceqa_public_review.html), at the Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU), Project Processing Counter, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, California 92123 and at the public library listed below. Comments on the Notice of Preparation document must be sent to the DPLU address listed above and should reference the project number and name.

WARNER RANCH, LOG NO. 06-02-020; 3810 06-002. The project is an amendment of the General Plan, a Specific Plan, a Rezone and a Vesting Tentative Map and would develop approximately 513.6 acres with 780 residential units (556 single family detached and 224 multi-family and attached town homes), approximately 10.8 acres of private parks, an 8-acre public park, and 344.2 acres of preserved open space. The project site is located approximately 5 miles east of Interstate 15 on State Route 76, west of Pala Temecula Road in the Pala Pauma Subregional Planning Area and within unincorporated San Diego County. Comments on this Notice of Preparation document must be received no later than **May 28, 2010** at 6:30 p.m. (a 30 day public review period). This Notice of Preparation can also be reviewed at the Pala Library, located at 12196 Pala Mission Road, Pala, CA 92059. A Public Scoping Meeting will be held at the Pauma Valley Community Center Hall, 16650 Highway 76, Pauma Valley, CA 92061 on May 6, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. For additional information, please contact David Sibbet at (858) 694-3091 or by e-mail at [david.sibbet@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:david.sibbet@sdcounty.ca.gov).







**ERIC GIBSON**  
DIRECTOR

## County of San Diego

### DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666  
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960  
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017  
[www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu)

April 29, 2010

#### **Updated CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04 and updates)**

1. Title; Project Numbers; Environmental Log Number:

Warner Ranch: (3810 06-002) SP06-002, GPA06-009, R06-011, VTM5508RPL<sup>3</sup>,  
ER#06-02-020

2. Lead agency name and address:

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

3. a. Contact David Sibbet, Project Manager  
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3091  
c. E-mail: [david.sibbet@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:david.sibbet@sdcounty.ca.gov).

4. Project location:

The project site is located in the northwestern portion of the County approximately 5 miles east of Interstate 15 on Pala Road (State Route 76) (SR76) and west of Pala Temecula Road in the Pala Pauma Subregional Planning Area within unincorporated San Diego County. Thomas Brothers Page 1029, Grid F/3 and 4; G/3 and 4

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Ali Shapouri, PO Box 676221, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan
Land Use Designation:	(18) Multiple Rural Use and (19) Intensive Agriculture
Density:	1 du/2 and 4 acres
Proposed Designation:	(21) Specific Plan Area
Proposed Density:	2.33 du/acre

7. Zoning
- |                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Use Regulation:            | A70 Limited Agriculture & A72 General Agriculture |
| Minimum Lot Size:          | 2 acres   |
| Special Area Regulation:   | Generally none; Floodplain over small portion.    |
| Proposed:                  | S-88 Specific Plan (1.52)                         |
| Proposed Minimum Lot Size: | 2,937 sf  |

8. Description of project :

The project is an amendment of the General Plan, a Specific Plan, a Rezone and a Vesting Tentative Map to develop 513.6 acres including 780 residential units (556 single family detached and 224 multi-family and attached town homes), 10.8 acres of private community parks including a clubhouse, 5.5 acres of landscape areas, an 8.0-acre public active recreational park and 344.2 acres of preserved open space. The site is subject to the General Plan 1.3 Estate Development Area (EDA) Regional Category, Land Use Designation (18) Multiple Rural Use and (19) Intensive Agriculture. Zoning for the site is A70 Limited Agriculture and A72 General Agriculture Uses. The project proposes a Specific Plan and associated General Plan Category change to 21 and zoning change to S88 with a 1.52 dwelling unit per acre density. Access would be provided by SR76 and an onsite network of private roads. The development area currently is not within water, sewer, or fire service districts; a portion of the site is within the Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD) but that district is not willing to serve the development. De-annexation from the RMWD and annexation to the Yuima Water District is proposed. A modification of the County Water Authority boundary would also be required. Expansion of sewer and water treatment and distribution systems would be required. Two water reservoir tanks are proposed in the northeastern portion of the site and a connection to a major water line that is proposed in the vicinity of the northern boundary of the property. Annexation to the North County Fire District is also proposed. The project is currently partially within the North County Fire Protection District and entirely within the District's sphere of influence. A secondary access road would link the proposed project to Pala Temecula Road with a 25-foot wide roadbed and fuel modification and would be aligned along an existing dirt road traveling through the northeastern portion of the project site to Pala Temecula Road. In addition, fuel modification will be proposed adjacent to the development areas which will remain outside the biological open space preserve. Earthwork quantities for the onsite development will consist of approximately 3.4 million cubic yards (MCY) of cut and 3.4 MCY of fill. The project will include offsite improvements to segments of SR76 and along the frontage of the project site, and may include water and sewer service facility improvements including pipeline conveyance systems. The project proposes to be implemented in phases. (APNs: 110-021-09, -10; 110-090-01, -17, -18; 110-021-32; 110-040-22)



