MARK WARDLAW
Director

BETH A. MURRAY
Assistant Director

County of San Diego

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 110, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

January 31, 2013

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G)

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

   Premier Color Nursery Grading Permit; PDS2012-2700-15652, PDS2012-3910-1202002

2. Lead agency name and address:
   County of San Diego, Department of Planning & Development Services
   5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
   San Diego, CA 92123

3. a. Contact: Ashley Gungle, Project Manager
   b. Phone number: (858) 495-5375
   c. E-mail: ashley.gungle@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

   The project is located at 1404 Winterhaven Road within the Fallbrook Community Plan Area within the unincorporated area of San Diego County (APN 106-280-04).

   Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1027, Grid J/7

5. Project Applicant name and address:

   Premier Color Nursery LLC, John Forester, P.O. Box 1660, Fallbrook, CA 92088

6. General Plan

Community Plan:	Fallbrook
Land Use Designation:	Semi-Rural 1 (SR-1)
Density:	1 du/ acre
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	N/A

7. Zoning
   Use Regulation: A70 (Limited Agricultural)
   Minimum Lot Size: 1 acre
   Special Area Regulation: A, C

8. Description of project:

   The project is a Major Grading Permit for the balanced cut and fill of approximately 26,000 cubic yards of material. The project is located at 1404 Winterhaven Road within the Fallbrook Community Plan Area within the unincorporated area of San Diego County (APN 106-280-04). The site is subject to the General Plan Semi-Rural Regional Category, Semi-Rural 1 (SR-1) Land Use Designation. Zoning for the site is A70 (Limited Agricultural). The site is currently used as a wholesale container plant nursery, a use that would be retained and expanded by the current proposal. Access would be provided by an existing private driveway connecting to Winterhaven Road. The project would be served by imported water and would not require sewer services.

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

   Lands surrounding the project site are used for agricultural and single family residential uses. The topography of the project site and adjacent land is moderately to gently sloping.

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

Permit Type/Action	**Agency**
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB

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.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology & Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Haz. Materials	☐ Hydrology & Water Quality
☐ Land Use & Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Population & Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic	☐ Utilities & Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning & Development Services 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 & Development Services 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 & Development Services finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Ashley Gungle
Signature

January 31, 2013
Date

Ashley Gungle
Printed Name

Land Use/Environmental Planner
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

The project site is located near the intersection of Brook Road and Winterhaven Road which are not scenic roads. Based on a site visit by County staff, the proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and will not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. Therefore, the proposed project will not have an 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

Based on a site visit completed by County staff, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as gently to moderately sloping lands containing residential and agricultural uses.

The proposed project is a grading permit for an agricultural operation. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reason: the proposed grading permit will allow for the expansion of the existing agricultural operation which is consistent with the existing agricultural uses in the project vicinity.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: 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 create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site contains lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The project site contains an existing agricultural operation and grading proposed by this project will allow for the continuance and expansion of agricultural uses onsite. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is zoned A70 (Limited Agricultural), which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not to result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because a wholesale nursery and growing grounds is a permitted use in A70 zones and will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project site supports lands that are included as a part of a Williamson Act contract. However, the proposed use is for agriculture and is consistent with the allowed uses in the contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site including offsite improvements do not contain forest lands or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project is consistent with existing zoning and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones.

d) Result in the loss of forest land , conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of offsite forest resources.

e) 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and surrounding area contain active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The project site will be retained as an agricultural use and the proposed grading of the site will allow for the expansion of agriculture on the site. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes development that was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below the screening levels, and subsequently will not violate ambient air quality standards.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

The project proposes grading for the expansion of an existing agricultural operation. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation

of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM_{10}, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, as well as VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM_{10} and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance for VOCs and PM_{10}. The proposed project will not exceed this threshold.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants.

Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance for VOCs and PM_{10}, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM_{10}, or any O_3 precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

Based a site visit conducted by County staff on May 7, 2012, 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. Further, the proposed project will not generate significant levels of air pollutants. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a site visit by County staff, it has been determined that no native vegetation communities or habitats exist on or adjacent to the site because it has been completely disturbed. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species and would not contribute to cumulative impacts to these designated species.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: County staff conducted a site visit and as a result, staff has determined that the proposed project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as defined by the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations. In addition, no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community has been identified within or adjacent to the area proposed for off-site impacts resulting from road improvements, utility extensions, etc. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

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 With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit conducted by County staff, it has been determined that the proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos and a site visit by County staff, it has determined that the site has been completely disturbed and/or contains agricultural uses and contains no native vegetation or habitats. Therefore, the project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area

Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, building records, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Diane Buell, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. The property contains a house dating to 1944 that will not be impacted as a result of this project. A survey of the property occurred in 1989 (Joyner 1989) and no cultural resources were found onsite. In addition, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Diane Buell, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Diane Buell, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be there will be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-

induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have a less than significant 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as PeC (Placentia sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes) and FaC (Fallbrook sandy loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes) that have a soil erodibility rating of severe as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Stormwater Management Plan that includes Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site.

- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

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

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

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable. Furthermore, the project does not propose any grading or alteration of land. Therefore, the project will not produce unstable geological conditions. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are PeC (Placentia sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes) and FaC (Fallbrook sandy loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes). However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for grading for the expansion of an agricultural use. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. A regional GHG inventory prepared for the San Diego Region[1] identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

According to the San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory (2008), the region must reduce its GHG emissions by 33 percent from “business-as-usual” emissions to achieve 1990 emissions levels by the year 2020. “Business-as-usual” refers to the 2020 emissions that would have occurred in the absence of the mandated reductions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. SANDAG has prepared a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which is a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy identifies how regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible. The County of San Diego has also adopted Climate Change policies in the General Plan. *[Identify applicable policies and discuss how the project complies]*

In addressing the potential for a project to generate GHG emissions that would have a potentially significant cumulative effect on the environment, a 900 metric ton threshold was selected to identify those projects that would be required to calculate emissions and implement mitigation measures to reduce a potentially significant impact. The 900

[1] San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory: An Analysis of Regional Emissions and Strategies to Achieve AB 32 Targets. University of San Diego and the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC), September 2008.

metric ton screening threshold is based on a threshold included in the CAPCOA white paper[2] that covers methods for addressing greenhouse gas emissions under CEQA. The CAPCOA white paper references the 900 metric ton guideline as a conservative threshold for requiring further analysis and mitigation. The 900 metric ton threshold was based on a review of data from four diverse cities (Los Angeles in southern California and Pleasanton, Dublin, and Livermore in northern California) to identify the threshold that would capture at least 90% of the residential units or office space on the pending applications list. This threshold will require a substantial portion of future development to minimize GHG emissions to ensure implementation of AB 32 targets is not impeded. By ensuring that projects that generate more than 900 metric tons of GHG implement mitigation measures to reduce emissions, it is expected that a majority of future development will contribute to emission reduction goals that will assist the region in meeting its GHG reduction targets.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) states that an EIR shall analyze greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a proposed project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

The project is a grading permit and is expected to generate less than 900 metric tons of GHG emissions based on estimates of GHG emissions for various project types included in the CAPCOA white paper[3]. Emissions from the project will be generated from grading activities and vehicle trips. The project's GHG emissions are found to have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to GHG emissions because the project will generate less than 900 metric tons of GHGs.

Furthermore, projects that generate less than 900 metric tons of GHG, will also participate in emission reductions because air emissions including GHGs are under the purview of CARB (or other regulatory agencies) and will be "regulated" either by CARB, the Federal Government, or other entities. For example, new vehicles will be subject to increased fuel economy standards and emission reductions[4], large and small appliances will be subject to more strict emissions standards, and energy delivered to

---

[2] See CAPCOA White Paper : "CEQA &Climate Change: *Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act* " January 2008 (http://www.capcoa.org/rokdownloads/CEQA/CAPCOA%20White%20Paper.pdf).

[3] 900 metric tons of GHG emissions are estimated to be generated by 50 Single Family Residential units, 70 apartments/condos, 35,000 sf of general commercial/office, 11,000 sf of retail, or 6,300 sf of supermarket/grocery space.

