



ERIC GIBSON
INTERIM DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

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

January 11, 2008

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/98)

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

Crossroads Investors Minor Subdivision; TPM 20800; STP 06-013; ER 04-02-002

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 Mark Slovick, Planner
b. Phone number: (858) 495-5172
c. E-mail: Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project site is located near 300 Reche Road on Ranger Road in the Fallbrook Planning Area within unincorporated San Diego County.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1028, Grid F/3

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Crossroads Investors I, LLC, 9255 Towne Center Drive, Suite 450, San Diego, CA 92121

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	Fallbrook
Land Use Designations:	1, Residential and 17 and Estate Residential
Densities:	1 du/1,2,4 acres and 1 du/2,4 acres

7. Zoning

Use Regulation: A70

Density: 0.5 du/1 acre
Special Area Regulation: B

8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation):

The project is a minor subdivision of 15.58 acres into four parcels and a remainder. Residences will be served by Rainbow Municipal Water District for water and on-site septic systems and access will be provided by a private easement road. The site currently contains an existing house and an agricultural pond, both of which will remain. The balance of the site contains an active agricultural grove and container plant nursery. Earthwork will include a balanced cut and fill of 10,000 cubic yards with a maximum cut slope of 1.5:1, maximum height of 15 feet; and a maximum fill slope will be 2:1, maximum height of 15 feet. The site has an existing dwelling which will remain.

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

The project site is surrounded by residential and agricultural uses to the north, west, and south. The eastern border of the property slopes steeply down to Old Highway 395. Interstate 15 lies further east, approximately 500 feet from the property's eastern border.

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

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Tentative Parcel Map	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Water District Approval	Rainbow Municipal Water District
School District Approval	Fallbrook Union School Districts

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz. Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing |

- [Public Services](#) [Recreation](#) [Transportation/Traffic](#)
 [Utilities & Service Systems](#) [Mandatory Findings of Significance](#)

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.

March 26, 2008

Signature

Mark Slovick

Printed Name

Date

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

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> 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. Based on a site visit completed by staff on January 15, 2004, the proposed project is located near or within the viewshed of a scenic vista, Old Highway 395 and Interstate 15. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying landcover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The subject scenic vista includes the steep slopes on the eastern side of Parcel 4 and the Remainder Parcel. The Remainder Parcel has an existing home that is proposed to remain unchanged under the proposed subdivision. However, if this home is removed in the future, a replacement home will be constructed at least as far from the top of slope as the existing home. The proposed house pad on Parcel 4 is set back from the top of slope to reduce visual impacts. The steep slopes will be conserved in an open space easement to buffer the proposed subdivision and the scenic vistas.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 Christine Stevenson on January 15, 2004 the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of 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 site is located within the viewshed of a County designated scenic highway. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within the composite viewshed of the scenic highway, including the underlying landform and overlaying landcover, establish the visual environment. The visual environment of the subject County scenic highway and resources extends along I-15 from route 78 to Riverside County;

and the visual composition consists of slopes with natural vegetation, rural residential and agricultural uses.

The proposed project is a minor subdivision and addition of four (4) additional residences. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment because the future homes will be set back from the slope and will not be visible from I-15. In addition, the steep slopes will be conserved in an open space easement to buffer the proposed subdivision and the scenic vistas.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway 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 composite viewshed of the State scenic highway and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because the project is consistent with surrounding land uses and development. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as agricultural and residential. The minimum lot size in the area is 2 acres and in some portions of the area the minimum lot size is 1 acre. The proposed project is a minor subdivision. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality because the proposed lot sizes and residential uses are consistent with surrounding parcels. The proposed subdivision will also have an open space easement to conserve the steep slope area over Parcel 4 and the Remainder Parcel. This open space easement will act as a buffer between the future development of a single-family residence and Interstate 15 and Old Highway 395.

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 |
|---|--|

- Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

The project proposes a minor residential subdivision, which may include outdoor lighting. Any future outdoor lighting pursuant to this project shall be required to meet the requirements of the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Section 6322-6326) and the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115).

