

November 8, 2007

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

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:  
TM 5343RPL<sup>3</sup>, GPA 03-006, R03-017, Log No. 03-14-060; Fuerte Ranch Estates
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 Camille Passon, Project Manager  
b. Phone number: (858) 694-2982  
c. E-mail: Camille.Passon@sdcounty.ca.gov.
4. Project location:  
  
South of Fuerte Drive and east of Damon Lane in the Valle de Oro community of the County of San Diego.  
  
Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1271, Grid H/3
5. Project Applicant name and address:  
  
Mike Reynolds  
Reynolds Communities  
1908 Friendship Drive, Suite A  
El Cajon, CA 92020
6. General Plan Designation  
Community Plan: Valle de Oro  
Land Use Designation: Existing: 19 (Intensive Agriculture)  
Proposed: 3 Residential  
Density: Existing: 1 du/4 acres  
Proposed: 2 du/1 acre

7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: Existing: A72  
Proposed: RR2  
Minimum Lot Size: Existing: 4 acres  
Proposed: 0.5 acre  
Special Area Regulation: N/A

8. Description of project:

The project is a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Tentative Map for a rural residential development in the Valle de Oro community of the County of San Diego. The project consists of forty (40) residential lots ranging in size from .50 to .98 acre on a 27.26-acre site located south of Fuerte Drive and east of Damon Lane. The project site will be accessed from Fuerte Drive and from Fuerte Farms Road. The project will receive water and sewer service from the Otay Water District and fire service from the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District.

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy (CUDA) Current Urban Development Area and General Plan Land Use Designation (19) Intensive Agriculture. It is currently zoned A72 (General Agricultural).

The requested General Plan Amendment would re-designate the site from (19) Intensive Agriculture to (3) Residential. The General Plan for (3) Residential permits a maximum density of 2 dwelling units per acre. The Rezone would change the zoning from A72 (Intensive Agriculture) to RR2 (Rural Residential – 2 dwelling units per acre).

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

Currently, the property is an operational poultry farm (Hooper's Poultry Farm). In addition to the poultry coops and numerous outbuildings, the site supports two single-family residences. All of the existing structures on-site are to be removed. The remaining land on-site is disturbed with a drainage ditch running southbound through the middle of the property. The site is bordered by residential development to the north, east, and west. South of the property is the Damon Lane County open space preserve/reserve. Fuerte Elementary School is to the west and adjacent to the project site. The topography of the project site and adjacent land is relatively flat and developed.

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

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
General Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Rezone	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 Grading Permit Plan Change	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Otay Water District
Sewer District Approval	Otay Sewer District
Fire District Approval	San Miguel Fire Protection District

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

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

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)  
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, 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.

_____ Signature	_____ November 8, 2007 Date
_____ Camille Passon Printed Name	_____ Land Use/Environmental Planner Title

## INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. Based on a site visit completed by Camille Passon on September 26, 2007, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. The project site is located along Fuerte Drive and Damon Lane in the Valle de Oro Community Planning area of San Diego County approximately four miles from Interstate 8. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**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 Camille Passon on September 26, 2007, 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 along Fuerte Drive and Damon Lane in the Valle de Oro Community Planning area of San Diego County approximately four miles from Interstate 8. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** 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 area can be characterized as developed with residential uses on lots averaging approximately one-half acre.

The proposed project is a Tentative Map, General Plan Amendment, and Rezone to allow for a 40-lot residential subdivision on approximately 27.26 acres. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: the site is surrounded by existing single-family residences. A subdivision to the north and one on the west include well over one hundred lots which are virtually identical in size and design with the project proposal. The land is relatively flat and will not require significant alteration of the existing landform. The existing land use designation (19) Intensive Agriculture was placed on the site in recognition of the existing poultry farming designation. Since the establishment of the poultry farm, the neighborhoods adjacent to the project site have developed with low density urban uses to the north, west, and east, and higher densities in the specific plan to the south. Agricultural uses are no longer appropriate for the site and residential uses would be more compatible with the existing visual character of the area.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: the project has been designed to be consistent with the surrounding development in the area. The project will not require significant alteration of the existing landform and a landscaping will be provided. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. However, the proposed project will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations because it will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. 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 effectively 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 ensures that this project in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

