

January 17, 2008

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

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:  
  
P07-008, RP 07-001, Log No. 98-14-016A; El Monte Valley Nature Park
  
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: Donna Beddow, Project Manager  
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3656  
c. E-mail: donna.beddow@sdcounty.ca.gov.
  
4. Project location:  
  
The project is located in the San Diego River watershed in the Lakeside Community planning area, within the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. It is bordered by El Monte Road to the south, Willow Road to the north, and Highway 67 to the west. The El Capitan Dam is located upstream of the project site to the east and El Cajon Mountain to the northeast.  
  
Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1212, Grid G/7
  
5. Project Applicant name and address:  
  
El Capitan Golf Club, LLC, and Endangered Habitats Conservancy  
13950 El Monte Road, Lakeside, CA 92040
  
6. General Plan Designation  
Community Plan: Lakeside  
Land Use Designation: 24 – Impact Sensitive  
Density: 1 du/ 4, 8, 20 acre(s)

7. Zoning (two zones):

Use Regulation: S82 – Extractive Use  
Minimum Lot Size: 8 acre(s)  
Special Area Regulation: F, S

Use Regulation: A70 – Limited Agriculture  
Minimum Lot Size: 4 acre(s)  
Special Area Regulation: S

8. Description of project:

The project is a Major Use Permit and Reclamation Plan for the excavation and restoration of the El Monte river valley, to ultimately result in the El Monte Valley Nature Park. The site is located within the regional category of Environmentally Constrained Area (ECA) per the County General Plan. The land use designation of the site under the General Plan is (24) Impact Sensitive. The site is zoned S82 (Extractive Use) Area, and has special area designators F (flood channel area) and S (scenic resources).

The river channel would be lowered approximately 12 to 14 feet resulting in groundwater recharge to allow viability of restored habitats. Adjacent areas would be lowered 10 to 12 feet, and the outermost areas would be lowered approximately 3 to 4 feet. Following lowering of the surface elevation, the groundwater levels would be increased and maintained by recharging the aquifer. Lowering of the channel involves the removal of approximately eight (8) to ten (10) million cubic yards of aggregate material (sand and gravel). This material would be separated onsite to remove organic topsoil, fines and various rocks and pebbles, and then transported offsite for sale. The excavation activity would occur over six to eight years with a complete project construction duration of eight to ten years. The site would be excavated and reclaimed in phases moving from upstream to downstream (generally east to west).

Reclamation of the project site would involve the establishment of cottonwood-willow riparian, sycamore-oak riparian, coastal sage scrub, chaparral, marsh/wetlands, and open water habitats. The reclamation plan would create approximately 380 acres of native habitat.

The raw water used to recharge the aquifer would come from the Helix No. 2 Pipeline, which delivers water from the San Diego County Water Authority's (SDCWA) Slaughterhouse Control Structure to the Levy Water Treatment Plant. The water would be delivered to spreading basins by an extension of the pipeline in Willow Road (directly adjacent to the project site) and T-connections to each basin. A total of approximately 80 acres of spreading basins would be required in up to 9 individual basins along the north side of the San Diego River.

Currently a private road, Dairy Road, runs north to south across the river. Under this proposal the road would be modified. The river crossing, currently a typical Arizona crossing, would be modified as necessary to stabilize the slopes and include culverts that could accommodate the lowering of the river channel.

Other elements of the nature park project include a public trail system consistent with County trail requirements. A trail would run generally parallel to the river on the north and south sides of the river with one crossing at the east end and at a new bridge over emergent marsh on the west end. The trail would accommodate pedestrian and equestrian users and would be accessed from existing staging areas.

Additional Background Information:

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified by the Helix Water District on June 16, 1999 supporting the approval of a golf course complex. The landowners are now proposing the above-described restoration project in lieu of the golf course facilities. The golf course complex would have consisted of two 18-hole golf courses, a 9-hole practice facility, a driving range, a club house and maintenance facilities. The previous analysis also included construction of access roads, a bridge across the San Diego River and construction of a 4-cart bridge for cross channel access to various playing areas. Construction of the golf courses would have required approximately 1.3 million cubic yards of grading. The project would have allowed the use of up to 1,200 acre-feet of groundwater per year for irrigation and other purposes. The certified EIR found significant effects to land use, aesthetics, traffic, biology, archaeology, hydrology and groundwater. All impacts were found to be mitigated below a significant level.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is located in the El Monte Valley within the Lakeside Community of San Diego County. The San Diego River channel crosses through the project site in an east to west direction. The project site and vicinity consist of rural agricultural lands placed within a broad floodplain contained by steeply sloping valley sidewalls. The channel gradient has been reduced in this stretch of river resulting in sand deposition and the creation of a broad, nearly level alluvial plain above the granitic basement of rocks.