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, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level

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

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

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

The project site and surrounding area, within a radius of 1 mile, has land designated as Unique Farmland. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by a County Agricultural Specialist and was determined not to have significant adverse project or cumulative level impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use because there is no active agriculture on the site, and The LESA model score is 23.8. A LESA model score of 23.8 means that the value of agricultural land resources of the project site is not considered significant. The LESA model measures both the soil-based qualities of land as they relate to agricultural suitability and it measures the

soil, economic, and geographic attributes that contribute to the overall value of the agricultural land.

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

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

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

The project site is zoned A70, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because single-family residential is a permitted use in A70 zones and will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. 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 Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

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

The project site and surrounding area, within a radius of 1 mile, has land designated as Unique Farmland. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by a County Agricultural Specialist and was determined not to have significant adverse project or cumulative level impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons: There is no active agriculture on the site, and the LESA model score is 23.8. A LESA model score of 23.8 means that the value of agricultural land resources of the project site is not considered significant. The LESA model measures both the soil-based qualities of land as they relate to agricultural suitability and it measures the soil, economic, and geographic attributes that contribute to the overall value of the agricultural land.

Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The project proposes development that was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the project is consistent the SANDAG growth projections used in the RAQS and SIP, therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

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

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. For CEQA purposes, these screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the CEQA Air Quality Handbook for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which has stricter standards for emissions of ROCs/VOCs than San Diego's, is appropriate. However, the eastern portions of the county have atmospheric conditions that are characteristic of the Southeast Desert Air Basin (SEDAB). SEDAB is not classified as an extreme non-attainment area for ozone and therefore has a less restrictive screening-level. Projects located in the eastern portions of the County can use the SEDAB screening-level threshold for VOCs.

The project proposes construction of four new residences, access roads and driveways, and septic fields. Grading will consist of a balanced cut and fill of approximately 10,000 cubic yards in an area of approximately 1.85 acres. Grading for the private easement road would involve 2,500 cubic yards of cut and fill over a 3-week time period. Each of the 4 new home pads (not counting the existing house on the remainder parcel) would involve an estimated 2,000 cubic yards of cut and fill. 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 and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 60 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 SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for criteria pollutants. As such, the project 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

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

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and VOCs as the result of increase of traffic. 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 and localized, resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 60 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 SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs and PM₁₀.

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 SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3, 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 PM₁₀, or any O₃ precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality.

Based a site visit conducted by Christine Stevenson on January 15, 2004, sensitive receptors have not 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. Furthermore, no emissions of air pollutants are associated with the project. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

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

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

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos and a site visit by Christine Stevenson on January 15, 2004, the site and surrounding area supports predominantly agriculture and developed land. A natural drainage containing riparian vegetation flows at the base of the slopes along the eastern border of Parcels 4 and the Remainder Parcel. The native habitat in this drainage will not be removed by the project. A Biological Open Space Easement over the drainage and a buffer will be dedicated to the County as a condition of this project. Since the native habitat be protected and avoided, there will be no significant impacts, either directly or through habitat modifications, 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. Since on-site habitat will be avoided, the project will not contribute to cumulative impacts on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

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

Based on a site visit conducted by County staff biologist Christine Stevenson on January 15, 2004, it has been determined that the proposed project site contains riparian habitat, developed land, and agricultural orchards within the project boundaries. Although the project site contains this habitat, the areas proposed for development will completely avoid direct impacts considered significant to any portion of the southern willow scrub. The development is set back over 100 feet to protect the riparian habitat from potential indirect impacts, including noise, lighting, human encroachment and invasive species. Furthermore, no off-site impacts have been identified within or immediately adjacent to a riparian or otherwise sensitive habitat. Therefore, with the dedication of the Open Space Easement, impacts are

considered less than significant since no direct, indirect or cumulative impacts are expected to occur to any riparian habitats or sensitive natural community 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.

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

County staff biologist Christine Stevenson visited the site on January 15, 2004. There are two natural drainages on site. The drainage on the eastern boundary likely meets County, State and Federal wetland definitions. There are no impacts proposed to this area, which will be preserved in a dedicated Biological Open Space Easement.