**II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is currently zoned A72, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because the project includes a rezone to change the zoning to RR2. The project site is the only property in the neighborhood with a zoning of A72 due to the existing poultry operation. The site is almost completely surrounded by residential zones including RR2 to the north and west and RS4 and SP80 to the south. There is an A70 zone to the east which has been developed with residential uses. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Although the project site currently contains an agricultural use (poultry operation), the proposed project was determined not to have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of active agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons: the poultry operation is the only active agricultural operation in the area. It is completely surrounded by single-family

residential uses and is not identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance.

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes development that requires a General Plan Amendment which will increase density levels. However, the project in conjunction with the other reasonably foreseeable projects within the subregional area do not exceed the growth expectations that were anticipated in the SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below the screening levels, and subsequently will not violate ambient air quality.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** 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 Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level

criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

The project proposes a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Tentative Map for a 40-lot residential subdivision. Proposed grading includes 100,000 cubic yards of excavation and embankment. However, 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 would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 480 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 less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** 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<sub>10</sub>) under the CAAQS. O<sub>3</sub> is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) 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<sub>10</sub> in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust

from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also as the result of increase of traffic from project implementation. However, 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 would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in PM<sub>10</sub> and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 480 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 less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM<sub>10</sub>, or any O<sub>3</sub> precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** 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 County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly

The following sensitive receptor has 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: Fuerte Elementary School. However, based on review by a DPLU staff air quality specialist, this project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant

concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction and operational phases. However, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than  $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ). Subsequently, no significant air quality – odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Moreover, the affects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources report prepared by Helix Environmental Planning and dated September 25, 2007. The site is 27.3 acres and the project proposes the development of 40 single-family residences. The site consists primarily of non-sensitive lands: 0.60 acres of non-native vegetation, 4.27 acres of Intensive agriculture, 13.57 acres of Disturbed habitat, and 7.95 acres of Developed habitat. The site also contains .01 acres of Mule fat scrub, .15 acres of Southern willow scrub, .14 acres of Disturbed wetland, .11 acres of Disturbed emergent wetland, .06 acres of Freshwater marsh, and .45 acres of non native grassland which are considered

sensitive by the County, California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The wetlands on-site were determined not to qualify as Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) wetlands pursuant to Section 86.602(q)(2)(bb) of the RPO. To mitigate for the loss of .46 acres of wetland habitat off site purchase of habitat at a 1:1 ratio will be required. To mitigate for the loss of .45-acre of non native grassland off-site purchase of habitat at a .5:1 ratio will also be required.

The proposed project would impact a total of 0.07 acres of habitat under U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdiction. This includes permanent impacts to 0.01 acres of freshwater marsh, and 0.03 acres of non-wetland Waters of the U.S. There would be temporary impacts to 0.03-acre of non-wetland Waters of the U.S. through realignment of the channel through the site. The project will be conditioned to obtain the appropriate 1600 permit from CDFG and a 401/404 permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the ACOE.

There were two (2) sensitive wildlife species observed on-site: Cooper's hawk and western bluebird. Breeding season avoidance will be implemented as a mitigation measure that prevents brushing, clearing, and/or grading during the avian breeding season between February 1 and September 15.

