



County of San Diego

ERIC GIBSON
INTERIM DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

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

June 5, 2008

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

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF SYCAMORE CANYON WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY

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

Sycamore Canyon Wireless Telecommunications Facility, P05-016,
ER 05-19-009
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 Merry Tondro, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3716
c. E-mail: Merry.Tondro@sdcounty.ca.gov.
4. Project location:

1853 Honey Springs Road, Jamul, CA 91935 (APN 600-220-18)
Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1313, Grid J/2
5. Project Applicant name and address:

Anne Wulftange
Sprint/Nextel
5761 Copley Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92111
6. General Plan Designation
Community Plan: Jamul-Dulzura
Land Use Designation: (18) Multiple Rural Use

- Density: 1 DU/4, 8, 20 Acres
7. Zoning
Use Regulation: A72 Limited Agriculture
Minimum Lot Size: 8 acres
Special Area Regulation: N/A

8. Description of project:

The project is a Major Use Permit to construct and operate an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility. The project consists of 12 panel antennas mounted at 26 feet onto a proposed 30-foot tall faux monobroadleaf tree. Associated project elements include a proposed 20' x 11.5' pre-cast concrete equipment shelter, two air conditioner units, two 6-foot tall sound barrier walls, and a separate 6-foot tall retaining wall. The faux monobroadleaf tree would be surrounded by an existing 20-foot tall tree and four proposed 20-foot Eucalyptus trees. The equipment shelter would be surrounded by proposed native shrubs. To maintain the landscaping, the project proposes to install a permanent irrigation system served onsite by groundwater. The project also proposes a 16-foot wide gravel driveway connected to an existing private access road. Finally, trenching would be conducted to install power and telecommunication utility lines.

Approximately two vehicle trips per month would be made for routine maintenance of the facility. Access to the site would be provided by a paved private access road connected to Honey Springs Road in the Jamul-Dulzura Community Planning Area.

The project is located on an 8.73-acre residential parcel. Existing onsite uses include a private residence, 13-foot tall water tank and shed. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Rural Development Area (RDA), Land Use Designation (18) Multiple Rural Use. Zoning for the site is A72 Limited Agriculture. All existing uses would be retained and no uses would be removed as part of the project.

To screen the proposed wireless telecommunication facility and blend it in with the surrounding landscape, the project proposes to give the equipment shelter a stucco finish and roof pitch that matches the existing on-site home. The shelter, noise barrier walls and retaining wall would be screened by 17 Toyon shrubs (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), 11 Cleveland sage shrubs (*Salvia clevelandii*), and 23 Dwarf coyote brush plants (*Baccharis pilularis*). In addition, the faux broadleaf tree was selected for its suitability to the surrounding landscape and would be painted to mimic the colors and textures associated with a natural tree. Faux foliage "slip-on" devices, or "socks", would integrate the 12 panel antennas. Finally, the 30-foot tall faux broadleaf tree would be surrounded by an existing 20-foot tree and four proposed 20-foot Eucalyptus trees.

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

Lands surrounding the project site are characterized largely as vacant open space and low-density residential. Vacant open space is located to the north and south of the site. Single-family residences are located to the east and west of the site. The topography of the project site and adjacent land is hilly with some slopes exceeding 25%. Highway 94 is in the project vicinity.

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

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 "Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

Merry Tondro
Printed Name

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. “Potentially 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

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: 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. State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation. Generally, the viewshed from a highway includes the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way and extends the distance of a motorist's line of vision, using a reasonable boundary when the view extends to the distant horizon. Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers.

Based on photographs of the subject parcel and photosimulations provided by the applicant, the proposed project would not be visible from a scenic vista, a County priority scenic route, or a State Scenic Highway; therefore, the project would not have an adverse impact on these visual resources.

The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings can be characterized as vacant open space and low-density residential with substantial mature vegetation and hills. As the proposed facility would be sited on top of a hill, there is the potential for the telecommunication tower and equipment shelter to visually "stand out" as unnatural features on the landscape. However, a number of proposed design features would serve to shield these elements and blend them in with the surrounding environment. First, the project proposes to use a faux broadleaf tree that would be painted to mimic the color and texture of a natural tree. The appearance of the proposed panel antennas would be masked through the use of faux foliage "slip on" devices, or "socks". Additionally, the 30-foot tall faux tree