The project impact area contains a natural drainage swale which flows southwestward from the proposed remainder parcel through parcels 1, 2, and 3. The project proposes to install one culvert along this drainage in parcel 1. The drainage contains upland plant species and agriculture. There are no hydric soils and it does not contain a "non-soil substrate." Therefore, it does not constitute a County-defined wetland. However, the drainage likely falls under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). The project will be conditioned to obtain permits from these agencies or written verification that a permit is not required prior to issuance of grading permits. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act in which the Army Corps of Engineers maintains jurisdiction over

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

Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a site visit by Christine Stevenson on January 15, 2004, staff biologist Christine Stevenson has

determined there will be no significant impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, no significant impacts on the use of established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and no significant impedance of the use of native wildlife nursery sites as a result of the proposed project. The only potential wildlife corridor and wildlife breeding locations on site are along the natural drainage at the base of the steep eastern slope. This whole slope will be placed in an Open Space Easement and will not be impacted. The balance of the site is used for and existing residence and agricultural grove. Therefore, no significant impacts are expected.

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

The project site is outside of the currently adopted Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and the site contains habitat that has been ranked as agriculture by the MSCP habitat evaluation model. The project will not preclude connectivity between areas of high habitat values because there are no high habitat value areas adjacent to the site. The project will not preclude or prevent the preparation of the subregional NCCP because the project will preserve the only significant biological resource, a natural drainage at the base of the eastern slope. maintain existing connectivity between undeveloped lands. A steep slope easement and a Limited Building Zone Easement will ensure that fire clearing from homes at the top of the slope will not affect the open space easement.

In addition, refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist for further information on consistency with the Natural Communities Conservation Plan and local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance.

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

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego staff certified archaeologist Gail Wright on March 5, 2004, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not

occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in an historical resources report titled Cultural Resources Survey Report for TPM 20800, Log No. 04-02-002 – Crossroads - Negative Findings; by Gail Wright, March 5, 2004.

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

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego staff certified archaeologist Gail Wright on March 5, 2004, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled Cultural Resources Survey Report for TPM 20800, Log No. 04-02-002 – Crossroads - Negative Findings; by Gail Wright, March 5, 2004.

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

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

A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History, combined with available data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that have marginal resource potential. Marginal resource potential is assigned to geologic formations that are composed either of volcanic rocks or high-grade metasedimentary rocks, but which nevertheless have a limited probability for producing fossil remains from certain sedimentary lithologies at localized outcrops. However, staff geologist Laura Maghsoudlou has reviewed the project and determined that there are no significant paleontological resources associated with this formation in Fallbrook. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact on paleontological resources.

Additionally, based on a site visit by Christine Stevenson on January 15, 2004, no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity.

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

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego staff certified archaeologist Gail Wright on March 5, 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. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled Cultural Resources Survey Report for TPM 20800, Log No. 04-02-002 – Crossroads - Negative Findings; by Gail Wright, March 5, 2004.

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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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. Also, a staff geologist has reviewed the project and has concluded that no other substantial evidence of recent (Holocene) fault activity is present within the project site. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known hazard zone as a result of this project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

The Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the California Building Code (CBC) classifies all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. However, the project is not located within 5 kilometers of the centerline of a known active-fault zone as defined within the Uniform Building Code's Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source Zones in California. In addition, the project will have to conform to the Seismic Requirements -- Chapter 16 Section 162- *Earthquake Design* as outlined within the California Building Code. Section 162 requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved by a County Structural Engineer before the issuance of a building or grading permit. Therefore, there will

be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of this project.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

The geology of the project site is identified as Vista coarse sandy loam, 15-30% and 30-65% slopes; Fallbrook sandy loam, 9-15% slopes, eroded; and steep gullied land. This geologic environment 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 to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.

iv. Landslides?

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

The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, a staff geologist has determined that the geologic environment of the project area is not located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity.

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

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Vista coarse sandy loam, 15-30% and 30-65% slopes; Fallbrook sandy loam, 9-15% slopes, eroded; and steep gullied land that have soil erodibility ratings 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 Stormwater Management Plan dated December 12, 2003, prepared by Patrick Harrison. The plan includes the following Best

Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site during construction: silt fencing, fiber rolls, stockpile management, solid waste management, sandbag barriers, and water conservation practices. After construction, there will be permanent landscaping, rock slope protection and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls.