[4] On September 15, 2009, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Transportation's National Highway Safety Administration (NHTSA) proposed a national program to reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel economy for new cars and trucks sold in the United States. The proposed standards would cut CO_2 emissions by an estimated 950 million metric tons and 1.8 billion barrels of oil over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program.

consumers will increasingly come from renewable sources[5]. As a result, even the emissions that result from projects that produce less than 900 metric tons of GHG will be subject to emission reductions. Likewise, the project would also participate in the mandated emissions reductions through energy and resource use that is subject to emission reduction mandates beyond "business-as-usual."

Therefore, it is determined that the project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. SANDAG has prepared a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which is a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy identifies how regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

To implement State mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The

[5] California's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) requires electric corporations to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources by at least 1% of their retail sales annually, until they reach 20% by 2010. In 2008, the governor signed Executive Order S-14-08 (EO) to streamline California's renewable energy project approval process and increase the state's Renewable Energy Standard to 33% renewable power by 2020. The Air Resources Board is in the process of developing regulations to implement the 33% standard known as the California Renewable Electricity Standard (RES).

County of San Diego has incorporated climate change policies into its General Plan. These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets.

VIII. 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 or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit and regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS) and does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

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

☐	Potentially Significant Impact	☒	Less than Significant Impact
☐	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) for the Fallbrook airport. However, the proposed project will not result in hazards to airport safety or surrounding land uses for the following reasons:

- The project does not propose construction of any structures.

Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

e) 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?

☐	Potentially Significant Impact	☐	Less than Significant Impact
☐	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☒	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

g) 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is completely surrounded by urbanized areas and/or irrigated lands and no wildlands are adjacent to the project. In addition, the proposed project includes grading for an agricultural operation and no new structures are proposed. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death.

h) 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by

County staff on May 7, 2012 there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

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

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes grading for an agricultural operation which requires completion of a Stormwater Management Plan. The project applicant has provided a copy of a Stormwater Management Plan which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the County of San Diego Watershed Protection Ordinance. The project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: a catch basin insert with hydrocarbon boom. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the Bonsall (903.12) hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit. As discussed in the Stormwater

Management Plan, according to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, this watershed is impaired for trash & debris and oil & grease.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: grading and agricultural uses. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: a catch basin insert with hydrocarbon boom.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego includes the following: San Diego Region, Order No. R9-2007-0001, (NPDES No. CAS 0108758); County Watershed Protection Ordinance; Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO); County Stormwater Standards Manual. The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. The Watershed Protection Ordinance has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit. The project lies in the 903.12 (Bonsall) hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; freshwater

replenishment; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: grading and agricultural uses However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: a catch basin insert with hydrocarbon boom.

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes grading for agricultural purposes. As outlined in the Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) dated December 2, 2013 and prepared by Raymond Escobar (Hunsaker & Associates), the project will implement site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons, based on a Hydrology Study prepared by Raymond Escobar with Hunsaker & Associates on July 24, 2012:

- Drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- The project will not increase water surface elevation in a watercourse with a watershed equal to or greater one square mile by one or more in height.

- The project will not increase surface runoff exiting the project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There are no existing or planned storm water drainage systems proposed by the project, nor does the project require such systems.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: trash & debris and oil & grease. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: silt fences, fiber rolls, desilting basin and catch basin insert with hydrocarbon boom. Refer to IX Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

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

ii. TSUNAMI

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

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. It has been 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. In addition, though the project does propose land disturbance that will expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

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

a) Physically divide an established community?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the General Plan Semi-Rural Regional Category and contains lands within the Semi-Rural 1 (SR-1) Land Use Designation. The project is also subject to the policies of the Fallbrook Community Plan. The property is zoned A70 (Limited Agricultural) which permits grading upon approval of a Major Grading Permit.

XI. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:
The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of "Potential Mineral Resource Significance" (MRZ-3).

However, the project site is surrounded by densely developed land uses including residential and agricultural land uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands or is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resources.