would be surrounded by four proposed 20-foot tall Eucalyptus trees and one existing 20-foot tall tree, visually integrating faux tree with the live trees in a “grove effect.” To shield the appearance of the proposed equipment shelter, the project would site the shelter on the shoulder of the hill and recess it slightly into the slope with the use of a retaining wall. The equipment shelter would have a stucco finish and roof pitch that matches the existing on-site home, and native vegetation would surround the shelter to provide visual screening. These elements combined would serve to integrate the facility with the surrounding environment and minimize its visual appearance. Finally, the facility would be located approximately 1,700 feet (1/3 mile) from the nearest public road, Honey Springs Road, and would be approximately 1.5 miles from the nearest vantage point on Highway 94. Given the screening elements that would be employed, the visual appearance of the facility from these distances would not be significant.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts to scenic resources within a scenic vista, a County priority scenic route, or a State Scenic Highway because the project is not located within the viewshed of any of these resources. Therefore, the potential direct and cumulative aesthetic impacts resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would not use building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the proposed project would not be a significant source of glare.

The project proposes one outdoor light fixture near the door of the equipment shelter. However, the project would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project would 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 source 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 would ensure that this project, in combination with past, present and future projects would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

In addition, the project's outdoor lighting would be controlled through the issuance of a Major Use Permit, which further limits outdoor lighting through strict controls. Therefore, compliance with the Code and the conditions of the Major Use Permit would ensure that the project would not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is zoned A72, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project would not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use because Wireless Telecommunication Facilities are a permitted use in A72 zones and their operation is compatible with agricultural uses. As the project site is not under a Williamson Act contract, there would be no conflict with either existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation because emissions from the construction phase of the project would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. Emissions associated with the project include very limited emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities and trips to and from the facility. The limited scale of construction and the limited vehicle trips (two per month) associated with the project would not constitute a significant air quality impact. Furthermore, any grading in excess of 200 cubic yards is subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures.

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. Also, the project does not include any elements that would cause objectionable odors. Finally, the project would not result in exposure of significant pollutant concentrations to sensitive receptors because the project would not produce significant pollutant concentrations. Therefore, the impact to air quality is less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly 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; 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; 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; or interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

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

No Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a site visit by County staff on June 17, 2005, it has been determined that the project site and surrounding area is completely disturbed and contains no native vegetation or habitats. No riparian habitat, sensitive natural community or wetland has been identified within or adjacent to the project area. 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. would not be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community; any candidate, sensitive, or special status species; or wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Additionally, the project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species; nor would the project interfere with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Since no biological resources occur on the project site, no direct or cumulative impact to these resources would result.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: County staff conducted a site visit on June 17, 2005. It was determined that the proposed project area, including all areas of potential disturbance from construction and grading, does not contain any sensitive natural communities as defined by the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other

local or regional plan, policy or regulation. Therefore, the project would not conflict with plans, policies or regulations adopted to protect biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There would be no impacts to historical or archaeological resources as a result of the project. The project site contains an existing single-family residence that is not designated as a historical resource. In addition, prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to buried historical resources. Finally, the project would not impact archaeological resources since prior grading of the project site has also eliminated any potential for impacts to buried archaeological resources.

The project would not disturb any human remains because the proposed project area does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The telecommunications facility and associated trenching would occur within a highly disturbed area of the property. In addition, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

- b) 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:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on a site visit by County staff on June 17, 2005, no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity.

With respect to unique paleontological resources, a review of paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History, combined with available data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that have marginal resource potential. Marginal resource potential is assigned to geologic formations that are composed either of volcanic rocks or high-grade metasedimentary rocks, but which, nevertheless, have a limited probability for producing fossil remains from certain sedimentary lithologies at localized outcrops.

Although the site has marginal resource potential, it has been determined that the project would have a less than significant impact on paleontological resources. This is because the project conforms to excavation guidelines set forth by the City of San Diego, County of San Diego and professional experts from the San Diego Natural History Museum to minimize the risk of significant impacts to paleontological resources. Excavation guidelines that minimize the risk of impacts include:

- a) The total excavation associated with the project does not exceed 2,000 cubic yards and not any portion of such excavation exceeds 10 feet in depth into the geologic formation; or
- b) The geologic formation has been previously excavated and the total excavation associated with the project does not exceed 2,000 cubic yards; or
- c) The project is located within 200 feet of a recorded fossil site and is within the same geologic formation as such site, the total excavation associated with the project is not more than 200 cubic yards and not any portion of such excavation exceeds 10 feet in depth.