- 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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. On a site visit conducted by Christine Stevenson on January 15, 2004 no geological formations or features were noted that would produce unstable geological conditions 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 |
|---|--|

- Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated No 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 following soil type on-site has a moderate shrink/swell rating: Fallbrook sandy loam, 9-15% slopes, eroded. 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?

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

The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves a standard subsurface system located on each parcel. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on June 12, 2001. Therefore, the project has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems as determined by the authorized, local public agency. In addition, the project will comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.

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 Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

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

The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports; 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

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

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

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

The proposed project is completely surrounded by urbanized or agricultural areas and there are no adjacent wildland areas. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated October 15, 2003, have been received from the North County Fire Protection District. The conditions from the North County Fire Protection District include: Provide 100-foot of combustible vegetation clearance around structures and 16-foot alongside roadways and driveways. Building setbacks from property lines will be sufficient to provide 100-foot of native vegetation clearance without going off-site. Therefore, based on the location of the project; review of the project by County staff; and through compliance with the North County Fire Protection District's conditions, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

i) Expose people to significant risk of injury or death involving vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies?

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

The project site contains an existing concrete-lined agricultural pond which will remain on site. Staff has coordinated with the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health, Vector Surveillance and Control Program. As long as the concrete pond is maintained free of vegetation and stagnant water that could support mosquito breeding, it should not pose a significant vector problem. Therefore, the project will not expose people to significant risk of injury or death involving vectors or create cumulatively considerable impact because all uses on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

The project proposes construction of four (4) additional residential structures, access roads and driveways, and parking which requires compliance with the San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO). The project applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan for minor projects which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. The project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMP's and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. During construction, the following will be used: silt fencing, fiber rolls, stockpile management, solid waste management, sandbag barriers, and water conservation practices. After construction, there will be permanent landscaping, rock slope protection and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls. 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The project lies in the Bonsall hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, although the mouth of the San Luis Rey impaired for coliform bacteria, no portion of the San Luis Rey River, which is tributary to the Pacific Ocean, is impaired. Constituents of concern in the San Luis Rey River watershed include coliform bacteria, nitrate, sediment, and pesticides.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: construction activities associated with four (4) additional residential structures, access roads and driveways, and normal residential uses such as parking of vehicles, irrigation, and vehicle washing. 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: silt fencing, fiber rolls, stockpile management, solid waste management, sandbag barriers, and water conservation practices. After construction, there will be permanent landscaping, rock slope protection and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls.

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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No 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 Bonsall hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey 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; freshwater replenishment; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities associated with four (4) additional residential structures, access roads and driveways, and normal residential uses such as parking of vehicles, irrigation, and vehicle washing. 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: during construction: silt fencing, fiber rolls, stockpile management, solid waste management, sandbag barriers, and water conservation practices. After construction, there will be permanent landscaping, rock slope protection and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls.

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

The project will obtain its water supply from the Rainbow Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The project proposes a 5 lot minor subdivision. As outlined in the Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) dated July 6, 2006 and prepared by Kevin Bresnahan, Civil Engineer, the project will implement bio-swales and riprap to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. These measures 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 onsite 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. 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reason, based on a Drainage Study prepared by Kevin Bresnahan, P.E., Land Development Design and Consulting on October 2006: Drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.

Therefore, the project will not 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. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

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

The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

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

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities associated with four (4) additional residential structures, access roads and driveways, and normal residential uses such as parking of vehicles, irrigation, and vehicle washing. 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: during construction - silt fencing, fiber rolls, stockpile management, solid waste management, sandbag barriers, and water conservation practices. After construction, there will be permanent landscaping, rock slope protection and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Drainage swales, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site. However, the project is not proposing to place structures with a potential for human occupation within these areas and will not place access roads or other improvements which will limit access during flood events or affect downstream properties.