Water currently flows in the river during periods of extended precipitation only. A number of ephemeral drainage channels also cross the project site before joining the San Diego River channel. These drainage courses have small watershed areas and would only be expected to flow in response to intense and extended rain events. The San Diego River on this site currently supports low quality riparian vegetation dominated by exotic plant species such as tamarisk (*Tamarix sp.*). There are also scattered large individual coast live oaks, western sycamores, Fremont cottonwoods, and black willows. The first phase of the golf

course was previously graded and is currently denude of vegetation. The remainder of the site consists of primarily nonnative grasslands and disturbed riparian vegetation.

Existing land uses in the surrounding valley include rural residential, dairy farming, extractive, field and orchard crops, public utilities, and open space. Land use is limited by physical constraints with the presence of the San Diego River floodway. Of note in the surrounding project area is the El Capitan Reservoir, just east of the project site along El Monte Road.

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

<b>Permit Type/Action</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
Reclamation Plan	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Air Quality Permit to Operate – Title V Permit	APCD
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Helix Water District
Fire District Approval	Lakeside Fire Protection District

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

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

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna Beddow, AICP  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
January 17, 2008

Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Land Use/Environmental Planner  
Title

## INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

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. The proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

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

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

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated. A scenic highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from Caltrans that the highway has been designated as an official Scenic Highway. Based on a site visit completed by staff on September 13, 2007, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the same composite viewshed as a State scenic highway and will not change the visual composition of an existing scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

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

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

Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as a flat, open valley.

The operational phases of the project have the potential to substantially alter the visual character of the site. Therefore, a visual analysis will be prepared and discussed within the context of the Subsequent EIR before potential effects to the existing environment's visual character and quality can be determined.

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

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

The project would use heavy equipment for mineral extraction during the operational phases. However, the project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not introduce a new source of light pollution that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

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

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

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

The proposed project site contains land disturbed from previous grading for a golf course and some minor areas of active agricultural use. Most of the site is underlain by Prime Farmland Soils and Statewide Significant Soils as defined by the NRCS and FMMP. In addition, the site also contains Farmland of Local Importance, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland. Due to the potential loss of agricultural resources on the project site, a Local Agricultural Resource Assessment (LARA) to address the potential impacts using the guidance found in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance will be prepared and discussed within the context of the Subsequent EIR.

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

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

The project site is zoned A70 (Limited Agriculture) and S82 (Extractive) Use Regulation. A70 is an agricultural zone that is intended to create and preserve areas intended primarily for agricultural crop production. In this zone, small farm animals may be kept and agricultural products raised on the premises may be processed. Typically, the A70 Use Regulations are applied to areas throughout the County to protect moderate to high quality agricultural land. The project proposes non-agricultural uses in the A70 zone and therefore, the potential for the project to conflict with zoning for agricultural use will be evaluated in the Subsequent EIR. The site does not contain lands under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore no conflicts with Williamson Act Contracts are anticipated.

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

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

The project will involve a temporary mining land use and ultimately a nature park. The project must evaluate the potential impact that could occur to surrounding agricultural operations as a result of the land uses proposed on the project site. The evaluation should consider land use compatibility of the proposed temporary and permanent uses with the viability of ongoing agricultural uses in the surrounding area, in accordance with County Guidelines for Determining Significance and will be discussed in the Subsequent EIR.

**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Would the project:

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

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

The project does not propose a change in zoning or General Plan designation, which could increase the density or use of the site beyond what was anticipated in the SANDAG growth projects that were used in the development of the RAQS and the SIP. However, the project does involve a Major Use Permit for a sand and gravel mining operation that may result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board from extraction, processing and stockpiling operations and vehicle trips generated by the proposed project. Therefore, because the proposed project may conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP, an air quality analysis of

project-generated emissions will be prepared and discussed in the Subsequent EIR. Likewise, the analysis shall address the project's contribution to a cumulative air quality impact.

