

October 18, 2007

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

1. Project Number/Environmental Log Number/Title:
P04-016, Log No. 04-02-011/Dai Dang Meditation Center
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: William Stocks, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3913
c. E-mail: William.Stocks@sdcounty.ca.gov.
4. Project location:
6326 Camino del Rey in the Community of Bonsall
Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page1068, Grid 2/D
5. Project Applicant name and address:
Dai Dang Meditation Center, Attention: Frank Hoang, 5059 E. Crescent Drive,
Anaheim Hills, California 92807; (714) 685-8589.
6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	Bonsall
Regional Category:	Estate Development Area (EDA)
Land Use Designation:	(19) Intensive Agriculture
Density:	1 du/2, 4 or 8 acres

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	A70 Limited Agricultural
Minimum Lot Size:	2 acres
Special Area Regulation:	N/A

8. Description of project:

The project proposes to legalize an existing Religious Assembly and Group Residential Use Type and, in the future, to expand the amount of structural square footage devoted to these uses. The project site is approximately 9 acres. The native vegetation on-site has been removed as a result of past residential and agricultural uses. In the past, the project site has supported various agricultural uses such as horse keeping and horticulture. Currently, eucalyptus is grown on-site for sale to plant and flower businesses. Past uses on the property include a single-family residence plus a caretakers mobile home residence, horse stables, equestrian facilities, and feed and storage buildings.

The current owners, Vietnamese Buddhist Meditation Congregation, purchased the property in 2001. There is a 2,589 square-foot, one-story house with a three-car garage that is currently being used as a rectory. The project proposes to retain this building in its current use. Approximately 50 feet north of the main house is a converted horse stable consisting of approximately 5,880 square-feet. The project proposes to convert this building to a storage facility. A 2,126 square-foot feed and equipment storage building is located 30 feet from the converted stables and it is proposed to be removed for parking. To the east of the storage building is a two-bedroom trailer previously used as a caretaker's residence and it is proposed to remain in this use. A groundwater well is located in the southwest corner of the property that is used for irrigation of the plants grown on the property. The well will be destroyed as a condition of project approval.

Current uses of the site include quiet meditation during the week days and religious assembly on the weekends that involves as many as 100 persons coming to the site. Events are held periodically that attract as many as 300 persons.

The project site currently receives imported water from the Rainbow Municipal Water District. Fire protection services are provided by the North County Fire Protection District. Sewage disposal is currently provided by an on-site septic system. This system will be upgraded to handle the future needs of the proposed project discussed below.

If approved, the proposed Major Use Permit would legalize the existing uses described above and provide for the development of the following:

- a. A Meditation Hall that is a partial two-story building totaling 7,664 square-feet with architectural features having a maximum height of 29 feet. This building has a large main room with an altar at the east end for congregational assembly and meditation. The east end of the building will have approximately 1,725 square-feet of space designated as multi-use room. This area will serve as the temporary kitchen and dining hall until the permanent facilities are constructed as part of the residence quarters. This portion of the building also contains separate men's and women's restroom. The second floor contains approximately 2,430 square-feet of office space, plus a restroom.
- b. A Residence Quarters, kitchen, and library building of 8,936 square-feet, with a maximum height of 33 feet – 2 inches. The two-story split level building will have a first floor layout consisting of six single bedrooms (approximately 220 square feet each), three multi-purpose rooms totaling approximately 900 square-feet, a laundry room, a locker room, and a communal bathroom.

The second story will have six single bedrooms (approximately 900 square feet, a communal bathroom, plus an isolation bedroom with a private bathroom (150 square-feet total). The east end of the building contains a 450 square-foot office and reception area, a 325 square-foot kitchen connected to a 1,055 square-foot dining area. The kitchen has additional areas such as smaller rooms to be used for storage, pantries, and refrigeration.

- c. A Main Worship hall and a meditation room for use by the monks and visitors. This building is a partial two-story building totaling 6,196 square-feet with a maximum height of 40 feet. It has a large room for congregational assemblies, an altar located in the central portion of the building, some office areas, and a restroom. The second story contains approximately 1,440 square-feet of additional office space plus a restroom.

These buildings will be connected with walkways, gardens, courtyards, and landscaping. The building layout and design were chosen to create an environment that is conducive to Buddhist teachings and meditation. Each building entrance accesses a landscaped courtyard. Other improvements include:

- A new parking lot with 81 parking spaces including 6 handicap accessible spaces;
- The existing monks' quarters and administrative operation in the main house will move into the new facility. The main house will be converted into a library and study rooms.

Grading activities for the proposed project site will include a total grading quantity of 14,400 cubic yards of cut and 13,400 cubic yards of fill with an export of 1,000 cubic yards of cut material. The total grading quantity includes the movement of 3,400 cubic yards of cut and 4,900 cubic yards of fill as a result of relocating the driveway. The largest cut slope onsite has a ratio of 1½:1, with an elevation difference of 13 feet. The largest fill slope onsite has a ratio of 2:1 with an elevation difference of 28 feet. The proposed grading program includes a number of retaining walls. However, the maximum height of visible retaining walls will be no greater than five feet.

The on-site buildings will be connected by walkways, gardens, courtyards and landscaping. A landscaped garden feature is also proposed between the main hall and meditation hall.

Main access to the development will be provided by a 24-foot wide paved driveway from Camino del Rey. Emergency access will be provided from Wrightwood Road at the northerly boundary of the site.

Operational Characteristics

The purpose of the meditation center is to create a non-stressful environment open to all people, Buddhists and non-Buddhists, who are interested in learning about and practicing the religion. There are no choirs or children's activities that would take place during the week or after normal business hours. Visitors only come on Sundays for a silent one-hour meditation, a silent communal lunch, and a question and answer period with the headmaster. This takes place from 9 am to 6 pm. The proposed use will result in an additional 41/98 (weekday/Sunday) average daily trips (ADT).

The Meditation Center proposes to hold seven special religious events per year. These events generally coincide with Buddhist religious holidays and cultural observances. Generally, these events include 200 to 300 people each and will involve special activities related to the Buddhist teachings. The events will take place on the project site. Because of the number of people at these special events, on occasion, amplified sound will be used in the interiors of the buildings. No use of amplified sound is requested in any of the exterior areas of the proposed project or on its structures either existing or proposed. At some of these events a meal will be prepared and served for the visitors. Overflow parking is proposed to be provided on the flat grass area next to Camino del Rey.