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

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

The project site contains drainage swales, which are identified as being 100-year flood hazard areas. However, the project is not proposing to place structures, access roads or other improvements which will impede or redirect flood flows in these areas.

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

i. SEICHE

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

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: Tsunami – 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, a staff geologist has determined that the geologic environment of the project area is not located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, the project does propose land disturbance that will expose soils and the project is not located downstream from 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The project does not propose the introducing new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 1.1 and 1.3 and General Plan Land Use Designation 1 (Residential) and 17 (Estate Residential). The current zoning regulations requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 1 acre on Assessor's Parcel Number 108-161-06 and 2 acres on Assessor's Parcel Number 108-161-05. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes and density that are consistent with the General Plan. The project is subject to the policies of the Fallbrook Community Plan and the Scenic Preservation Guidelines of the I-15 Corridor Design Review Board. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Fallbrook Community Plan and the Scenic Preservation Guidelines. Future construction on Parcels 2, 3, 4 and the remainder parcel will require the submittal of Site Plans to ensure conformance with the Scenic Preservation Guidelines. The current zone is A70, Limited Agricultural. The project site has two minimum lot sizes: a net minimum lot size of 1 acre for proposed parcel 1; and a net minimum lot size of 2 acres for proposed parcels 2, 3, 4, and remainder. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

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

Although 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 undetermined mineral resources MRZ-3, a staff geologist has reviewed the site's geologic environment and has determined that the site is not located within an alluvial river valley or underlain by coastal marine/non-marine granular deposits. Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state will occur as a result of this project. Moreover, if the resources are not

considered significant mineral deposits, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

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

The project site is zoned A70, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000).

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

The project is a residential subdivision that will be occupied by residents. Based on a site visit completed by Eilar Associates on September 22, 2005, and as described in the Noise Analysis (Eilar Associates, February 2, 2005), the surrounding area is zoned A70 and contains agricultural and rural residential uses. Parcels 1 and 2 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. Parcels 3 and 4 and the remainder parcel will be subject to noise levels exceeding the referenced limits. To mitigate the noise impacts to future residents, the project will dedicate a noise protection easement over parcels 3 and 4 and the remainder parcel. With the dedication of the noise easement, project impacts will not expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards.

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 (Eilar Associates, February 2, 2006), parcels 3 and 4 and the remainder parcel will be subject to noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan. No noise impacts are anticipated on parcels 1 and 2 because they are located further away

from Interstate 15 and have proposed pads that are at least 50 feet lower than Parcels 3 and 4. The estimated location of the 75-decibel CNEL contour includes parts of Parcel 4 and the remainder parcel, but they are not considered buildable areas due to the steep slope limitation. Simple sound attenuation barriers and typical standard fencing were not feasible for parcels 3 and 4 and the remainder. Therefore, the project will dedicate a Noise Protection Easement over the entire areas of Parcel 3, 4, and remainder parcel. Through dedication of this easement, subsequent analysis will be required that assures that structures and uses within the easement will not be exposed to noise levels above County Noise Element requirements. Therefore, 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 Eilar Associates and dated February 2, 2006, 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 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 Eilar Associates and dated February 2, 2006, 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 Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The project proposes four new residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation. However, the facilities are setback 200 feet from any public road or transit Right-of-Way and any property line for industrially zoned uses. A setback of 200 feet ensures that the operations do not have any chance of being impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 1995). In addition, the setback ensures that the project will not be affected by any past, present or future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise.

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

The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: vehicle traffic from four additional residences. 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 Eilar Associates dated February 2, 2006. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

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

The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

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

The property currently has one single-family residence, which will remain. This residential development would not displace any amount of existing housing. Potentially a total of an additional three single-family dwellings will exist when the lots are developed. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people

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

The property currently has one single-family residence, which will remain. This residential development would not displace any amount of existing housing. Potentially a total of an additional three 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: The North County Fire Protection District, Fallbrook Union Elementary School District, and The Rainbow Municipal Water District. The Fallbrook Union High School District did sign the service availability form but did indicate that the project will result in the overcrowding of the school.

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

The project involves a minor 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 may 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. 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.