Staff has determined that although the site supports biological habitat and species, implementation of the mitigation measures described above will ensure that project impacts will not result in substantial adverse effects, or have a cumulatively considerable impact to 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. All potentially significant impacts will be reduced to a level below significance.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** The Biological Resources report prepared by Helix Environmental Planning and dated September 25, 2007 determined that the proposed project site contains a disturbed man made drainage. The drainage contains .01 acres of Mule fat scrub, .15 acres of Southern willow scrub,

.14 acres of Disturbed wetland, .11 acres of Disturbed emergent wetland, and .06 acres of Freshwater marsh. Although the project site contains this habitat, it does not qualify as Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) wetland according to Section 86.602(q)(2)(bb) of the RPO. Project impacts to associated habitat will be mitigated by off-site preservation of .46 acres of wetland habitat.

The proposed project would impact a total of 0.07 acres of habitat under U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdiction. This includes permanent impacts to 0.01 acres of freshwater marsh, and 0.03 acres of non-wetland Waters of the U.S.. There would be temporary impacts to 0.03 acre of non-wetland Waters of the U.S. through realignment of the onsite channel. To mitigate for permanent impacts ACOE and CDFG will require .06 acres wetland creation habitat to be purchased off site. The temporary impacts to 0.03 acres of non-wetland Waters of the U.S. will result in the habitat to be placed into a flowage easement. The project will be conditioned to obtain the appropriate 1600 permit from CDFG and a 401/404 permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the ACOE.

Therefore, impacts to sensitive natural communities as identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations are considered less than significant through the implementation of onsite flowage easement preservation and offsite habitat purchases.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Pursuant to Clean Water Act Section 404 and California Fish and Game Code Section 1602, implementation of the proposed project would impact a total of 0.07 acre of Army Corps of Engineers and CDFG jurisdictional areas. This includes permanent impacts to 0.01 acres of freshwater marsh, 0.03 acres of non-wetland Waters of the U.S., and temporary impacts to 0.03-acre of non-wetland Waters of the U.S. through realignment of the channel through the site. To mitigate for the impacts off site purchase of habitat will include: 0.01 acres of freshwater marsh at a ratio of 3:1, and 0.03 acres of non-wetland Waters of the U.S. at a ratio of 1:1. The temporary impacts to 0.03 acres of non-wetland Waters of the U.S.

will result in the habitat to be placed into a flowage easement. The Corps, CDFG, and RWQCB require the habitat to be protected by fencing where by it will be enhanced and maintained. Details of the enhancement and weeding program will be determined in consultation with the wetland permitting agencies during the wetland permitting process. With the implementation of mitigation measures detailed above impacts to wetlands or waters of the U.S. that are regulated under the Army Corps of Engineers will be reduced below significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, and the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species staff have determined that the site has limited biological value. The site predominantly contains developed, disturbed, intense agriculture habitat. Aerial evidence shows the site has been continually disturbed with intense agricultural uses, which would not be ideal for wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites. Properties north, east, and west of the site are developed with dense residential developments. There is an existing drainage south of the property that connects with Sweetwater creek approximately 1.5 miles to the south of the proposed project. The existing creek/stream would likely be an ideal corridor that local wildlife would use. The man made drainage onsite is maintained from runoff from existing farming operations. Therefore, it is not expected that the proposed project would result in impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and/or the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP) Special Area Management Plans (SAMP) or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego certified archaeologist staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on September 27, 2004, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The majority of the project area has been disturbed by agricultural and nursery production for many years. However, a natural drainage runs through the property from northeast toward the southeast. Although the drainage was also disturbed, the area was surveyed. The remains of old structures were observed in a state of disrepair and none would appear to have historical significance. In addition, no artifacts or features were observed in the areas surveyed and the potential for artifacts or features in the areas disturbed by long-term agricultural/nursery use is very low; the survey was negative and no further archaeological work is needed for this project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on September 27, 2004, it has been determined that the 26.86-acre parcel APN 498-153-01 Fuerte Ranch Estates project in Valle de Oro does not contain any archaeological resources. The majority of the project area has been disturbed by agricultural and nursery production over many years and only a small portion of the property was accessible for survey because of the presence of large greenhouse structures. However, a natural drainage runs through the property from northeast toward the southeast. The drainage area was surveyed although heavily disturbed. No prehistoric artifacts or features were observed in the areas surveyed and the potential for artifacts or features in the areas disturbed by long-term agricultural/ nursery use appears to low.