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

The site is located in the northerly portion of San Diego County in the Bonsall Community Plan area. The area generally supports agricultural uses, as well as rural residential uses, often combined with agricultural or equestrian operations.

The site slopes generally from the northeast to the south, with on-site topography ranging from approximately 410 feet above mean sea level (amsl) in the northeasterly portion of the site to approximately 202 feet amsl along Camino del Rey. Vegetation on-site includes non-native grassland, although the majority of the site is either developed or disturbed. No wetlands are present on-site and no prominent features are visible.

Existing development on the site is set back from Camino del Rey on top of the south-facing slope. Views of the site are limited due to topography and existing vegetation.

The subject property is bordered directly to the north by an undeveloped parcel of land. Just north of this parcel is a single-family residence, located uphill from the project site, along the slope. This residence is the closest residential use to the proposed project, and is located approximately 400 feet from the northern boundary of the project site and approximately 590 feet from the nearest proposed building (Residence Hall). Wrightwood Road, which will provide future emergency access for the proposed project, presently dead-ends at the northerly border of the site. Immediately to the northwest, north and northeast are rural residential uses and undeveloped land designated as residential acreage. Lots in these areas generally range from two to four acres in size, with a number of lots supporting secondary agricultural uses. Further to the northwest of the site is an extensive equestrian (thoroughbred) training facility that includes numerous stables and supporting equestrian-related facilities.

Adjacent to the east of the site is a single-family residential use with supporting citrus and avocado crops. Further to the east and southeast (immediately across Camino del Rey) are similar single-family rural residential uses on two- to four-acre lots.

Also to the southeast of the site, across Camino del Rey, is another large equestrian operation with several stable complexes, exercise arena and other supporting facilities. The property is comprised of several parcels that also support a single-family home, as well as agricultural uses. Further to the southeast are residential estate uses on lots generally ranging from four to nine acres, many of which also support small-scale agricultural uses.

Further to the south and southwest of the site are residential estate uses, with lots generally ranging in size from 4 to 14 acres. Many of these parcels also support agricultural crops. Additionally, across Camino del Rey and west of Via Maria Elena, to the southwest of the site, are large-acre agricultural uses with single-family residential uses and structures associated with the agricultural uses.

Adjacent to the west of the project site is land used for agricultural production, associated with the thoroughbred training center located to the northwest of the project site. Crops produced and stored are utilized for animal feed (equestrian). Operation of this facility requires the transport of goods to and from the site via large trucks that enter and exit the site from Camino del Rey. Large trucks are often parked on the site to await the transport of products. Further to the west is a single-family rural residential use.

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

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Exploratory Borings, Direct-push Samplers and Cone Penotrometers Permits	County of San Diego
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego
Water Well Permit	County of San Diego
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
Air Quality Permit to Construct	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
Air Quality Permit to Operate – Title V Permit	APCD
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Rainbow Water District
Fire District Approval	North County Fire District

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

William Stocks

Printed Name

October 18, 2007

Date

Land Use/Environmental Planner

Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. Based on a site visit completed by William Stocks on May 6, 2004, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. The project site is located in Bonsall north of Camino del Rey approximately one-quarter mile east of the San Luis Rey Golf Course. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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 William Stocks on May 6, 2003, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the same composite viewshed as a State scenic highway and will not change the visual composition of an existing scenic resource within a State scenic highway. Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The project site is not within the viewshed of a State scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site is situated on the slopes above the Moosa Creek Valley. The surrounding area is comprised of single-family estate homes and agricultural uses that include orchards. Based on the analysis set forth in the Extended Study on Community Character, the project would have no significant impacts on the visual quality of the site and its surroundings. The project buildings and layout have been designed to minimize grading and the need for visible retaining walls. The buildings have been designed to be set into the hillside rather than on building pads which would require more grading. The proposed Residence Hall, the largest proposed building, has been designed as a split-level pad to minimize the need to grade into the existing hillside. The proposed parking lot has been designed to take advantage of the existing topography so that no grading or retaining walls are required along the western edge of the property where the project would be the most visible from off-site. The proposed courtyards have been designed in tiered fashion to minimize the grading and use of retaining walls that would otherwise be required if they were located at the same elevation as the proposed buildings. Where possible the project has been designed to leave the natural slope of the site intact.

Changes along the project frontage will be minimized because the proposed development is located at the rear of the property. The front portion of the property currently supports agricultural activities that consist of growing eucalyptus which is sold to the local florists. This agricultural activity will continue on the property. The project will realign the existing driveway to meet minimum safety requirements for access. As such, the existing character of the project site as it is visible along the frontage of Camino del Rey will experience little change.

Views to the site from off-site vantage points across the valley to the south, as well as from certain locations to the west, southwest and northwest will be reduced through both distance and topography. Proposed landscaping will blend development on the project site into the natural landscape and will minimize views into the site from off-site locations. The project has been designed such that any required retaining walls or manufactured slopes will be located within the interior of the development and away from the property edges to reduce their visibility. The proposed project has been designed in accordance with the Bonsall Community Design Guidelines to include architectural design features of the surrounding rural community in terms of natural building material and colors, lighting features and landscaping elements.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

In addition, the proposed project will control outdoor lighting and sources of glare in the following ways:

1. The project will not install outdoor lighting that directly illuminates neighboring properties.
2. The project will not install outdoor lighting that would cast a direct beam angle towards a potential observer, such as a motorists, cyclist or pedestrian.
3. The project will not install outdoor lighting for vertical surfaces such as buildings, landscaping, or signs in a manner that would result in useful light or spill light being cast beyond the boundaries of intended area to be lit.
4. The project will not install any highly reflective surfaces such as glare-producing glass or high-gloss surface color that will be visible along roadways, pedestrian walkways, or in the line of sight of adjacent properties.

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.

In addition, the project's outdoor lighting is controlled through the Major Use Permit, which further limits outdoor lighting through strict controls. Therefore, compliance with the Code, in combination with the outdoor lighting and glare controls listed above ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Although the project site does support the growing of eucalyptus for flower arrangements, it does not contain any significant agricultural resources, lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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 the proposed Religious Assembly and Group Residential Use Types are permitted in the A70 Use Regulations upon approval of a Major Use Permit and an application for such a permit is currently under review. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site and surrounding area has agricultural uses. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by the project manager Bill Stocks and was determined not to have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance or active agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons:

- Surrounding active agricultural operations consist of avocado and/or citrus orchards which commonly operate among residential uses and create minimal land use conflicts due to the nature of the activity. The addition of the proposed Religious Assembly and Group Residential use would not introduce a change in the existing environment that could impact existing land uses
- Active agricultural operations are separated from proposed land uses on the project site by topography on the west and a road on the south. Topography also helps separate the proposed project from existing orchards along the easterly side of the project.
- Active agricultural operations in the surrounding area are already interspersed with single-family residential uses and the proposed use would not significantly change the existing land uses in the area, resulting in a change that could convert agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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 a Religious Assembly and Group Residential Use Type. 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 41/98 (weekday/weekend) 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM_{10} , NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. 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 PM_{10} 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 41/ 98 (weekday/ weekend) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

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 Bill Stocks on May 6, 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 point-source emissions of air pollutants (other than vehicle emissions) 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

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

An Extended Study on Biology (Letter Report) was prepared for this project to assist in responding to the questions in this section.