There is an existing surplus of County Regional Parks. Currently, there is over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which far 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 surplus 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 any cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant surplus of regional recreational facilities will remain.

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

The proposed project will result in an additional 60 ADT. The project was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the

number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The proposed project would generate 60 additional trips. Given the County's traffic thresholds (Table 1) 100 ADT on a road operating at LOS F and 200 ADT on a road operating at LOS E there would be no direct impacts to a road segment. Using SANDAG's estimate for AM and PM peak hour trips, the project would generate less than five peak hour trips and will not exceed the five additional trips to a critical move threshold - especially when the trips are distributed on the road network. Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project impact on traffic volume, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. 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 for designated roads or highways?

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

The proposed project will result in an additional 60 ADT. The project was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to exceed a level of service (LOS) standard at the direct project level for the following reasons: The proposed project would generate 60 additional trips. Given the County's traffic thresholds (Table 1) 100 ADT on a road operating at LOS F and 200 ADT on a road operating at LOS E there would be no direct impacts to a road segment. Using SANDAG's estimate for AM and PM peak hour trips, the project would generate less than five peak hour trips and will not exceed the five additional trips to a critical move threshold - especially when the trips are distributed on the road network. Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project-level impact on the LOS standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

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.

The proposed project generates 60 ADT. 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, or place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The North County Fire Protection district has reviewed the proposed project and the Fire Protection Plan / Fuel Management Plan (Lamont Landis, July 16, 2006) 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

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

The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves four on-site wastewater systems, with a standard subsurface system located on each parcel. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed

the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on June 12, 2001. Therefore, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency.

- 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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. Based on the service availability forms received, the project will not require construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate adequate water facilities are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Rainbow Municipal 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The project does not include new or expanded storm water drainage facilities which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

The project will receive water service from the Rainbow Municipal Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Rainbow Municipal 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The proposed project will rely completely on an on-site wastewater system (septic system); 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

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

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, 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly Biological Resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes dedication of a Biological Open Space Easement. 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

FOR ALL RESPONSES

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

Status	Permit Type	Number	Comment
APPROVED	ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT	05-027	MATTHEWS - open space encroachment
APPROVED	ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT	05-047	AG BRUSHING AND CLEARING
APPROVED	MAJOR USE PERMIT	03-006	Pala Mesa Resort
OPEN	MAJOR USE PERMIT	03-098	Wireless Facility
OPEN	MAJOR USE PERMIT	03-127	Los Willows use permit
OPEN	MAJOR USE PERMIT	04-005	Pala Mesa Resort
APPROVED	MAJOR USE PERMIT	74-121	Pala Mesa Maintenance Bldg
APPROVED	SITE PLAN	00-043	LEE HOME / I 15 CORRIDOR
APPROVED	SITE PLAN	04-010	DYAL SITE PLAN
OPEN	SPECIFIC PLAN - AMENDMENT	03-005	Pala Mesa Resort
APPROVED	TENTATIVE MAP	5158	PALISADES ESTATES
OPEN	TENTATIVE MAP	5231	PALA MESA
OPEN	TENTATIVE MAP	5449	FALLBROOK OAKS TM 5449
APPROVED	TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP	20427	Leising Lot Split
APPROVED	TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP	20434	Atteberry TPM
APPROVED	TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP	20442	Rakos Lot Split
OPEN	TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP	20451	SCHNOEBELEN
APPROVED	TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP	20476	Daniels TPM
DONE	TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP	20381	CHIPMAN
DONE	TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP	20440	Chipman
APPROVED	TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP	20581	Treister Tentative Parcel Map
OPEN	TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP	20793	Mission Ridge Road TPM TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP DIEN N
OPEN	TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP	20976	DO

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 Biological Resources and Transportation/Traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes dedication of a Biological Open Space Easement and payment of the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF). 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"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, 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 Transportation/Traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF). 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. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