## 9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The surrounding area consists of rural residential, agriculture, and Native American Reservation with agriculture, residential and casino. SR76 (Pala Road) forms the southern boundary of the project site; the Reservation forms the majority of the eastern, northern, and southern boundaries of the project site; and there are several rural residences and vacant land in unincorporated land to the west. Elevation on the project site ranges from 980 feet above mean sea level to 1175 feet in the northern portion of the site. The project site was a working horse ranch with an estate, guesthouse, avocado and citrus groves and vacant natural land. Several drainages occur on the project site with the Gomez Creek being most prominent. The site drains to the San Luis Rey River to the south. Large boulders and rock outcrops occur on hillsides; the San Luis Rey floodplain and associated areas have been farmed for many years. The vegetation onsite consists of chaparral, coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, riparian woodland, grassland, developed land, and agricultural fields. The eastern and northern portions of the property are predominately covered by chaparral and coastal sage scrub with the southwestern portion of the project area being farmed. The property includes houses, barns, arenas, stables, guesthouse (motel style), and several outbuildings (located in the southwestern and central portions of the property). The site currently has two access roads, both from SR76.

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

<b>Permit Type/Action</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Administrative Permit Entry	County of San Diego
General Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego
Road Opening	County of San Diego
Road Vacation	County of San Diego
Specific Plan	County of San Diego
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Remandment of Relinquished Access Rights	County of San Diego
Underground Storage Tank Permit	County of San Diego
Annexation to a City or Special District	Local Agency Formation Commission

	(LAFCO)
State Highway Encroachment Permit	CALTRANS
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Endangered Species Act Section 7 - Consultation or Section 10a Permit	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Stormwater Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approvals	Yuima and Rainbow Water Districts
Sewer District Approval	Yuima Water District
Fire District Approval	North County Fire District
County Water Authority Approval	County Water Authority

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

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



**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

  
SignatureApril 29, 2010  
DateDavid Sibbet  
Printed NameLand Use/Environmental Planner III  
Title**INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including 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, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance



**I. AESTHETICS** -- Would the project:

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways. Based on a site visit completed by Maggie Loy on 9-20-2006 and David Sibbet on 2-1-10, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a designated scenic vista. The area is generally rural with horizon views of rugged mountains and a major valley and river. Portions of the valley are intensely developed in agriculture and industrial (mining) uses.

However, the project will change the composition of the view for drivers on SR76. The project site is located north of the San Luis Rey River and in the rugged foothills on the south flanks of Mount Olympus approximately 1.5 miles north of the site. The Tourmaline Queen Mountain is approximately 2 miles to the northeast of the site. Wilderness Gardens is the closest recreational destination and it is about 3 miles to the east of the site. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within these viewsheds, including the underlying landform and overlaying landcover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The visual environment of the subject scenic vista consists of rugged mountains and the San Luis Rey River.

The proposed project is a 780 unit residential development. A technical study must address the existing visual environment and the proposed change in terms of visual character and quality for drivers on SR76. Cumulative impacts and visual impacts from project proposed improvements to the highway should also be addressed.