In addition, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a listing of Native American Tribes whose ancestral lands may be impacted by the project. The tribes listed by the NAHC were received July 25, 2005 and letters requesting tribal consultation were sent out October 14, 2005. The Kumeyaay cultural repatriation Committee responded with a recommendation that Native American observers be on site during any ground disturbing activities.

Grading monitoring, consisting of a County-approved archaeologist and Native American observer, will be a required condition of project approval because of the proximity of known archaeological sites and since only a small portion of the property was accessible for survey because of the presence of large greenhouse structures and nursery plantings.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** 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 that support known geologic characteristics with the potential to support unique geologic features. Additionally, based on a site visit by Camille Passon on September 26, 2007 no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, on September 27, 2004, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the geologic environment of the project site is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is not within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as placencia sandy loam and friant fine sandy loam, which have a soil erodibility rating of "moderate" and "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. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Storm water Management Plan (DPLU received June 7, 2007, with changes as emailed on October 10, 2007 to DPLU) prepared by Polaris Development Consultants. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: silt fence, fiber rolls, sand bag barrier, stockpile management, desilting basin,

- dewatering operations, stabilized construction entrance/exit, reducing the disturbance of slopes, conserving natural areas where feasible.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is 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 on-site are placentia sandy loam and friant fine sandy loam. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply 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         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. A service availability letter dated October 19, 2006 has been received from the Otay Water District indicating that the facility has adequate capacity for the projects wastewater disposal needs. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

**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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**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.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Although the project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing school, the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

- 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

- i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is completely surrounded by urbanized areas and/or irrigated lands and no wildlands are adjacent to the project. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated October 10, 2007 and conditions, dated October 10, 2007, have been received from the San Miguel Fire Protection District. The conditions from the San Miguel Fire Protection District include: an automatic fire sprinkler system, site inspections, street numbers/premises identification, review and approval by the fire department regarding the design of fire apparatus access roads, surfacing of access roads, street names, the installation of four new fire hydrants, the prohibition of gates or other structures that could obstruct fire access unless they meet standards approved by the fire chief, response map updates, and clearance of brush or vegetative growth from structures. Therefore, based on the location of the project; review of the project by County staff; and through compliance with the San Miguel Fire Protection District's conditions, the project is not expected to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by Camille Passon on September 26, 2007, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** -- Would the project:

- a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Tentative Map for a 40-lot residential subdivision which requires a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a copy of a stormwater management plan which demonstrates that the project will comply with all the requirements of a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: site design BMPs including reducing impacts to receiving waters, minimizing the impervious footprint, conserving natural areas where feasible, draining rooftops, sidewalks, walkways, and trails into adjacent landscaping, and minimizing erosion from slopes; source control BMPs including signs to discourage illegal dumping, providing attached lids on all trash containers, reducing excessive irrigation runoff, designing driveways with shared access, flared, or wheelstrips, using permeable surfacing where feasible, and designing driveways and guest parking to discharge into landscaping prior to discharging to the storm water conveyance system; and treatment control BMPs including detention basins with grass lining and storm drain inserts. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project lies in the Sweetwater hydrologic subarea, within the 909.22/Hillsdale hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, although portions of the San Diego Bay are impaired for coliform bacteria, no portion of the Sweetwater River, which is tributary to the Bay, is impaired. Constituents of concern in the Sweetwater River watershed include coliform bacteria and trace metals.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: construction of single-family residential development, driveways, parking areas, landscaping, and other activities associated with single-family residences. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: site design BMPs including reducing impacts to receiving waters, minimizing the impervious footprint, conserving natural areas where feasible, draining rooftops, sidewalks, walkways, and trails into adjacent landscaping, and minimizing erosion from slopes; source control BMPs including signs to discourage illegal dumping, providing attached lids on all trash containers, reducing excessive irrigation runoff, designing driveways with shared access, flared, or wheelstrips, using permeable surfacing where feasible, and designing driveways and guest parking to discharge into landscaping prior to discharging to the storm water conveyance system.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the

Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Storm water Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Sweetwater hydrologic subarea, within the 909.22/Hillsdale hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; and rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: parking areas, construction activities, equipment, materials, storage and handling areas during construction, maintenance, repair, washing activities, landscaping, and other activities associated with single-family development. Such uses have the potential to contribute to the following pollutants: sediments, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, and pesticides. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: site design BMPs including reducing impacts to receiving waters, minimizing the impervious footprint, conserving natural areas where feasible, draining rooftops, sidewalks, walkways, and trails into adjacent landscaping, and minimizing erosion from slopes; source control BMPs including signs to discourage

illegal dumping, providing attached lids on all trash containers, reducing excessive irrigation runoff, designing driveways with shared access, flared, or wheelstrips, using permeable surfacing where feasible, and designing driveways and guest parking to discharge into landscaping prior to discharging to the storm water conveyance system; and treatment control BMPs including detention basins with grass lining and storm drain inserts.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will obtain its water supply from the Otay Water District. A project facility availability form dated October 19, 2006 has been received from the Otay Water District indicating that water service is available for this project. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to develop 27.3 acres into a 40-minimum ½-acre sized lots. As outlined in the Storm Water Management Plan, (DPLU received June 7, 2007, with changes as emailed on October 10, 2007 to DPLU, and preliminary grading plans and preliminary drainage study (both DPLU received June 7, 2007), the project will not significantly alter existing drainage patterns of the site, and it will implement site design measures, source control, and treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. All three documents were prepared by Polaris Development Consultants and DPW reviewed and accepted. The project will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any on-site and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. The projects grading, the drainage study and SWMP will be reviewed in more depth as part of the final grading and improvement plan process. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI. Geology and Soils, Question b.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** As outlined in the Polaris Development Consultants prepared /DPW reviewed and accepted preliminary grading plans and preliminary drainage study (both DPLU received June 7, 2007), the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river nor substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result flooding on- or off-site in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The Department of Public Works DPW has accepted these studies. Both the preliminary drainage study and preliminary are acceptable for CEQA review purposes. Additionally, these aspects will be reviewed again and in more depth as part of the final grading and improvement plan process.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the predevelopment flow rates. It proposes to incorporate on-site detention facilities that will detain post-development flows to pre-development conditions, in perpetuity. The capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems will not be affected by the project.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: parking areas, construction activities, equipment, materials, storage and handling areas during construction, maintenance, repair, washing activities, landscaping, and other activities associated with single-family development. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: site design BMPs including reducing impacts to receiving waters, minimizing the impervious footprint, conserving natural areas where feasible, draining rooftops, sidewalks, walkways, and trails into adjacent landscaping, and

minimizing erosion from slopes; source control BMPs including signs to discourage illegal dumping, providing attached lids on all trash containers, reducing excessive irrigation runoff, designing driveways with shared access, flared, or wheelstrips, using permeable surfacing where feasible, and designing driveways and guest parking to discharge into landscaping prior to discharging to the storm water conveyance system; and treatment control BMPs including detention basins with grass lining and storm drain inserts. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or County Floodplain Maps were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact will occur. Both the drainage study and SWMP are acceptable for CEQA review purposes and will be reviewed in more depth as part of the final grading and improvement plan process.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** As outlined in the storm water management plan and in the preliminary grading plans and drainage study, the project will not place structures within the 100-year storm flood ways and will place no structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. The drainage study, grading, and SWMP will be reviewed in more depth as part of the final grading and improvement plan process.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