- | | |
|---|--|
| Stormwater Management Plan for Priority Projects, Kevin Bresnahan, P.E., July 6, 2006 | California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. |
| Preliminary Drainage Study for Tentative Parcel Map 20800 RPL1, Kevin Bresnahan, P.E., October 2006. | California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. |
| Cultural Resources Survey Report for: TPM 20800, Log No. 04-02-002 – Crossroads - Negative Findings; by Gail Wright, March 5, 2004 | California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. |
| Acoustical Analysis Report for Crossroad Investors TPM. Eilar Associates, February 2, 2005. | 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. |
| Fire Protection Plan / Fuel Management Plan, Lamont Landis, July 16, 2006. | California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Abandoned Mined Lands Unit, GIS Data. |
| Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. | California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. |
| American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government. | California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. |
| American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001. | |
| Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites, (PRC §5097-5097.6), California Public Resources Code. | |

Crossroads Investors
TPM 20800; STP 06-013; ER 04-02-002

- 46 -

1/11/08

- California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
- 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.
- California Department of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153.
- 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.
- California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998.
- California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003.
- California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000.
- California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033.
- California Emergency Services Act Government Code, Title 2, Division 1, Chapter 7 § 8585-8589.
- California Emergency Services Act, Government Code, Title 2, Division 1, Chapter 7 § 8585-8589.
- California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003.
- 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.
- California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
- California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2000.
- California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25316 and §25117.
- California Health & Safety Code Section 2000-2067.
- California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 4000-41956.
- California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001.
- California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084.
- California Register of Historical Resources. Public Resources Code. §5024.1.
- California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996.
- California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996.
- California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988.
- California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000.
- California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.
- California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
- California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq.
- CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993.
- City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.
- Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan.
- 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.
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. Revised February 25, 1999.
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. Revised September 1998.
- County of San Diego, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses-Division 7 of Title 8 of the San Diego Code.
- County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994.
- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater.

Crossroads Investors
TPM 20800; STP 06-013; ER 04-02-002

- 47 -

1/11/08

- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility.
- County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002.
- 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.
- 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.
- County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998.
- 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.
- County of San Diego, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000.
- County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Ordinance No. 5281 (New series).
- County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000.
- Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act.
- Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.
- Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.
- Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, Title 2, Division 1, Chapter 7.5 § 8680-8692.
- Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987.
- Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985).
- Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1.
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972.
- FEMA: Floodplain Management Summary, Updated April 11, 2002.
- Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.
- 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.
- Hazardous Buildings. California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2.
- Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.
- Historical Resources. California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029.
- 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.
- 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.
- Human Remains. California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5.
- Integrated Waste Management Plan, Countywide Siting Element 2003 Amendment. Final Review Draft. Department of Public Works County Recycling Program.
- International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.
- International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747.
- Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
- 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.
- Moore, Ellen J. 1968. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15.
- National Environmental Policy Act, 1969.
- National Flood Insurance Act of 1968.
- National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.
- Native American Heritage. Public Resources Code §5097.9-5097.991.

Crossroads Investors
TPM 20800; STP 06-013; ER 04-02-002

- 48 -

1/11/08

- Nonpoint Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government.
- Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.
- On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002.
- Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq.
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality.
- Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68.
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.
- Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
- Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended 42 U.S.C. 5121, et seq., Pub. L. 103-181, Pub. L. 103-337, and Pub. L. 106-390, October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68.
- San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997.
- San Diego County Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994.
- San Diego County Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003.
- San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.
- San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982.
- San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations.
- San Diego County Light Pollution Code (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.
- San Diego County Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.
- San Diego County, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989.
- San Diego County, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2003 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2003.
- San Diego County, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002
- San Diego County. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758.
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan.
- SANDAG Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000.
- SANDAG, 1999a. 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments.
- SANDAG, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994).
- SANDAG, The San Diego Region's Housing Crisis, July 2001.
- Sax, J.L. Review of the laws establishing the SWRCB's permitting authority over appropriations of groundwater classified as subterranean streams and the SWRCB's implementation of those laws. January 2002.
- Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54].
- State Historic Building Code. California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961.
- State Landmarks. Public Resources Code §5031-5033.
- State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998.
- State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 and CAS000002
- Subdivision Map Act, 2002.
- Todd, D. K., Ground Water Hydrology, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1959.
- U.S Department of Defense, Air Installations Compatible Use Zones Program, 1977
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996.
- 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.
- 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.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002.
- 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.
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.