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Based on County records, staff field site visits and the Biological Technical Report dated August 17 2006 prepared by REC Consultants the 9-acre site supports 2.3 acres of non-native grasslands, 2.9 acres of general agriculture and 3.8 acres of disturbed/developed. No sensitive animal or plant species were observed, or are expected to occur, on-site.

Although there are no sensitive species onsite and the loss of non-native grasslands is less than five acres, to reduce the cumulative loss of non-native grasslands in the Bonsall/Moosa Creek area to less than significant, mitigation will be required for project impacts to 2.3 acres of non-native grasslands. Mitigation will take place offsite at a ratio of 0.5:1 through the preservation of 1.2 acres of non-native grassland habitat. On-site preservation is also a possibility.

Therefore, staff has determined that although the site supports naturalized biological habitat, the removal of this habitat will not result in substantial adverse effects, 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 as mitigation has been provided to reduce to less than significant the cumulative loss of habitat.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Based on County records, staff field site visits and the Biological Technical Report dated August 17 2006 prepared by REC Consultants the 9-acre site supports 2.3 acres of non-native grasslands, 2.9 acres of general agriculture and 3.8 acres of disturbed/developed. There are no riparian habitats onsite and thus there will be substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat. Impacts to 2.3 acres of non-native grasslands will be mitigated at a ratio of 0.5:1 through the preservation of 1.2 acres of non-native grasslands off-site. Thus, any substantial effect on non-native grasslands, a sensitive natural community, has been mitigated to less than significant.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Based on County records, staff field site visits and the Biological Technical Report dated August 17 2006 prepared by REC Consultants, the project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site is located north of Moosa Creek and north of Camino del Rey. Surrounding habitats to the immediate north and west are patchy remnants of low to medium quality coastal sage scrub which are not expected to provide for gnatcatcher population dispersal. That is further development of the project site will not interfere

substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors due to the degraded nature of the land on the project site, lack of connectivity to any higher value habitats and adjacency to major roads. Nor will additional development of the project site impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites as no wildlife were observed on-site or are expected to utilize the site.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated July 2007 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on July 21, 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 the cultural resources report titled, "Cultural Resource Survey Report for P04-016, Log No. 04-02-011, Dai Dang Meditation Center, APN 127-460-14" prepared by Gail Wright, dated July 21, 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on July 21, 2004, it has been determined that there are no impacts to archaeological resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in the cultural resources report titled, "Cultural Resource Survey Report for P04-016, Log No. 04-02-011, Dai Dang Meditation Center, APN 127-460-14" prepared by Gail Wright, dated July 21, 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Unique Paleontological Resources - 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 low resource potential. Low resource potential is assigned to geologic formations that, based on their relative young age and/or high-energy depositional history, are judged unlikely to produce important fossil remains. Typically, low sensitivity formations produce invertebrate fossil remains in low abundance, which are not considered highly sensitive.

Unique Geologic Features – The site does contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan or support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. Additionally, based on a site visit by Bill Stocks on May 6, 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on July 21, 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 the cultural resources report titled, "Cultural Resource Survey Report for P04-016, Log No. 04-02-011, Dai Dang Meditation Center, APN 127-460-14" prepared by Gail Wright, dated July 21, 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

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

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site is not within a potential Liquefaction area. This indicates that the geologic environment of the project site is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site is in an area delineated as a low threat for susceptibility to landslides. As such, the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable and result in landslides. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures from adverse effects of landslides.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Fallbrook Sandy Loam and Ramona Sandy Loam that have a soil erodibility rating of "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Storm water Management Plan dated February 2, 2007, prepared by Richard W. Hartley, Civil Engineer. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site:
 - Silt Fence,
 - Fiber Rolls,
 - Street Sweeping and Vacuuming,
 - Storm Drain Inlet Protection,
 - Stockpile Management,
 - Solid Waste Management,
 - Stabilized Construction Entrance/ Exit,
 - Vehicle and equipment Maintenance,
 - Gravel Bag Berm,
 - Sandbag Barrier
 - Material Delivery and Storage,
 - Spill Prevention and Control,
 - Concrete Waste Management,
 - Water Conservation Practices,
 - Paving and Grinding Operations, and
 - Any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final building approval.
- Biofilters
 - Grass Swale, and
 - Grass Strip;
- Extended/dry detention basin with grass lining;
- Infiltration Basins
 - Porous concrete, and
 - Porous modular concrete block

- Catch basin drainage insert (Note: Catch basin inserts and storm drain inserts are excluded from use on County-maintained right-of-way and easements.
- 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The project will result in site disturbance and grading for an access driveway and a detention basin in the southerly one-third of the site and, in the northerly one-third, grading is required for the proposed additional 22,796 square-feet of new construction. Total grading quantities will involve 14,400 cubic yards of cut; 13,400 cubic yards of fill; and 1,000 cubic yards will be exported off-site. The proposed project is consistent with the geological formations underlying the site. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project has on-site soils with a moderate potential to be expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are Cineba coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30% slopes, Fallbrook sandy loam, 9 to 15% slopes, Ramona sandy loam, 9 to 15% slopes, Ramona sandy loam, 5 to 9%. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply with the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves a single wastewater system located at the base of the bluff in the southerly portion of the site. The system will utilize horizontal seepage pits. 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 October 19, 2006. 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 Incorporation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project is not located within one-quarter mile of and 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

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

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

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

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

The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is located outside a dam inundation zone.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposed project is adjacent to areas where residences are intermixed with wildlands, however, a Fire Protection Plan (Short Form) has been prepared by the applicant and approved by the North County Fire Protection District (NCFPD) and the County Fire Marshall, which indicates that risk is minimized through the incorporation of the following requirements as conditions of project approval:

- A requirement that the access road be 24 feet AC surface from Camino del Rey to the northern property boundary, as shown on the plans;
- Gates, if installed, across access road shall conform to NCFPD standards for electric gates;
- The number and location of fire hydrants capable of providing a 1500 GPD flow;
- Automatic fire sprinkler system for all new structures; and
- Provide native vegetation clearance around all structures in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Protection Plan (Short Form) approved by both the NCFPD and County Fire Marshall.

Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated September 20, 2006, have been received from the NCFPD indicating that the emergency travel time to the project site is 5 minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County Public Facilities Element is 10 minutes. Therefore, based on the location of the project; review of the project by County staff; and through compliance with the NCFPD'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) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project will not produce or collect animal waste, standing water, agricultural operations, solid waste facilities or other similar uses that are potential vector sources. However, the project is adjacent to potential vector sources (equestrian facilities and a feed distribution business) and, therefore, the project could increase the exposure of people to vector sources. However, the owners of the potential offsite vector sources would typically meet their legal obligation to prevent the source from becoming vector breeding habitat since the breeding of mosquitoes is unlawful under the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 2060-2067.

Furthermore, the San Diego County, Department of Environmental Health, Vector Control Program's primary objective is to control vectors and preserve or create an environment favorable to humans and animals by lessening the effect that vectors and/or nuisances have upon the quality of life. Under the powers of a vector control district, as adopted by the County Board of Supervisors, the VCP provides countywide vector prevention and control services funded through a voter approved benefit assessment district. Mosquito, domestic rat, fly and other vector prevention and control programs are provided to reduce the risk of diseases these vectors can transmit and to minimize nuisances they cause. Therefore, the legal responsibilities of property owners to ensure nuisances from vectors are not produced in combination with the enforcement and vector control activities of the DEH VCP ensure that nuisances and/or public health issues related to vectors would not occur as a result of the project being located near potential off-site vector breeding sources.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Extended Studies for Hydrology and Hydraulics, and Stormwater Management were prepared by Spear and Associates, Inc. (Civil Engineering and Land Surveying), dated received by DPLU February 6, 2007, to assist in responding to the questions within this section.

Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes to develop a Group Residential and Religious Assembly Use on an approximately 9-acre parcel, which requires an NPDES permit for discharges of stormwater associated with construction activities from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to an on-site wastewater system (OSWS), also known as a septic system. Discharged wastewater must conform to the 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 October 19, 2006. Therefore, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency.

As described in the Stormwater Management Plan prepared by Spear & Associates, Inc. dated July 31, 2006 (received Feb. 6, 2007), the project site proposes, and will be required to implement construction-phase and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) including site design measures, source control, and treatment control to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

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

will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project lies in the Bonsall hydrologic subarea (903.12), within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, and the proposed 2006 CWA Section 303(d) List the Pacific Ocean Shoreline at the mouth of the San Luis Rey River is impaired for bacteria, and the San Luis Rey River is impaired for chloride (lower 13 miles) and total dissolved solids (TDS). Potential sources of these impairments are listed as unknown point and nonpoint sources and urban runoff, and for TDS the sources also include industrial point sources, agriculture storm runoff, surface mining, flow regulation/modification, natural sources, and golf course activities.

As described in the project's Stormwater Management Plan, anticipated and potential pollutants from the proposed project include sediments, nutrients, trash and debris, pesticides, oxygen demanding substances, oil and grease, and bacteria and viruses. The project site proposes, and will be required to implement construction-phase and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) including site design measures, source control, and treatment control to reduce these potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse

effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Storm water Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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:

- Attached residential development,
- Hillside Development, and
- Parking Lots.

These sources could result in the production of the following types of pollutants:

- Sediments,
- Nutrients,
- Heavy Metals,
- Organic Compounds (including petroleum hydrocarbons),
- Trash and Debris,
- Oxygen Demanding Substances (including solvents),
- Oil and Grease,
- Bacteria and Viruses, and
- Pesticides.

However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses:

- Silt Fence,
- Fiber Rolls,
- Street Sweeping and Vacuuming,
- Storm Drain Inlet Protection,
- Stockpile Management,
- Solid Waste Management,
- Stabilized Construction Entrance/ Exit,
- Vehicle and equipment Maintenance,
- Gravel Bag Berm,
- Sandbag Barrier
- Material Delivery and Storage,
- Spill Prevention and Control,
- Concrete Waste Management,
- Water Conservation Practices,
- Paving and Grinding Operations, and
- Any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final building approval.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes to develop a 9 acres site fronting on the northerly side of Camino del Rey westerly of Via Maria Elena, in Bonsall. The project proposes to legalize the existing Meditation Center buildings and add three more buildings totaling 22,796 square-feet, along with associated parking lot, septic system, and driveway relocation. As outlined in the SWMP prepared by Richard Hartley, Spear and Associates (DPLU received February 6, 2007), in the Conceptual Grading Plans (2 sheets) for "Dai Dang Meditation Center" DPLU received February 6, 2007, and/or in the CEQA level preliminary Hydrology & Hydraulics Study prepared by Richard Hartley, Spear and Associates (DPLU received February 6, 2007), the project will implement the site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. Other BMPs include: minimization of impervious areas;

preservation of existing drainage patterns through use of grading, pervious pavers, spreading outlet structure, detention basin and retention basin; on-site vegetated swales; source control-including homeowner education, and parking designed to reduce pollution, and efficient irrigation and landscaping systems; and treatment control-grass lawns and swales, dry detention basin and storm drain inserts. 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 on-site and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. As outlined in the SWMP prepared by Richard Hartley, Spear and Associates (DPLU received February 6, 2007), in the Conceptual Grading Plans (2 sheets) for "Dai Dang Meditation Center" DPLU received February 6, 2007 and/or in the CEQA level preliminary Hydrology & Hydraulics Study prepared by Richard Hartley, Spear and Associates (DPLU received February 6, 2007), that addresses drainage and related issues and indicates that the project will not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The Department of Public Works DPW has accepted this study.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff:

- Attached residential development,
- Hillside Development, and
- Parking Lots.

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:

- Biofilters
 - Grass Swale, and
 - Grass Strip;
- Extended/ dry detention basin with grass lining;
- Infiltration Basins
 - Porous concrete, and
 - Porous modular concrete block

- Catch basin drainage insert (Note: Catch basin inserts and storm drain inserts are excluded from use on County-maintained right-of-way and easements.)