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

ii. TSUNAMI

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

iii. MUDFLOW

**No Impact:** Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, though the project does propose land disturbance that will expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose the introducing new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. The project has obtained project facility availability forms from all of the serving agencies and utilities needed to serve the project are located in adjacent streets. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy Current Urban Development Area (CUDA) and proposed General Plan Land Use Designation (3) Residential. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of ½-acre and not more than 2 dwelling units per acre. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes and density that are consistent with this proposed General Plan designation. The project is subject to the policies of the Valle De Oro Community Plan. The Valle De Oro Community Plan encouraged development which will lead to a community with a balance of land uses, which will conserve natural and manmade resources, and which will provide a pleasant, safe environment for present and future residents. The application is consistent with the surrounding residential development in the area. There are two adjacent subdivisions across Fuerte Drive and to the west which together include well over one hundred ½ acre lots. The project proposes to revegetate the existing and highly disturbed drainage on-site helping to restore a natural resource and create a safe environment for future residents. The Valle De Oro Community Plan calls for gradual residential growth in areas where necessary public services and facilities are easily provided. The project has obtained will serve letters from all of the serving agencies and utilities needed to serve the project are located in adjacent streets. The Community Plan encourages quality design and

appropriate land use patterns. The application provides for the creation of semi-custom, large lot residential development on lots ½-acre and greater. A proposed open space drainage area is designed to provide a revegetated, natural buffer creating a sense of openness and privacy. The project has been designed to fit in with the existing residential development in the area. The Community Plan also has a policy to maintain existing residential character in the Mt. Helix area (north of Casa de Oro and west of Avocado Boulevard) by limiting densities to a maximum of 1 or 2 dwelling units per acre. The project is located east of Avocado Boulevard; therefore, this policy should not apply. However, the project still proposes a maximum density of 2 dwelling units per acre. The proposed zoning is RR2 (Rural Residential), which requires a net minimum lot size of ½-acre. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size. For additional information concerning General Plan and Community Plan consistency, please refer to the General Plan Amendment Report received by DPLU on October 30, 2007 prepared by Vance and Associates.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by densely developed land uses including single-family residences and a school which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is currently zoned A72 and has a proposed zoning of RR2. Neither of these zones are considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S82). In addition, the project does not have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

**XI. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** The project consists of the a 40 lot subdivision to a 26.9 acre lot and will be occupied by residential use. Based on a site visit completed by Camille Passon on September 26, 2007, and as described in the Noise Analysis prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc (ISE) and dated September 10, 2007, the surrounding areas are zoned rural residential and agriculture. Dedication of a Noise Protection Easement and implementation of temporary construction noise walls will ensure the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by ISE and dated September 10, 2007, the location of the 60 dBA CNEL contour includes the second story of Lot 1. Staff recommends a Noise Protection Easement over Lot 1. Noise sensitive outdoor areas will have traffic noise levels as high as 59 dBA CNEL at Lot 40 which is in compliance with the County Noise Element 4b, 60 dBA CNEL requirement. Mitigation measures for noise sensitive outdoor use areas are not necessary.

Therefore, dedication of the Noise Protection Easement will ensure the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by ISE and dated September 10, 2007, non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A72 that has a one-hour nighttime average sound limit of 45 dBA. The adjacent properties to the north and west are zoned RR2 and have one-hour nighttime average sound limit of 45 dBA. The Noise Analysis states the project's noise levels at the adjoining properties will not exceed County Noise Standards.

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by ISE and dated September 10, 2007, temporary construction noise levels will exceed the County Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410) requirement of 75 dBA with any construction activities occurring within 100 feet of the project boundary line. Temporary construction noise mitigation in a form of an 8-foot high, ½-inch plywood noise wall will be installed around the perimeter of the project site. The temporary noise mitigation will be constructed with no gaps or openings. Implementation of the temporary noise mitigation noise wall will decrease predicted construction sound levels to meet County Noise Ordinance construction noise level requirements. For temporary construction noise wall details, please refer to Section: Construction Noise Emission Levels and Figure 6 in the noise report prepared by ISE dated September 10, 2007. Dedication of the Noise Protection Easement and implementation of the temporary construction noise barrier will ensure the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the facilities are typically setback more than 50 feet from any County Circulation Element (CE) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 38 VdB or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities would insure that these proposed uses or operations do not have any chance of being impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 1995, Rudy Hendriks, *Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations* 2002). This setback insures that this project site will not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Vehicle traffic traveling on Fuerte Drive and nearby agricultural activities. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise

sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on a Noise Analysis prepared by ISE dated September 10, 2007. Due to potential traffic increase from the proposed project, traffic noise increase would be 1.3 dBA CNEL along Damon Lane, south of Fuerte Drive and is considered an insignificant noise increase. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Temporary construction noise levels will exceed the County Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410) requirement of 75 dBA with any construction activities occurring within 100 feet of the project boundary line. Temporary construction noise mitigation in a form of an 8-foot high, ½-inch plywood noise wall will be installed around the perimeter of the project site. The temporary noise mitigation will be constructed with no gaps or openings. Implementation of the temporary noise mitigation noise wall will decrease predicted construction sound levels to meet County Noise Ordinance construction noise level requirements. For temporary construction noise wall details, please refer to Section: Construction Noise Emission Levels and Figure 6 in the noise report prepared by ISE dated September 10, 2007. Dedication of the Noise Protection Easement and implementation of the temporary construction noise barrier will ensure project will comply with County of San Diego Noise Regulations.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction

operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING** -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment from (19) Intensive Agriculture to (3) Residential, a Rezone from A72 to RR2, and a Tentative Map for a 40-lot residential subdivision. However, this physical and regulatory change will not induce substantial population growth in an area, because the regulatory change does increase density or intensity of land use that is inconsistent with the surrounding area. The existing land use designation (19) Intensive Agriculture was placed on the site in recognition of the poultry farming operation. Since the establishment of the poultry farm, the neighborhood adjacent to the project site has developed with low density urban residential uses to the north, west, and east, and higher densities in the specific plan to the south. Utilities available to serve the project are already located in the adjacent roads so there is no need for the extension of infrastructure and public facilities into previously unserved areas. The project site is already surrounded by existing single-family development on lot sizes similar to what is being proposed by the project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The property currently has one single family residence in addition to several structures associated with the poultry farm, which are to be removed. This residential development would not displace any existing housing. Potentially a total of 40 single-family dwellings will exist when the lots are developed.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The property currently has one single family residence in addition to several structures associated with the poultry farm, which are to be removed. This residential development would not displace any existing housing.

Potentially a total of 40 single-family dwellings will exist when the lots are developed. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people

### **XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: San Miguel Fire Protection District, Otay Water District, and the Cajon Valley Union School District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

### **XIV. RECREATION**

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves a residential subdivision that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to pay park fees. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication and thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** A Traffic Study (TS), prepared by Darnell & Associates revision dated November 20, 2006, was completed and DPW reviewed and accepted for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study estimates that the proposed project will result in an estimated additional 480 Average Daily Trips, ADT. These were further estimated to be 38 am peak hour / 48 pm peak hour. The Traffic Study outlined the project-generated-traffic travel routes and analyzed these road segments and intersections. This report concludes that the project does not have a significant direct impact on any of the roadway segments in the vicinity of the project and will not significantly impact any of the analyzed intersections. Also refer to the answer for XV. b. below.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** A Traffic Study (TS), prepared by Darnell & Associates estimated additional 480 Average Daily Trips, ADT (38 am peak hour/48 pm peak hour project trips), this report determined that the project's traffic

volumes will not result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways and intersections in relation to the existing traffic volumes and capacity of the street system.