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

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

Air quality impacts from land use projects are typically the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

The project involves eight (8) to ten (10) million cubic yards of material extraction. Emissions from the mining may be significant; resulting in pollutant emissions above the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. As such, the project may violate air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. These potential impacts will be discussed in the context of the Subsequent EIR and supporting technical analysis.

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

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

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) under the CAAQS. O<sub>3</sub> is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM<sub>10</sub> in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

The project has the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment, primarily related to extraction, processing and stockpiling operations and vehicle trips generated by the proposed project. Therefore, an air quality analysis shall be prepared that includes a cumulative analysis of the project in the context of all past, present and reasonably anticipated future projects within the project area. This analysis will also be discussed in the Subsequent EIR.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly. No sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

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

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

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

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

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

- Potentially Significant Impact       Less than Significant Impact  
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

The project site consists of agriculture, non-native grassland, tamarisk scrub, southern willow scrub, and disturbed oak woodland. In addition, large areas on site are disturbed (bare) lands due to previous grading. The purpose of the project is to restore the riparian and upland vegetation communities along the San Diego River. This will create habitat to support special status species, such as least Bell's vireo. However, the operational phases of the project will have a significant temporary impact on the existing biological environment. Due to temporary impacts to biological resources, a technical report will be prepared and the findings discussed within the context of the Subsequent EIR.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact       Less than Significant Impact  
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

The project will affect riparian habitat as well as other natural communities along the San Diego River. The reclamation phase of the project will provide higher value habitat within an open space preserve. However, the temporary impacts that may occur during the extraction phases are potentially significant and will be analyzed in the Subsequent EIR.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact       Less than Significant Impact  
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

The project site contains jurisdictional wetlands and will involve modification of the wetlands in order to lower the river channel and restore the area to native riparian and upland habitat. The project will be required to obtain a permit or letter of permission from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act prior to any work being done within jurisdictional limits. The Subsequent EIR will analyze the project's potential impacts to jurisdictional resources and discuss how it complies with the ACOE requirements.

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

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

The project site has the potential to support wildlife movement. The reclamation phase of the project will enhance the site as a movement corridor. However, the temporary impacts that may occur during the extraction phases are potentially significant and will be analyzed in the Subsequent EIR.

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

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

The project is outside of any HCP or NCCP and will not conflict with conservation planning efforts. The open space preserve that will result from the project is expected to contribute to the goals of the County's MSCP, which surrounds the El Monte Valley. In addition, the project has been found to comply with local ordinances, such as the County's Resource Protection Ordinance.

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

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

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

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Rebecca McCorkle-Apple, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of The survey are provided in a cultural resources report titled, "Archaeological Site Visit for CA-SDI-13,562 and CA-SDI-17,300 and Literature Review for El Monte Valley Nature Park Project", prepared by Rebecca McCorkle-Apple, dated June 2007.

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

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

Based on a review of the EIR prepared for the El Capitan Golf Course, it has been determined that there may be effects to archaeological resources during the extraction phases of the proposed project. The significance of potential impacts will be analyzed in a technical report and summarized in the Subsequent EIR.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

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

The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan (see Appendix G for a listing of unique geological features) or that support known geologic characteristics with the potential to support unique geologic features. Additionally, based on a site visit by Mindy Fogg on September 13, 2007, no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity.

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

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

A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during

excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

The project has a low potential for containing paleontological resources and will excavate the substratum and/or bedrock below the soil horizons.

A monitoring program implemented by the excavation/grading contractor will be required. Equipment operators and others involved in the excavation should watch for fossils during the normal course of their duties. In accordance with the Grading Ordinance, if a fossil or fossil assemblage of greater than twelve inches in any dimension is encountered during excavation, all excavation operations in the area where the fossil or fossil assemblage was found shall be suspended immediately, the County's Permit Compliance Coordinator shall be notified, and a Qualified Paleontologist shall be retained by the applicant to inspect the find to determine if it is significant. A Qualified Paleontologist is a person who has, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Land Use Director:

- A Ph.D. or M.S. or equivalent in paleontology or closely related field (e.g., sedimentary or stratigraphic geology, evolutionary biology, etc.);
- Demonstrated knowledge of southern California paleontology and geology; and
- Documented experience in professional paleontological procedures and techniques.