The County of San Diego Ordinances for 9424 and 9426 require that priority projects incorporate in the design a single or combination of treatment control BMPs designed to infiltrate, filter, and or treat run-off from the projects footprint to one of the “Numeric Sizing Treatments Standards”. The project has selected the treatment BMPs mentioned above because they will best remove the Pollutants of Concern anticipated by the project as there are no listed 303d waterways down stream from this project listed. The project site has been designed so that all roof areas and impervious areas on each lot will drain to grass areas and then to one of the two Treatment Control – Grass Swales and Storm Drain Inserts or the dry detention basin. All BMPs must be in place prior to the project being approved for occupancy. The Owner/Applicant will responsible for maintaining all Project BMPs and will enter into an agreement with the County ensuring the long-term maintenance of these facilities.

Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site, therefore, no impact will occur.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site, therefore, no impact will occur.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area including a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. 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

Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is in an area delineated as a low threat for susceptibility to landslides. As such, the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

An Extended Study for Community Character was prepared by RBF Consulting to assist in the responses to these questions.

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Discussion/Explanation:

A. General Plan

1. Regional Land Use Element

The project site is located in the Estate Development Area (EDA) Regional Category. The EDA combines agricultural and low density residential uses. The proposed Religious Assembly/ Group Residential use is compatible with this Regional Category provided that the design and location is consistent with the Bonsall Community Plan and the Findings required to approve a Major Use Permit can be made pursuant to Section 7358 of the Zoning Ordinance (See below).

2. Bonsall Community Plan

The Bonsall Community Plan sets forth Policies and Recommendations intended to guide the location and design of future projects within the Plan

Area. The Community Character Chapter of the Plan explains that the Bonsall area consists primarily of low-density estate type residential and agricultural uses. Houses are generally located far apart and randomly, on hillsides and hilltops, as well as in the valleys. Surrounding the houses are large open spaces composed of fallow fields, undisturbed native vegetation and agriculture. Agriculture is a key factor in Bonsall's rural community character, as are the scenic sometime narrow and winding, rural roads and rolling hill and valley topography.

A common value for most residents is the tranquil, private rural life, provided by the large open spaces between houses, screening vegetation, beauty of natural landforms, natural resources and features, lack of noise and congestion, and the presence of agriculture and animal raising.

The ridgelines, hilltops, and steep slopes prevalent in Bonsall are important natural resources, and are important factors in the visual beauty and rural community character of Bonsall. Structures too great in height can adversely impact these natural landforms and their visual contribution to community character. The project site is subject to the (19) Intensive Agriculture Land Use Designation of the Bonsall Community Plan.

The project site is comprised of 9.0 acres. Existing development totals 10,420 square feet and includes a single-family residence (2,589 sq. ft.), a building formerly used for stables but now converted to storage (5,705 sq. ft.), and an equipment storage building/ workshop (2,126 sq. ft.). The latter building will be demolished as part of the project and replaced with a parking area. The remaining 8,294 square-feet of building area will be retained as part of the project. The new development is proposed to total 22,796 square-feet. The new construction will be split into three structures grouped together in the northerly one-third of the project site. Upon completion the project site will have a total of 31,090 square feet of structure. Structural coverage would be about 12.6 percent. The existing structures on the site are fairly typical of the surrounding development, which is zoned with a minimum lot area of 2 acres. For a 2-acre lot the existing 10,420 square-feet would cover about 12 percent of the site. The applicant examined most of the surrounding lots and determined that the total development of the project would be greater than the residential lot but less than some of the non-residential uses in the area such as the equestrian facilities.

The existing development is located on a bluff overlooking the Moosa Valley floodplain. Camino del Rey delineates the southerly boundary of the project site. The distance between Camino del Rey and the first building at the top of the bluff is over 500 feet. In addition, the site at the top of the bluff is about 100 feet higher in elevation than Camino del Rey. The new proposed development is located another 260 further north. The

new development would only be visible on Camino del Rey from a distance of about ¼ mile to the west. The conceptual landscape plan includes numerous large trees that will help break-up any structural massing and generally buffer views of the new buildings from this direction.

The large parcel to the west is in a non-residential agricultural support use and it is separated by considerable distance and topography. The new buildings are proposed to be at least 100 feet from the northerly project boundary. The parcel adjacent to the north is 3.13 acres and it is vacant. The parcel to the east is approximately 8 acres. There is a residence on this lot located over 500 feet away in the far easterly corner of the lot and separated from the project site by an avocado grove.

Under current circumstances, the new development would be considered to be maintaining adequate separation from surrounding residences and uses. As such, it would be compatible with the existing character of Bonsall as described in the community plan. In addition, portions of the project site are used for the raising of eucalyptus for flower arrangements, which would enhance the project's compatibility with the agricultural character of Bonsall. The proposed use is as a meditation center and for religious ceremonies on Sunday, thus it would tend to be consistent with some of the other essential characteristics of the Bonsall community such as the tranquil, private rural life with a lack of noise and congestion. Finally, the project site is subject to the (19) Intensive Agriculture Land Use Designation, which is applied to a variety of agricultural properties that may include "minor commercial, industrial, and public facility uses appropriate to agricultural operations or supportive of the agricultural population." The Religious Assembly Use Type is allowed in most residential and agricultural zones upon approval of a Major Use Permit and, as such, it should be considered to be supportive use within an agricultural land use designation.

B. Zoning

1. Use Regulations

The project site is subject to the A70 Limited Agricultural Use Regulations and it proposes combined Religious Assembly and Group Residential Use Types. Both these Use Types are permitted within the A70 Use Regulations upon approval of a Major Use Permit. The project involves an application from a Major Use Permit (discussed below).

2. Density

The project site is zoned with a Density Designator of "0.5" dwelling units per acre. This designator does not pertain to the Religious Assembly Use Type. It also does not pertain to the Group Residential Use Type unless one of the units on-site includes a separate kitchen, in which case, that living unit shall be counted as a dwelling unit in calculating density. The 9-acre project site would yield 4 dwelling units and the project, as proposed, is consistent with this requirement.