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

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

**No Impact:** State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated. A scenic highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from Caltrans that the highway has been designated as an official Scenic Highway. Based on a site visit completed by Maggie Loy on 9-20-2006 the proposed project is not located near or visible within the same composite viewshed as a State scenic highway and will not change the visual composition of an existing scenic resource within a State scenic highway. Generally, the area defined within a State



scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The project site is located north of the SR76 and the current view is to the rugged foothills on the southern flanks of Mount Olympus, but this highway is not designated as scenic. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

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

☒ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact  
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as rural with sporadic residences and agricultural uses, and Native American land with a casino and residential community. The project will modify the onsite views from a rural farm to that of a planned residential community. The project may not be compatible with the existing visual environment's character and quality because it will consist of a land use that is different from that surrounding the project site. Therefore a technical study must address the existing visual character and proposed change and determine whether there are significant impacts to visual quality.

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

☒ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact  
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone A as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, about 12 miles west of the Palomar Observatory. The project is required to conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the Zone A lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, San Diego Gas and Electric land use planners, personnel from Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to address and minimize the impact of new sources of light pollution on



nighttime views. The standards in the Code establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits generally ensures that projects in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects do not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

However, the project does propose a General Plan Amendment that would allow more development in the area of concern for the Palomar Observatory and the project is adjacent to Pala Indian Reservation which is not regulated by County of San Diego codes or regulations. Therefore, a technical study must address the existing visual environment and the proposed change in terms of whether there would be a substantial new source of light that would cause a significant visual impact or contribute to significant cumulative impacts on the amount of outdoor lighting in Zone A.

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The project site does contain lands designated as Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland, and is adjacent to land designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. In addition, the project contains Farmland of Local Importance. Because some of these lands will be converted to a non-agricultural use, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The project site has been actively farmed and is currently zoned A-70 and A-72, which are considered to be agricultural zones. While the project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract, lands to the south and southwest



are under contract as agricultural preserve. Because the project does have the potential to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and adjacent Williamson Act Contract lands, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

☒ Potentially Significant Impact                      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact  
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The project site does contain lands designated as Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland, and is adjacent to land designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance. In addition, the project contains Farmland of Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Because some of these lands will be converted to a non-agricultural use, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact                      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact  
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The project involves residential development at a density that is greater than what has been planned and therefore, the project could potentially conflict with the RAQS and the SIP. In addition, operation of the project may result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards of toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. Therefore, the project may conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) on a project or cumulative level. Because the project proposes greater urban density in a non-attainment area, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

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



- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated      ☐ No Impact

**Potentially Significant Impact:** In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. For CEQA purposes, these screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the CEQA Air Quality Handbook for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which has stricter standards for emissions of ROCs/VOCs than San Diego's, is appropriate.

The project proposes construction and will result in residential traffic. While grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase may be substantial, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in approximately 7,000 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate more than 2,000 ADT are above the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for criteria pollutants. As such, the project may violate air quality standards and may contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated      ☐ No Impact

**Potentially Significant Impact:** San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual



geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns ( $PM_{10}$ ) and less than or equal to 2.5 microns ( $PM_{2.5}$ ) under the CAAQS.  $O_3$  is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides ( $NO_x$ ) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of  $PM_{10}$  in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands. Sources of  $PM_{2.5}$  primarily include construction vehicle diesel fuel particulates.

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of  $PM_{10}$ ,  $PM_{2.5}$ ,  $NO_x$  and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. While, the grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures, the emissions from the construction phase could be considerable, resulting in  $PM_{10}$ ,  $PM_{2.5}$ , and VOC emissions above the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in about 7,000 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate more than 2,000 ADT are above the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs,  $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$ . Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: Banks Elementary School. An Air Quality Analysis will determine if the project would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