If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that the fossil or fossil assemblage is significant; a mitigation program involving salvage, cleaning, and curation of the fossil(s) and documentation shall be implemented. If no fossils or fossil assemblages of greater than 12 inches in any dimension are encountered during excavation, a "No Fossils Found" letter will be submitted to the County Department of Planning and Land Use identifying who conducted the monitoring and that no fossils were found. If one or more fossils or fossil assemblages are found, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a report documenting the mitigation program, including field and laboratory methodology, location and the geologic and stratigraphic setting, list(s) of collected fossils and their paleontological significance, descriptions of any analyses, conclusions, and references cited.

Therefore, with the implementation of the above project requirements during project grading operations, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant. Furthermore, the project will not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that require grading in sensitive paleontological resource areas will be required to have the appropriate level of paleontological monitoring and resource recovery. In addition, other projects that propose any amount of significant grading would be subject to the requirements for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

The significance of potential impacts will be discussed in the Subsequent EIR.

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

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

Based on a review of the EIR prepared for the El Capitan Golf Course, it has been determined that there may be effects to archaeological resources during the extraction phases of the proposed project. The significance of potential impacts will be analyzed in the Subsequent EIR.

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

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

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

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

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

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

The project does not propose any structures, and therefore, would not be exposing people or structures to seismic shaking. If any structures are deemed necessary during the operational phases, they must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

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

iv. Landslides?

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

The project does not propose any structures and the site is not within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

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

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

The project proposes mineral excavation that may result in unprotected erodible soils and will alter topography and drainage patterns. The project proposes to separate topsoil from aggregate material, and then use the topsoil on site for restoration. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be prepared as part of the project to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit. The SWPPP will outline measures to control erosion. The measures will also be discussed in the context of the Subsequent EIR prepared for the project.

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

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

The project proposes mineral extraction over an eight-year period; however, the proposed project is consistent with the geological formations underlying the site. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

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

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

The soils on-site are Friant rocky fine sandy loam, Riverwash, Tujunga Sand, Visalia sandy loam, and Cieneba-Fallbrook rocky sandy loam. The project proposes excavation and restoration of the river and will not include the construction of any habitable structures on-site. In addition, a Reclamation Plan is required to address the methods in which reclamation, including reestablishment and revegetation of the site, will be accomplished for the project. The Reclamation Plan will be included as an appendix to the EIR and discussed in the EIR.

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

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

The project proposes excavation and restoration of the San Diego River. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

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

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes?

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

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. The only hazardous material that would be used on site would be fuel used for construction equipment. A specific fueling location will be established and designated for containment of spills.

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

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

The project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances. The only hazardous material that would be used on-site would be fuel used for construction equipment. A specific fueling location will be established and designated for containment of spills.

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

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

The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school and the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

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

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

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The

project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

The Dam Evacuation Plan for will not be interfered with because even though the project is located within a dam inundation zone, the project is not for a hospital, school, skilled nursing facility, retirement home, mental health care facility, care facility with patients that have disabilities, adult and childcare facility, jails/detention facilities, stadium, area, amphitheater, or similar use that may limit the ability of the County Office of Emergency Services to implement a dam evacuation plan.

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

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

The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. The project does not propose to place people or structures in this area. Rather, the project proposes to restore the river valley and will have to ensure that the restored

vegetation does not create a hazard to nearby residences. The project will be required to comply with the regulations relating to defensible space as specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 0 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Fire management and defensible space will be further discussed within the Subsequent EIR prepared for this project.

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

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

The project proposes river restoration and basins that may increase vectors in the area. However, the habitat and open water will be a substantial distance from any residences and will be managed and monitored as an open space park. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

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

- a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

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

Permits regulating industrial stormwater runoff include NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities. One of the requirements through the Industrial Storm Water Permit, which is obtained from the State Water Resources Control Board, is the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The NPDES permit controls and allows for the discharge of stormwater associated with industrial activities and is needed for industrial businesses falling within certain categories or that conduct business under certain Standard Industrial Classification codes. Compliance with these regulations relating to waste discharge will be analyzed within the context of the Subsequent EIR and supporting technical documents.