3. Other Development Regulations

- a. Lot size – The "2-acre" does not pertain to this project.
- b. Building Type – The "C" Designator allows all of the structures proposed except the residence hall which would be considered a "Multi-Dwelling". However, the residence hall is exempt from the requirements of this designator pursuant to Section 4315 b.
- c. Height – The "G" Designator allows 2 stories with a maximum height of 35 feet. The project proposes the height of the new structures to be between 29 and 35 feet with the exception of the steeple over the altar in the Main Hall, which is proposed to extend to a height of 40 feet. Zoning Ordinance Section 4620g provides for an exemption from the maximum height provision of an applicable height designator for "...Any structure for which a Major Use Permit is granted pursuant to other provisions of this ordinance, when the Major Use Permit authorizes an exemption to the height regulations." The proposed increase in height is relatively minor and the design of the steeple would not create a bulky architectural feature, therefore, the exemption for the steeple can be granted.
- d. Setback – The "W" Designator requires a 60-foot front yard; a 25-foot interior side yard; a 35-foot exterior side yard; and a 25 foot rear yard. The project, as proposed, is consistent with these requirements.

4. Bonsall Community Design Guidelines

Applications for a Major Use Permit involving the Religious Assembly and Group Residential Use Types within the boundaries of the Bonsall Community Planning area are subject to the Community Design Review process. As such, the project is required to be reviewed for consistency with the Bonsall Community Design Guidelines. The applicant has prepared a

Community Character Analysis that provides a detailed evaluation of the project's consistency with these guidelines. In summary, the project is consistent with these guidelines for the following reasons:

- Grading: Noticeable landform alteration will be limited to construction of the access driveway and a detention basin. Grading for the buildings has been designed to blend-in with the natural topography. The buildings, and surrounding courtyards and parking areas will be at different levels and include terracing that reflects the existing topography. Retaining walls are placed into the interior of the buildings and none of the visible retaining walls exceed 5 feet.
- Protection of Ridgelines: The project site is not located on a ridge line
- Protection of Scenic Roads:
 - The project does not propose any realignment or widening of existing roads.
 - Camino del Rey borders the project to the south, however, no development is proposed in the area adjacent to the road that would permanently affect the existing scenic qualities.
 - Grading for a new access driveway is required for safety purposes and the graded slopes of a proposed detention basin will be visible from the road, however, the proposed landscaping will effectively buffer any potential visual impacts.
- Site Planning
 - The new development proposed by the project will set into the hillside at the rear one-third of the site. From the south and the west the new development would only be visible from a distance and the proposed landscaping plan will effectively buffer any potential visual impacts. From the north and east the view of the project will be of the limited because the buildings will be at a lower level and there is an existing avocado grove located between the project site and the nearest residence. Existing residences to the north are a little higher in elevation than the proposed

project and these views are proposed to be buffered by dense landscaping.

- The proposed parking areas will not be visible from the surrounding areas due to topography and landscaping.
- Architectural Character: The objective is for buildings to emphasize Bonsall's rural character. The location and architectural style of the proposed buildings have religious significance; however, the applicant has made an effort to be consistent with the Guidelines.
 - The height, bulk and scale of each of the individual new buildings are comparable to some of the larger estate residences in the area.
 - The buildings are designed with a horizontal emphasis, linked by one-story covered walkways between the structures that further increase the horizontal appearance.
 - The buildings are designed with simple elevations and with limited decorative ornamentation.
 - Proposed building materials will be of natural colors. Exterior finishes will be of earth-toned stucco, which blends in with surrounding development.
 - Wooden doors will be used.
 - The structures will also feature a series of roof overhangs with stucco-finished columns, allowing for covered walkways around the perimeter of the buildings.
 - The roofs of the structures will be finished with terra cotta clay tile, consistent with many of the surrounding residential uses, as well as the larger equestrian facilities in the area.
 - The project incorporates the use of covered walkways, courtyard terraces and other defined outdoor spaces. A landscaped garden feature is proposed between the main hall and the meditation hall.

- Roof-mounted mechanical equipment will also be screened from view from adjacent properties through project design which includes a well within the rooftop so that equipment is shielded from off-site views. On-site trash facilities will also be screened from view.

5. Major Use Permit

The following is an analysis of how the project is consistent with the findings required to approve a Major Use Permit as set forth in Section 7358 of the Zoning Ordinance:

Before any use permit...may be granted, it shall be found:

- a. *That the location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses, residents, buildings, or structures, with consideration given to:*

- 1. *Harmony in scale, bulk, coverage and density;*

The proposed new development will not exceed the maximum of 35 feet allowed by the zone except for a steeple that is proposed to extend up to 40 feet. Zoning Ordinance Section 4620g provides for an exemption from the maximum height provision of an applicable height designator for, "...Any structure for which a Major Use Permit is granted pursuant to other provisions of this ordinance, when the Major Use Permit authorizes an exemption to the height regulations." The proposed increase in height is relatively minor and the design of the steeple would not create a bulky or incongruent architectural feature. The buildings will be set into the hillside and surrounded by dense landscaping including trees, which will help avoid any visual impacts from proposed structures.

The project proposes three new buildings totaling 22,796 square feet to be located on the rear one-third of the 9-acre project site. The buildings will be separated by gardens that will help break-up the mass of the structures. The buildings are designed with a horizontal emphasis, linked by one-story covered walkways between the structures that further

increase the horizontal appearance. The new buildings are separated from adjoining uses by a minimum of 500 feet on east, west and south and the project would not be visible from adjoining properties at these locations because of intervening topography and an avocado orchard. The project would be visible from the north; however, the adjacent lot is vacant. The primary view for the residential lots located to the north is towards the west. Any views south to the project site will be buffered with dense landscaping.

Regarding coverage, the project site is comprised of 9.0 acres. Existing development totals 10,420 square feet and includes a single-family residence (2,589 sq. ft.), a building formerly used for stables but now converted to storage (5,705 sq. ft.), and an equipment storage building/ workshop (2,126 sq. ft.). The latter building will be demolished as part of the project and replaced with a parking area. The remaining 8,294 square feet of building area will be retained as part of the project. The new development is proposed to total 22,796 square feet. The new construction will be split into 3 structures grouped together in the northerly one-third of the project site. Upon completion the project site will have a total of 31,090 square feet of structure. Structural coverage would be about 12.6 percent. The existing structures on the site are fairly typical of the surrounding development, which is zoned with a minimum lot area of 2 acres. For a 2-acre lot the existing 10,420 square feet would cover about 12 percent of the site. The applicant examined most of the surrounding lots and determined that the total development of the project would be greater than the residential lots but less than some of the non-residential uses in the area such as the equestrian facilities. For these reasons the project is considered to be reasonably compatible with the surrounding development in the area in terms of coverage.

2. *The availability of public facilities, services and utilities;*

The project has received Facility Availability Forms from the Fire and Water Districts indicating that the project is located within the Districts and service will

be available commensurate with need. Sewage disposal will take place on-site through a system approved by the Department of Environmental Health.