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



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

**No Impact:** No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records and a site visit by County biologist Maggie Loy on 9-20-2006, the site and surrounding area supports native vegetation, namely, coastal sage scrub, chaparral, grasslands, pasture, and a variety of wetland and woodland types. A number of species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species have a high potential to occur. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a site visit by Maggie Loy on 9-20-2006, the site and surrounding area supports sensitive native vegetation, namely, coastal sage scrub, chaparral, annual grasslands/pasture, and a variety of wetland types. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Based on the site visit, it has been determined that the proposed project site contains several significant drainages, which if impacted may cause significant alterations to wetland habitats and/or watersheds that have been identified as California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers. In addition, the offsite road improvements could impact wetlands associated with the San Luis Rey River. Therefore a technical study must determine the significance of the impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Wildlife corridors potentially exist along natural drainages through various sensitive habitat types onsite, including: oak woodland, wetland habitats and coastal sage scrub. The project may potentially impact these corridors and may create additional indirect impacts through increased noise and activity. In addition, the site may contain a population of migratory fish. Therefore a technical study must determine the significance of the project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Based on the site visit, it has been determined that the proposed project may conflict with provisions of the Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) and will be subject to the County Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance. If a conflict with plans, policies, and ordinances that protect biological resources should occur, project alterations and mitigations would be required. Therefore, a technical study must determine the consistency with the NCCP and propose mitigation if necessary.



**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

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

☒ Potentially Significant Impact                      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless                      ☐ No Impact  
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, it has been determined that the project may affect historical resources onsite or as part of proposed offsite improvements. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

☒ Potentially Significant Impact                      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless                      ☐ No Impact  
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, it has been determined that the project site including the offsite improvement areas contains archaeological resources and therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact                      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless                      ☒ No Impact  
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

**No Impact:** Unique Paleontological Resources - A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains.

Unique Geologic Features – The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan (see Appendix G for a listing of unique geological features) or support any known

geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. The Tourmaline Queen Mine is found approximately 2 miles to the east.

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

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact  
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The project site is not known to contain a cemetery but based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, it has been determined that the project site including the offsite road improvement area contains archaeological resources which may include interred human remains, and therefore potentially significant impacts to cultural resources could occur.

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The project site is not known to contain a cemetery but based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, it has been determined that the project site including the offsite improvement areas contain archaeological resources which may include interred human remains. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

#### **VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

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

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

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



**Potentially Significant Impact:** There is a fault that crosses the site. It is not an Alquist Priolo fault but it must be investigated to ensure that it is not active. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The project is located within 5 kilometers of the centerline of the Lake Elsinore fault zone as defined within the Uniform Building Code's Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source Zones in California. To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements -- Chapter 16 Section 162- Earthquake Design as outlined within the California Building Code. Section 162 requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved by a County Structural Engineer before the issuance of a building or grading permit. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking from the as a result of this project.

There will also be an investigation of the onsite fault described above and if this fault is potentially active, there may be significant seismic shaking impacts in the proposed development area. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** There will also be an investigation of the onsite fault described above and if this fault is potentially active, there may be significant seismic related ground failure including liquefaction impacts in the proposed development area. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

iv. Landslides?

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** Slopes on site are significantly steep and have been noted as a "Landslide Susceptibility Area." A Geologic Investigation will be required to identify the location of geologic hazards that pose risk to people or property from landslides or rockfall and to provide engineering design measures to mitigate impacts.

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils onsite are identified as Cieneba-Fallbrook, Las Posas, Visalia, Ramona, and Cieneba. All of these soils have a soil erodibility rating of "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The project does propose development of steep slopes which may increase erodibility. Due to these factors, a geologic report must determine the significance of project impacts and recommend procedures to avoid substantial soil erosion and loss of topsoil on a project level.

c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

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

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The project area includes steep slopes, areas with soils that have a high potential for shrink/swell and areas with significant rock formations. In addition, there is a fault that crosses the site. Therefore, potentially significant impacts from geologic hazards could occur. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils onsite that have are listed as having a high potential for shrink swell soil include Las



Posas stony fine sandy loam (LrG and LrE). However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply with the 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 ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

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

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

**No Impact:** The project is for 781 residential units on sewer. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

## **VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** -- Would the project:

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

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

**No Impact:** The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. The project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

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

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



**Less than Significant Impact: Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school and is on the site of historic agriculture which may have unrecorded underground storage tanks or hazardous substance spills that remain in the soil. However, the project will not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because all storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances will be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520.

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

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections will occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulation; the project will not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

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

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