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

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

The project lies in the El Monte and Santee hydrologic subareas (907.12 and 907.15), within the San Diego River hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, a portion of this watershed at the Pacific Ocean and mouth of the San Diego River is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents of concern in the San Diego watershed include coliform bacteria, total dissolved solids, nutrients, petroleum chemicals, toxics, and trash.

The project proposes mineral extraction that could contribute additional pollutants to the San Diego River hydrologic unit, if only temporarily. Therefore, the Subsequent EIR and supporting technical documents must discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs that will be employed as required by the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO).

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

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

The project proposes a recharge of the site to increase surface and subsurface flows along the San Diego River in order to restore the riparian habitat. To ensure adequate maintenance of the recharge project, the County will require a Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (GMMP), which will specify ongoing groundwater monitoring and reporting requirements. Groundwater investigation work and the preparation of a GMMP will be conducted by a qualified hydrogeologist. This technical study will be discussed in the context of the Subsequent EIR along with the SWPPP requirements to address any potential degradation of beneficial uses.

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

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

The project proposes to recharge the site and substantially increase net aquifer volume in order to re-establish riparian habitat along the river. As noted in Section VIII.c above, the changes to groundwater on and around the site will be analyzed and discussed within the EIR and as part of the Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (GMMP). The changes are not expected to result in any decrease (temporary or permanent) of groundwater availability.

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

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

The project proposes mineral extraction in the San Diego River that will alter existing drainage and topography. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project may result in significantly increased erosion or siltation on- and off-site and therefore, will be analyzed within the context of the Subsequent EIR, a preliminary hydrology study, and a hydraulic and sedimentation study.

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

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

The project proposes mineral extraction in the San Diego River that will alter existing drainage and topography. As such, the project may result in flooding on- and off-site. Potential effects will be analyzed within the context of the Subsequent EIR, the preliminary hydrology study, and the hydraulic and sedimentation study.

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

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

The project proposes to lower the river channel of the San Diego River which will increase surface flows. Therefore, the Subsequent EIR, the preliminary hydrology study and the SWPPP must analyze and address the project's affect on surface runoff in relation to existing and planned storm water drainage systems.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

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

The project will have several potential sources of polluted runoff primarily from, but not limited to, on-site equipment, maintenance, and trucking activities. Therefore, the Subsequent EIR must analyze and discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs that will be employed. Also, the Subsequent EIR must discuss how potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the project will not result in any substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

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

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

The project site is in the San Diego River, which is mapped on a FEMA floodplain map. However, the project is not proposing to place structures with a potential for human occupation within these areas and will not place access roads or other improvements which will limit access during flood events or affect downstream properties.

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

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

The project site is a segment of the San Diego River, which is identified as being 100-year flood hazard areas. However, the project is not proposing to place structures, access roads or other improvements which will impede or redirect flood flows in these areas.

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

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

The project lies within a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County, as identified on an inundation map prepared by the dam owner. However, the proposed project will not result in exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss injury, or death since it will not place people or structures within this flood hazard area. In addition, the San Diego County of Disaster Preparedness has an established emergency evacuation plan for the area and the project will not interfere with this plan.

l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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:

i. SEICHE

The project site is located near a reservoir; however, the project proposes to restore the river valley and does not propose development that could be inundated from a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, staff has determined that the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will be subject 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

The project does not propose the introducing new infrastructure such major roadways or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

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

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

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy "Environmentally Constrained Area" and General Plan Land Use Designation 24 - Impact Sensitive with an (25) Extraction overlay. The Impact Sensitive designation is applied to the site due to the presence of the San Diego River floodway and riparian zone. The Extraction overlay designation is applied only in areas containing economically extractable mineral resources. This designation promotes extraction as the principal and dominant use.

Zoning for the property is S82 (Extractive) and A70 (Limited Agriculture). The S82 (Extractive) Zone is intended to identify areas where mining, quarrying, or oil extractive uses are permitted. Approximately 385 acres of the project site is zoned as S82. The site is classified and designated as containing a regionally significant sand resource. Approximately 77 acres of the project site is zoned as A70. This zoning designation allows for limited development consistent with rural residential and a variety of agricultural uses.