The minimum graded cut depth of 10 feet is the approximate depth at which bedrock is unweathered and the depth at which unique paleontological resources can typically begin to be found. The excavation volume of 2,000 cubic yards is based on an excavation with 20' x 10' footprint and a 10' depth. The excavation volume of 2,000 cubic yards was designed to address the patchy nature of many fossil occurrences and the observation that fossil discoveries increase in frequency with increasing volume of excavation. The project would excavate to a maximum depth of two feet for the utility trenching and would result in approximately 56 cubic yards of earth movement. Therefore, because the project would not exceed the above excavation guidelines, the project would not result in the permanent loss of significant paleontological information. Moreover, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable loss of information, because all projects in areas with marginal resource potential are required to have paleontological monitor during grading operations if these guidelines are exceeded. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

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?
 - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv. Landslides?
 - v. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
 - vi. Unstable geological conditions?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is 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. However, the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the California Building Code (CBC) classify all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. Although the project is within San Diego County, and thus, within the UBC and CBC Zone 4 seismic zone, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault or strong seismic groundshaking. This is because the project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would not involve habitable structures or significant construction of property. In addition, to ensure the structural integrity of the equipment shelter, 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, as the facility would be unmanned and the equipment shelter would conform to CBC and County Code requirements, there would be a less than significant impact associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault or seismic groundshaking.

The site is located within a very low to marginal landslide susceptibility zone. Also, according to 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 identified as Cieneba-Fallbrook rocky sandy loam (CnG2) and Vista coarse sandy loam (VsG) that have a soil erodibility rating of severe and are not considered

expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). Therefore, impacts associated with landslides and seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.

The project would not result in unprotected erodible soils; would not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and would not develop steep slopes. Although the project would result in site disturbance associated with installation of the telecommunication tower, equipment shed and utility trenching, grading would result in total soil movement of less than 700 cubic yards and the project would be 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), which regulate soil disturbance and restoration. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil, nor create unstable geologic conditions. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

In addition, the project would not contribute to a cumulative geologic or soils impact because all past, present and future projects evaluated for this initial study 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 Stormwater Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Also, all past, present and future projects evaluated for this initial study that involve issuance of a building permit 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, the cumulative geologic and soils impact is less than significant.

Based on the above, potential geologic and soils impacts as they pertain to the criteria listed in question VI. a) are less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that does not include or require septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No wastewater would be generated as a result of this project; therefore, there is no impact.

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; through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; through the emission or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or because the site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would 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. The project would 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. In addition, the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; nor is the project located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

- b) 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, public use airport or a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

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

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

d) 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:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project has demonstrated compliance with County Policy FP2, Fire Code Compliance for Cellular Facilities. The goal of the fire prevention standards in Policy FP2 are to make sure cellular sites are self protecting, with no fire agency emergency response anticipated, especially in major wildland incidents. This is accomplished primarily through construction with non-combustible exterior materials. Based on compliance with the County Policy FP2, Fire Code Compliance for Cellular Facilities, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facilities or other similar uses. Moreover, the project is an unmanned telecommunication facility that would not include new residents or occupants that could be exposed to existing vector sources.

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

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility, which requires completion of a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) for Minor Projects to demonstrate compliance with all requirements of the County of San Diego Watershed Protection Ordinance. The Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), dated May 24, 2005 for the proposed project, was reviewed by the Department of Public Works and deemed complete. The project proposes minor grading, trenching and construction of the telecommunication facility and would be required to implement site design measures and/or source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff and receiving waters. Implementation of BMPs such as fiber rolls and sandbag barriers, as detailed in the SWMP for this project, would 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).

The proposed BMPs identified in the project's SWMP for minor projects are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting processes that have been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact to an impaired water body, as listed by the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulations for the County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and the San Diego Unified Port District include 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); and, County Storm Water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purpose of these ordinances is to protect the health, safety and general welfare of County of San Diego residents; protect water resources and improve water quality; 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; secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions and requirements that vary depending on the 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 obtain permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects so that water quality is not degraded from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and proposes BMPs or design measures to mitigate impacts that may occur in the watershed. As the proposed project would be required to implement the water quality protection measures contained in its Stormwater Management Plan, the impact would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that includes establishment of landscaping for screening purposes. Proposed landscaping would rely on groundwater for irrigation for a maximum of five years. The proposed landscaping is expected to become established within five years and to be able to survive without irrigation thereafter. Based on the limited scale of proposed landscaping and the temporary use of groundwater for irrigation, the project would not have a significant adverse impact on the availability or recharge of groundwater.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would

result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project is an unmanned telecommunication facility that, due to its small size (20' x 11.5' equipment shed and 30-foot tall tower), limited disturbance area, and location away from streams and rivers, would not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, nor alter the course of a stream or river, to result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