3. *The harmful effect, if any, upon desirable neighborhood character;*

The Bonsall Community Plan sets forth Policies and Recommendations intended to guide the location and design of future projects within the Plan Area. The Community Character Chapter of the Plan explains that the Bonsall area consists primarily of low-density estate type residential and agricultural uses. Houses are generally located far apart and randomly, on hillsides and hilltops, as well as in the valleys. Surrounding the houses are large open spaces composed of fallow fields, undisturbed native vegetation and agriculture. Agriculture is a key factor in Bonsall's rural community character, as are the scenic sometime narrow and winding, rural roads and rolling hills and valley topography.

A common value for most residents is the tranquil, private rural life, provided by the large open spaces between houses, screening vegetation, beauty of natural landforms, natural resources and features, lack of noise and congestion, and the presence of agriculture and animal raising.

The ridgelines, hilltops, and steep slopes prevalent in Bonsall are important natural resources, and are important factors in the visual beauty and rural community character of Bonsall. Structures too great in height can adversely impact these natural landforms and their visual contribution to community character.

An Extended Study on Community Character was prepared for the project and it found that, although the total development of the project would be greater than the surrounding estate residential lots, it would be less than some of the non-residential uses in the area such as the equestrian facilities.

The project would not be visible from the east due to the presence of an existing avocado orchard. To the south and west, the project is only visible from a distance due to topography. For the estate residence to the north, primary views are to the west and views to the south toward the project will be buffered by dense landscaping.

Portions of the project site are used for the raising of eucalyptus for flower arrangements, which would enhance the project's compatibility with the agricultural character of Bonsall. The proposed use is as a meditation center and for religious ceremonies on Sunday, thus it would tend to be consistent with some of the other essential characteristics of the Bonsall community such as the tranquil, private rural life with a lack of noise and congestion. The Religious Assembly Use Type is allowed in most residential and agricultural zones upon approval of a Major Use Permit and, as such, it usually be accommodated without inconveniencing the neighbors, if properly designed.

Noticeable landform alteration will be limited to construction of the access driveway and a detention basin. Grading for the buildings has been designed to blend-in with the natural topography. The buildings, and surrounding courtyards and parking areas will be at different levels and include terracing that reflects the existing topography. Retaining walls are placed into the interior of the buildings and none of the visible retaining walls exceed 5 feet.

The project does not propose any realignment or widening of existing roads. Camino del Rey borders the project to the south, however, no development is proposed in the area adjacent to the road that would permanently affect the existing scenic qualities. Grading for a new access driveway is required for safety purposes and the graded slopes of a proposed detention basin will be visible from the road, however, the proposed landscaping will effectively buffer any potential visual impacts. The proposed parking areas will not be visible from the surrounding areas due to topography and landscaping.

The location and architectural style of the proposed buildings have religious significance; however, the applicant has designed the project to be compatible with the Bonsall Community Design Guidelines in the following ways:

- The height, bulk and scale of each of the individual new buildings are comparable to some of the larger estate residences in the area.
- The buildings are designed with a horizontal emphasis, linked by one-story covered walkways between the structures that further increase the horizontal appearance.
- The buildings are designed with simple elevations and with limited decorative ornamentation.
- Proposed building materials will be of natural colors. Exterior finishes will be of earth-toned stucco, which blends in with surrounding development.
- Wooden doors will be used.
- The structures will also feature a series of roof overhangs with stucco-finished columns, allowing for covered walkways around the perimeter of the buildings.
- The roofs of the structures will be finished with terra cotta clay tile, consistent with many of the surrounding residential uses, as well as the larger equestrian facilities in the area.
- The project incorporates the use of covered walkways, courtyard terraces and other defined outdoor spaces. A landscaped garden feature is proposed between the main hall and the meditation hall.
- Roof-mounted mechanical equipment will also be screened from view from adjacent properties through project design which

includes a well within the rooftop so that equipment is shielded from off-site views. On-site trash facilities will also be screened from view.

4. *The generation of traffic and the capacity and physical character of surrounding streets;*

A Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the project concluded that the proposed project will result in an additional 41/98 (weekday / Sunday) ADT. The additional 41/98 (weekday / Sunday) ADT project traffic is less than the County minimum criteria for direct impacts on road segments, or at intersections. 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.

5. *The suitability of the site for the type and intensity of use or development which is proposed;*

The project site can accommodate all required parking, on-site sewage disposal and still provide adequate buffers in terms of setbacks and landscaping that will effectively separate the project from the surrounding uses.

6. *Any other relevant impact of the proposed use;*

No other relevant impacts have been identified.

b. *That the impacts, as described in paragraph "a" of this section, and the location of the proposed use will be consistent with the San Diego County General Plan.*

The project site is subject to the (19) Intensive Agriculture Land Use Designation, which is applied to a variety of agricultural properties that may include "minor commercial, industrial, and public facility uses appropriate to agricultural operations or supportive of the agricultural population." The Religious Assembly Use Type is allowed in most residential and agricultural zones upon approval of a Major Use Permit and, as such, it should be considered to be supportive use within an agricultural land use designation. The scale, bulk

and coverage of the project are compatible with surrounding uses, in particular, the equestrian facilities.

- c. *That the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act have been complied with.*

Review of the project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act has resulted in the issuance of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The zoning for the project site includes the A70 Limited Agricultural Use Regulations, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S82) 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

An Extended Study for Noise was prepared to assist in responding to the questions set forth in this section.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project is a facility for religious assembly and meditation including residential quarters, communal services, a library, and related functions such as the observance of annual religious holidays with special events (5 per year). Based on a site visit completed by Bill Stocks on May 6, 2004, and as described in the Acoustical Site Assessment (#05-055) by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc. dated August 19, 2005, the surrounding area supports residential and commercial uses and is occupied by local residents. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is in 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 an Acoustical Site Assessment (#05-055) prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering and dated August 19, 2005, project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). The Acoustical Site Assessment (#05-055) prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering indicates that the 60 dB CNEL contour for the Camino del Rey is potentially 260 feet from the centerline of this roadway. Although no proposed buildings or structures were proposed inside this contour, a significant portion of project site could be used for noise sensitive land uses in a future project modification. A condition pursuant to the Major Use Permit will require an acoustical analysis prior to the issuance of building permits for any new residential development or noise sensitive land

use applications within 260 feet of the centerline of Camino del Rey. With this condition, the project will be in conformance on site to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b). 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 an Acoustical Site Assessment (#05-055) by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc. dated August 19, 2005, non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A70 that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 decibels during the day and 45 decibels at night. The adjacent properties are zoned A70 and have the same one-hour average sound limits at each property line. The Site Assessment states that no major onsite noise sources were proposed by this modification including minor maintenance activities and concludes that property line noise levels from the project will not exceed County Noise Standards. Hours of public services and access are limited to Sundays between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. except for four special events per year. No outdoor electronic sound amplification is required for these events and the permit modification will include a condition to prohibit such a use in the future for any special events. To ensure compliance to property line standards, a condition pursuant to the Major Use Permit requires an acoustical certification test by a County-approved noise consultant to monitor and to report the property line noise levels during at least one special event within six months of occupancy and to recommend measures, as needed, to reduce any excessive event noise below the appropriate County one-hour average noise level standard of either 50 decibels during the day or 45 at night.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410