Agencies such as Office of Mining and Reclamation, California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Army Corps of Engineers also have jurisdiction over the project and are identified as responsible agencies. The project is required to obtain permits from these agencies and comply with applicable regulations.

As such, the project will not conflict with known land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects.

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

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

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

The lands within the project site have not been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997); but the site is underlain by alluvial deposits and contains mineral resources that would be of value to the region. Although the project proposes to extract a substantial amount of aggregate, the proposed reclamation and preservation of the river valley may still result in the loss of remaining unearthed minerals within the project site. The potential impacts to the state's and region's mineral resource availability will be analyzed and discussed in the Subsequent EIR.

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

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

The project site is zoned S82 (Extractive Use) and A70 (Limited Agriculture); and the site is designated within the County's General Plan as an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). Although the project proposes to extract approximately eight (8) to ten (10) million cubic yards of material, the restoration and conservation of the river valley may still result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. This potential loss and its significance will be evaluated in the Subsequent EIR for the project.

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

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

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

Potential noise impacts from the proposed project would result during the operational phases of the mineral extraction, which would include operation of construction vehicles and equipment for site grading, soil excavation, aggregate recovery and hauling, groundwater recharge, and revegetation. Residences are located adjacent to the site haul routes. On an intermittent basis, noise levels are expected to exceed County standards. Potential effects will be analyzed and discussed in the project acoustical analysis, reclamation plan, and Subsequent EIR.

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

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

Potential noise impacts from the proposed project would result during the operational phases of the mineral extraction, which would include operation of construction vehicles and equipment for site grading, soil excavation, aggregate recovery and hauling, groundwater recharge, and revegetation. Residences are located adjacent to the site haul routes. On an intermittent basis, noise levels are expected to exceed County standards. Potential effects will be analyzed and discussed in the project acoustical analysis to determine whether a potentially significant impact from groundbourne vibrations will occur as a result of the project and if mitigation is required. This determination will be further discussed in the Subsequent EIR for the project.

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

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

Potential noise impacts from the proposed project would result during the operational phases of the mineral extraction, which would include operation of construction vehicles and equipment for site grading, soil excavation, aggregate recovery and hauling, groundwater recharge, and revegetation. The operational phases would occur over a period of eight to ten years and would not be permanent. The final phase of the project would be the preservation of the river as an open space park, which is not expected to have noise levels above existing ambient levels.

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

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

The project involves mineral extraction over a period of eight to ten years. The operational phases will include sources of noise such as operation of construction vehicles and equipment for site grading, soil excavation, aggregate recovery and hauling, groundwater recharge, and revegetation. Substantial temporary and periodic increases in noise levels are expected to occur depending on the location and intensity of such activities. Potential effects will be analyzed and discussed in the project acoustical analysis, reclamation plan, and Subsequent EIR.

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

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

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

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

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

The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The proposed project will not displace any existing housing since the site is currently vacant.

c) 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         |

The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

### **XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

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

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

The proposed project is not expected to result in a substantial new need for facilities or services than are currently necessary for this area. The project proposes to excavate the site over a period of eight to ten years to restore and preserve the river. No new development or infrastructure is proposed. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment associated with the addition of facilities or services.

#### **XIV. RECREATION**

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

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

Although the project does not increase the need for recreational facilities, the proposed end use is an open space park with equestrian trail. As such, the project proposes a net increase in recreational facilities and will not result in substantial physical deterioration parks or other recreational facilities.

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

Although the project does not increase the need for recreational facilities, the proposed end use is an open space park with equestrian trail. The proposal for a trail is not expected to have an adverse physical effect on the environment since the overall project will restore the river valley and reduce on-going degradation of this segment of the San Diego River. The equestrian trail will be a passive presence around the site that will not adversely effect the environment.

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

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

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

The extraction phases of the proposed project will have a potentially significant impact related to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The traffic increases would potentially affect Maplevue Street, SR 67 to Vine Street, Lake Jennings Park Road, and Blossom Valley Road to I-8 westbound ramp. Traffic increases would also potentially affect intersections along Maplevue Street and/or Lake Jennings Park Road. A traffic impact analysis will be prepared that will include a complete analysis of affected roadways and intersections. The results of the analysis and the determinations of significance will be discussed in the context of the Subsequent EIR.