The project proposes minor grading and construction for the equipment shed, utility trenching and access driveway. Existing natural topography and drainage courses on- and off-site would not be altered as a result of the project. Native landscaping would be planted and maintained as part of the visual screening strategy for the project; therefore, the existing characteristics of the site that influence drainage would not be substantially altered and would not result in an increase in flooding. Furthermore, the project's Stormwater Management Plan requires implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would minimize erosion and sedimentation in onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works would ensure that the Stormwater Management Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, impacts associated with significantly increased erosion or sedimentation and altered drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site are less than significant. In addition, erosion and sedimentation would be controlled within the boundaries of the project; therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on project impacts related to soil erosion, refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

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

No Impact: The proposed project does not include nor require stormwater drainage systems. Furthermore, the project would not result in a significant increase in pervious

surfaces that could contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: 100-year flood hazard areas were not identified on the project site; therefore, no impact would occur.

- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or from 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:

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area including a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. As the project site is not located along the

shoreline of a lake or reservoir, nor within one mile from the coast, the site would not be at risk of inundation by seiche or tsunami.

Mudflow is a type of landslide. The project site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. In addition, the project does not propose land disturbance that would expose soils nor is it located downstream from exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project would expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

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

a) Physically divide an established community?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that does not propose the introduction of major roadways, water supply systems, or other major infrastructure that could significantly disrupt or divide an established community.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy Rural Development Area (RDA) and San Diego General Plan Land Use Designation (18) Multiple Rural Use. The project is consistent with the General Plan because wireless telecommunication facilities are anticipated by the 18 (Multiple Rural Use) Land Use Designation, which provides for uses applied in remote areas, with overall low population density, and with an absence of most public services.

The property is zoned A72 which permits wireless telecommunication facilities upon the issuance of a Major Use Permit pursuant to the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance Section 6980. The project, at a maximum height of 30 feet, conforms to the Zoning

Ordinance 35-foot height limit. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

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 or to a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a wireless telecommunication facility that would involve a limited area of construction. Due to its small size, any future use or availability of mineral resources would not be lost. Therefore, there is no impact to mineral resources.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Noise-generating attributes of the proposed project include temporary noise associated with construction of the facility and long-term noise associated with two Marvair Model Compac II wall-mounted air conditioner units located on the northern façade of the proposed equipment shed. The proposed project site is zoned A72 for Agricultural Use.

An analysis of the proposed project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards follows.

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise-sensitive areas. A proposed use that has the potential to expose noise-sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels

(dB(A)) must have an acoustical study prepared. If the acoustical study finds that the proposed project would generate noise in excess of 60 dB(A) CNEL, modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise-sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute.

A Noise Impact Analysis was prepared by Eilar Associates (September 11, 2006). The analysis found that noise levels from the proposed Marvair Model Compac II wall-mounted air conditioner units would be as high as 49 dB(A) CNEL at the nearest (western) property line of the proposed project site. As the noise generated by the air conditioner units would be less than the General Plan standard of 60 dB(A) CNEL, the impact is less than significant. The proposed project would 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

Section 36.404 of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance prohibits the one-hour average sound level at the boundary line of the property on which the sound is generated to exceed a pre-determined limit defined by the property's zone. The proposed project site is zoned A72. The most stringent one-hour average sound limit for Zone A72 is 45 dB(A).

A Noise Impact Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates (September 11, 2006) found that the noise levels from the proposed Marvair Compact II wall-mounted air conditioner units would be as high as 49 dB(A) CNEL at the western property line of the proposed project site. This value exceeds the County Noise Ordinance standard of 45 dB(A) for Zone A72. The analysis proposed a 6-foot tall, L-shaped sound barrier wall at the northwest corner of the telecommunication facility lease area as mitigation to reduce noise to a level that meets the Noise Ordinance standard. The wall would extend 18 feet 10 inches on the northern edge of the lease area and 12 feet on the western edge of the lease area. With this noise mitigation included, the analysis projected that the sound barrier wall would reduce noise at the western property line to 41.3 dB(A). Noise would be 37.5 dB(A) and 28.1 dB(A) at the northern and eastern property lines, respectively. Noise would be 27.6 dB(A) at the onsite residential building façade to the south of the facility, and would be less at the southern property line. As the noise level would conform to the 45 dB(A) Noise Ordinance standard at all property lines, the proposed mitigation would be sufficient to reduce potentially significant impacts to below a level of significance.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.410

Based on the Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates (September 11, 2006), the project would not generate construction noise in excess of the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410). Construction operations would occur during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. Also, due to the small scale of construction required, it is not anticipated that the project would operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75 dB between the

hours of 7 AM and 7 PM. Therefore, the short-term construction impact to noise sensitive areas is less than significant.