However, the County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. This program is based on a summary of projections method contained in an adopted planning document, as referenced in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(1)(B), which evaluates regional or area wide conditions contributing to cumulative transportation impacts. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

A Traffic Study (TS), prepared by Darnell & Associates estimated additional 480 Average Daily Trips will be generated by this project. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the unincorporated county that were analyzed by the TIF program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

In order to mitigate its incremental contribution to significant cumulative traffic impacts, the proposed project will pay the TIF prior to obtaining building permits.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** The proposed project does not propose increased hazards and will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, or place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. In response to public's expressed concerns about traffic safety, the applicant's traffic engineer (Darnell & Associates) reviewed the traffic operations of Fuerte Drive. Fuerte Drive between Avocado Boulevard and Chase operates at a level of service (LOS) of C or better currently and will continue to operate at C with the project traffic. Fuerte Drive west of Avocado Boulevard and Chase Avenue east of Fuerte Road operate at LOS E or worse under 2030 conditions with or without the project, however, the project traffic was found to have less than a significant direct impact on these segment and less than a significant direct impact on the intersections: I-8 ramps/Fuerte Drive, and Chase Avenue/Jamacha Road.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The San Miguel Fire Protection District has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that there is adequate emergency fire access. Additionally, roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain existing conditions as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project facility availability form has been received from Otay Water District that indicates the district will serve the project. Therefore, because the project will be discharging wastewater to a RWQCB permitted community sewer system and will be required to satisfy the conditions listed above, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, including the Regional Basin Plan.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate adequate water and wastewater treatment facilities are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Otoy Water District. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves new and/or expanded storm water drainage facilities. The new and/or expanded facilities include grass lined detention basins and storm drain inserts. Refer to the Storm water Management Plan dated May 7, 2007 for more information. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form Section I-XVII, the new and/or expanded facilities will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment. Specifically, refer to Section VIII for more information.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project requires water service from the Otay Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Otay Water District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project requires wastewater service from the Otay Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Otay Water District has been provided, indicating adequate wastewater service capacity is available to serve the requested demand. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440 et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly mule fat scrub, southern willow scrub, disturbed wetland, disturbed emergent freshwater marsh, and non-native grassland. However, mitigation has been

included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes off-site purchase of habitat and fencing where habitat will be enhanced and maintained. In addition, grading monitoring will be required to mitigate for potential impacts to buried cultural resources. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Paseo Fuerte Estates	TM 5476, R06-002, P06-019
Fuerte Hills	TM 4656
Carson	TM 4895
Explorer Road	TPM 20630
Explorer Road Lot Split	TPM 20854
Sitto	TM 5127
Minor Deviation to Site Plan	85-062-03
Minor Deviation to Site Plan	85-062-04
Minor Use Permit Cox/Sprint	00-120

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to transportation/traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the Transportation Impact Fee. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there

are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to traffic and noise. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes a noise protection easement and a temporary noise mitigation wall during construction as well as payment of the Transportation Impact Fee. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

#### **AESTHETICS**

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

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

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

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

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

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

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

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

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

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

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

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. ([www.intl-light.com](http://www.intl-light.com))

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. ([www.lrc.rpi.edu](http://www.lrc.rpi.edu))

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

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. ([www.blm.gov](http://www.blm.gov))

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

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

#### AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov), [www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. ([www.qp.gov.bc.ca](http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca))

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

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. ([www.sdcounty.ca.gov](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov))

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

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

#### AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. ([www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov))

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

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

#### BIOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. ([migratorybirds.fws.gov](http://migratorybirds.fws.gov))

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

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

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

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

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC

§35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. ([www.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

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

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

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

## HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. ([www.dpla2.water.ca.gov](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov))

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov), <http://www.amlegal.com/>)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. ([www.projectcleanwater.org](http://www.projectcleanwater.org))

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

## LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. ([www.co-san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co-san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord. Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

#### MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

#### NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

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

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

#### POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter

69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

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

#### RECREATION

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

#### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

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

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

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

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

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

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

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

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

**UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS**

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

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public  
Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management,  
Sections 40000-41956. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78:  
Small Wastewater. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization  
Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992.  
([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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