Based on an Acoustical Site Assessment (#05-055) by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc. dated August 19, 2005, 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 75 dB between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes institutional and residential facilities where low ambient vibration and quiet are essential during the day and for acceptable sleeping conditions. However, these facilities are setback more than 50 feet from any County Circulation Element (CE) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise levels of 35 dB (A) or less and vibration with rms velocity amplitudes of 0.0028 inches per second or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. It is not expected that any adjacent County CE roadway would be dominated by frequent heavy-duty vehicle activities or any nearby industrial activities. Any setback of 50 feet or more from the roadway centerline for frequent heavy-duty truck activities provides assurance that the proposed residential uses or activities would not be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Federal Transit Administration, "Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment," Final Report, May 2006). Any existing facilities or permitted projects in the vicinity that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise are not expected to affect the proposed religious use.

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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 an Acoustical Site Assessment (#05-055) prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering and dated August 19, 2005. The project will increase ambient noise levels by less than 1 dB CNEL on a daily basis. 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

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 an average sound level of 75 dB between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The property currently has one dwelling unit which will remain. This project includes a group residential component that will provide housing for approximately an additional 20 persons at any one time.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The property currently has one single-family dwelling unit, which will remain. This residential development would not displace any amount of existing housing. This project includes a group residential component that will provide housing for approximately an additional 20 persons at any one time.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: North County Fire Protection District and the Rainbow Water District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XIV. RECREATION

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobilehome park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

An Extended Study on Traffic was prepared to assist in responded to the questions in this section.

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), dated 8-17-06, prepared by Darnell & Associates on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use under Environmental Review Number ER 04-02-011, was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study concluded that the proposed project will result in an additional 41/98 (weekday/Sunday) ADT. The additional 41/98 (weekday/Sunday) ADT project traffic is less than the County minimum criteria for direct impacts on road segments, or at intersections. 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 and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), dated August 17, 2006, prepared by Darnell & Associates on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use under Environmental Review Number ER 04-02-011, was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study concluded that the proposed project will result in an additional 41/98 (weekday/Sunday) ADT. The addition of additional 41/98 (weekday / Sunday) ADT project traffic is less than the County minimum criteria for direct impacts on road

segments, or at intersections. 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.

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 41/98 (weekday/Sunday) 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impedes adequate site distance on a road.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The North County Fire Protection District has reviewed the proposed project and associated emergency access roadways and has determined that there is adequate emergency fire access proposed. Additionally, roads used will be required to be improved to County standards.

- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes a Religious Assembly Use and a Group Residential Use. The maximum use of the site would be on Sundays when approximately 100 persons are expected. The parking requirement for a Religious Assembly Use is one parking space for every four persons based on the total occupancy of the largest assembly room

permitted by the Uniform Building Code (UBC). The total occupancy allowed by the UBC far exceeds the total number of persons expected for typical Sunday services. The project proposes 81 parking spaces, which translates to approximately 324 persons. Periodically (five times per year), events will be held that are expected to be attended by 300 persons. Thus, the number of parking spaces provided should be adequate to handle the maximum expected number of visitors who would be attending the periodic special events. To ensure that all visitors will be conveniently accommodated during these special events the project proposes to provide an overflow parking area in the southerly portion of the site. Based upon the project description the parking program will be appropriate for the proposed intensity of use.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves a single wastewater system located at the base of the bluff in the southerly portion of the site. The system will utilize horizontal seepage pits. 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 October 19, 2006. 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The project does not include new or expanded water facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water treatment facilities. Based on the service availability forms received, the project will not require construction of new or expanded water treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate adequate water treatment facilities are available to the project from the Rainbow Water District. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. The new facilities include two detention basins. Refer to the Storm Water Management Plan dated February 2, 2007, for more information. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form Section I-XVII, the new facilities will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project requires water service from the Rainbow Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Rainbow 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"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly Non-Native Grassland. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes off-site preservation in a mitigation bank. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Mission Evangelical Church	P88-045
Olive Hill	TM 4976RPL4R
Golf Green Estates	TM 5498
Sanders	TPM 20845
Rawhide Ranch	P72-618
Public Stable (Parsons)	P79-134
Bresa del Mar (expired)	TM 4793
Brisa del Mar	TM 5492
San Luis Rey Ranches	TM 5079
Rancho Carmargo	TM 5037
Diamante	R03-003
Lilac del Cielo	TM 5427
Las Casitas	TM 5387
San Luis Rey Ventures	TM 4956

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 Biology and Traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes off-site preservation in a mitigation bank and payment of the Traffic Impact Fee prior to the issuance of building permits. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to cumulative traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the Traffic Impact Fee prior to the issuance of building permits. 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.

Extended Studies for:

- Community Character, prepared by RBF, dated August 2007.
- Noise, Prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc.; dated August 19, 2005.
- Biology (letter report), Prepared by REC, dated August 7, 2006.
- Stormwater Management, Prepared by Spear and Associates, dated February 6, 2007.
- Hydrology & Hydraulics, Prepared by Spear and Associates, dated February 6, 2007.
- Traffic Study, Prepared by Darnell and Associates, dated August 17, 2006.

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900,

AESTHETICS

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

effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

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

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

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

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

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)

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

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

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

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

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

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

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

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

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

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

AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

BIOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

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

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

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

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

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

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

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991.

American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

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

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

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

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

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

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

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

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

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

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

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

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

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

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

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

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

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

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

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

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

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

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

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

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

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

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

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

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

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)

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

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

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

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

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

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

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

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

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

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

NOISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

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

RECREATION

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

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

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

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

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

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

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

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

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

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

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

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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

ND10-07\0402011-ISF;jcr