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

The extraction phases of the proposed project may have a potentially significant impact with regards to level of service (individual or cumulative). The traffic increases would potentially affect Maplevue Street, SR 67 to Vine Street, Lake Jennings Park Road, and Blossom Valley Road to I-8 westbound ramp. The traffic increases may exceed a Level of Service (LOS) standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways. A traffic impact analysis will be prepared that will include a complete analysis of individual and cumulative effects. The results of the analysis and the determinations of significance will be discussed in the context of the Subsequent EIR.

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         |

The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

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

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

The proposed project will take access from El Monte Road. Adequate sight distance will be required for the proposed project based on County requirements. A sight distance study for the unobstructed intersectional sight distance looking along El Monte Road in both directions from the project entrances is required. The results of the sight distance study will be discussed in the context of the Subsequent EIR.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

During the extraction phases of the project, the site will have adequate emergency access since the ingress/egress will also have sufficient capacity to serve trucks carrying aggregate material. Subsequent to the operational phases, emergency access is not expected to be necessary since the site will serve as an open space park and no new development is proposed.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

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

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6766 Parking Schedule requires provision for on-site parking spaces. The project site contains enough area to provide the necessary parking to be consistent with the Ordinance; therefore, the proposed project will not result in insufficient parking capacity.

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

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

The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists since no hazards or barriers are proposed.

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

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

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

The project does not involve any uses that will discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). The employees of the operation will be provided portable toilettes, which will be managed by the owner and waste will be transported off-site. Therefore, the project will not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

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

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

The project does not involve new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities. However, the project proposes to expand water facilities since raw water that will be used to recharge the aquifer would come from the Helix No. 2 Pipeline, which delivers water from the San Diego County Water Authority's (SDCWA) Slaughterhouse Control Structure to the Levy Water Treatment Plant. The water would be delivered to the on-site spreading basins by an extension of the pipeline in Willow Road and T-connections to each basin. The pipeline extension is estimated to be approximately 15,000 feet. Extension of the pipeline may have significant adverse effects to biological and/or cultural resources. The potential effects associated with the construction and alignment of the water line will be discussed and evaluated in the Subsequent EIR.

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

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

The project does not propose the construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities. Therefore, the project will not result in significant environmental effects associated with stormwater facilities.

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

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

The project proposes to pipe-in raw water that will be used to recharge the aquifer. The untreated water would come from the Helix No. 2 Pipeline, which delivers water from the San Diego County Water Authority's (SDCWA) Slaughterhouse Control Structure to the Levy Water Treatment Plant. The water would be delivered to the on-site spreading basins by an extension of the pipeline in Willow Road and T-connections to each basin. It is estimated that no more than 1,300 acre-feet of untreated water per year will be needed until such time as Helix provides an alternative water source (potentially through a recycled water treatment facility in the future). Helix Water District has provided a letter dated June 1, 2007 stating that it has sufficient transmission pipeline capacity and that the volume of necessary raw water can be purchased from the SDCWA. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

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

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

The proposed project for mineral extraction and river restoration will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers' service capacity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

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

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

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. As a result of this evaluation, the project was determined to have potential significant effects related to sensitive species and habitat modification, impacts to riparian habitat and wetlands, wildlife corridors, and archaeological resources. While mitigation may be proposed that would reduce these effects to a level below significance, the specific measures and effectiveness of such mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unknown. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance and would require discussion and analysis of the above issues in the context of the Subsequent EIR.

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

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems. While mitigation has been proposed in some instances that reduce these cumulative effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance

and would require discussion and analysis of the above issues in the context of the Subsequent EIR.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact       Less than Significant Impact  
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects related to aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils, hazards, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation/traffic. The Subsequent EIR will evaluate potentially significant impacts and identify appropriate mitigation where feasible.

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

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

Archaeological Site Visit for CA-SDI-13,562 and CA-SDI-17,300 and Literature Review for El Monte Valley Nature Park Project San Diego County, California", dated June 2007, prepared by Rebecca McCorkle Aple with EDAW, Inc.

#### AESTHETICS

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative

Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

#### BIOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

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

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

#### HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

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

#### MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

#### NOISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### POPULATION & HOUSING

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

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

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

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

#### RECREATION

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

#### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.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](http://www.sandag.org))

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

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

#### UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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

ND01-08\9814016-ISF:jcr