Finally, noise impacts resulting from the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable. 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 would not exceed noise standards for noise-sensitive areas, nor would the project exceed noise level limits at the property line or during construction. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

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 on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent, 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:

Less Than Significant Impact: 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 proposed project is for a wireless telecommunication facility that would not result in an increase in noise levels by 10 decibels due to the limited noise producing equipment included as part of the project and based on anticipated compliance with County of San Diego General Plan and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance standards (refer to Question XI. a). Also, 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.

The project would not result in cumulative noise impacts as determined through an analysis of past, present and future projects within the vicinity. It was determined that the project, in combination past, present and future projects, 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 past, present and future projects considered within the proposed project vicinity.

- d) 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, public use airport or private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or private airstrip. Therefore, there is no impact.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly; displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would have no effect on the availability of housing, nor displace housing or people. Furthermore, the project does not propose 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. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth by proposing a physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would not result in the need for significantly altered public services or facilities. Correspondence from the Department of Planning and Land Use, Building Division confirmed that the project would meet fire code access, water supply and fuel modification requirements, thereby exceeding FP-2 requirements. As such, the proposed project does not require a Service availability form from the Rural Fire Protection District.

Furthermore, as an unmanned telecommunication facility, the project does not require the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, parks or other public service facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse physical affect on the environment due to new or significantly altered public services or facilities.

XIV. RECREATION – Would the project:

- 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:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use, such as a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction of a single-family residence. Therefore, the project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or 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:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities, and as discussed in XIV. a., would not result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, there is no impact to recreation.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would result in an additional two trips per month. The project was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The proposed project generates two additional trips. Given the County's traffic thresholds (Table 1) 100 ADT on a road operating at LOS F and 200 ADT on a road operating at LOS E there would be no direct impacts to a road segment. Using SANDAG's estimate for AM and PM peak hour trips, the project would generate less than five peak hour trips and would not exceed the five additional trips to a critical move threshold - especially when the trips are distributed on the road network. Therefore, the project would 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:

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

However, the County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. This program is based on a summary of projections 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 two trips per month. These trips would 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 is required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, would mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, or place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Correspondence from the Department of Planning and Land Use, Building Division confirmed that the project would meet fire code access and exceed FP-2 requirements. Additionally, public roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards. Therefore, the project has adequate emergency access.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed telecommunication facility is unmanned, requiring two maintenance trips per month. There is adequate space to park a maintenance vehicle at the end of the proposed gravel driveway. As this space would meet the parking needs of the facility, the project would not result in an insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an unmanned telecommunication facility. Its implementation would not result in construction of new road design features, nor present any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Therefore, the project would not conflict with policies regarding alternative transportation.

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

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board or require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is an unmanned telecommunication facility that would not result in wastewater discharge to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the project would not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements. Furthermore, the project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities or require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project would not require construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities. As a result, significant environmental effects would not occur from the construction of new or expanded facilities.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that includes establishment of landscaping for screening purposes. The proposed landscaping would rely on onsite groundwater for irrigation for a maximum of five years. The proposed landscaping is expected to become established within five years and survive without irrigation thereafter. Therefore, based on the limited scale of proposed landscaping and the temporary nature of the proposed irrigation, the project would not result in the need for new or expanded water entitlements.

- d) 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:

No Impact: The proposed project an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- e) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility and would not generate solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County. Therefore, compliance with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulation related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: 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. There is no substantial evidence that there are biological or cultural resources that would be affected or associated with this project. 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
Verizon Wireless – 94/Engineer Springs	MUP06-087
Sprint/Nextel – Engineer Springs	MUP05-022
Swift Tentative Parcel Map	TPM20903
Verizon Wireless – Johnson	ZAP 00-075

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: 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 project's potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to transportation and traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF, which will be required 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:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: 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 noise and

transportation and traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to below a level of significance. This mitigation includes construction of an L-shaped sound attenuation barrier and payment of the TIF. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

VIII. 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.

Eilar Associates, Acoustical and Environmental Consulting. Noise Impact Analysis, Nextel Communications, Site Number: CA-8412, Site Name: Sycamore Canyon, 1853 Honey Springs Road, Jamul, California 91935, County of San Diego Limited Use Permit Case Number: P05-016. September 11, 2006.

Sprint/Nextel. Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects. May 24, 2005.

AESTHETICS

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

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

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

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, 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/ile-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 (NLPPI), 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.sandiego.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.sandiego.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.dplw2.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.sdcountry.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.sdcountry.ca.gov)

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

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

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/attach.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.