XII. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is an agricultural grading permit. Based on a site visit completed by County staff, the surrounding area supports residential and agricultural uses. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA) for single residences (including senior housing, convalescent homes), and 65 dBA CNEL for multi-family residences (including mixed-use commercial/residential). Moreover, if the project is excess of 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities as mentioned within Tables N-1 and N-2. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL . Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A70 that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50dB. The adjacent properties are zoned RR and A70 and have one-hour average sound limit of 50dB. Based on review by County staff the project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards,

which is 50dB, because the project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409
The project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.

3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level and will involve only temporary construction noise which will not exceed the limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports for the Fallbrook Airport. However, the project implementation is not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A). The location of the project is outside of the CNEL 60 dB(A) contours for the airport.

In addition, based on the list of past, present and future projects there are no new or expanded public airports projects in the vicinity that may extend the boundaries of the CNEL 60 dB noise contour. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise on a project or cumulative level.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

XIII. 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)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has a single family residence, which is to remain. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace any existing housing.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has a single family residence, which is to remain. The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people.

XIV. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XV. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobilehome park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation: The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines) establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. These Guidelines incorporate standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards and Mobility Element, the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program and the Congestion Management Program.

No Impact: The project will not result in any additional vehicle trips and will not alter the surrounding circulation system in any way, therefore the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation: The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) of which the Congestion Management Program (CMP) is an element to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced CEQA review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project's impacts on CMP system roadways, their associated costs, and identify appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on CMP transit performance measures are identified.

No Impact: The project does not propose any additional ADTs; therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with level of service standards, travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

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?

☐	Potentially Significant Impact	☒	Less than Significant Impact
☐	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The main compatibility concerns for the protection of airport airspace are related to airspace obstructions (building height, antennas, etc.) and hazards to flight (wildlife attractants, distracting lighting or glare, etc.). The proposed project is located within the Fallbrook Airport Influence Area. The proposed land uses are consistent with the allowable land uses identified for Airport Influence Area 2 within the ALUCP for the Fallbrook airport, therefore the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns because the allowable land uses within Airport Influence Area 2 are created for the purpose of ensuring ongoing airport safety, including maintenance of air traffic patterns. Furthermore, the project would not exceed the FAR Part 77 criteria related to airspace obstructions. Refer also to section VIII.e Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a significant impact on air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impedes adequate site distance on a road.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code, therefore, the project has adequate emergency access. Additionally, roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The proposed project includes grading for an agricultural operation. Project implementation will not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project will not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve any uses that will discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. Moreover, the project does not involve any landform modification or require any source, treatment or structural Best Management Practices for storm water. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve or require water services from a water district. The project is a grading permit that does rely on water service for any purpose.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project for a grading permit for an agricultural operation and 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for a grading permit for an agricultural operation and will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a grading permit for an agricultural operation and will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County. Therefore, compliance with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulation related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

XVIII. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. There is no substantial evidence that there are biological or cultural resources that are affected or associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Green Canyon North TM	2100-55531
FALLBROOK CLEARCREST LANE	3100-4803
CP#7502	3100-5214
CP#3446	3100-4905
LUNBERG, STAGG, JADUDI	3100-4378
BELL BROOK ESTATES PRD TM & TM/TE4830	3100-4830
CRUZ RESIDENTIAL LOT	3100-4628
CP#1174	3100-4731
J. R. FOX	3100-4831
FALLBROOK CLEARCREST LANE	3100-4803
CP#714	3100-4794
AVOWOOD SUBDIVISION TM4756 &STP88062	3100-4756
ELVIN STAHL PRD TM4714	3100-4714
TPM 20824	3200-20824
DIVIDE 4.8 ACRES INTO 3 LOTS	3200-19458
TPM21006	3200-21006
EGGER REVOCABLE FAMILY TRUST	3200-19527
BROWN & KARNAUSKAS	3200-19601
GORDON STEEL	3200-19534
3 LOT MINOR SUBDIVISION	3200-19879
FALLBROOK PRD	3300-87040
LAST STRAW FEED STORE	3300-90002
L PERMIT	4700-14439
TPM13392, URX530	4920-32453
2131 BROOKE RD / DRIVEWAY APPROACH	4920-33513
stage coach ln fallbrook pud	4920-87518

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 XVIII 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 is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, IX Hydrology and Water Quality XII. Noise, XIII. Population and Housing, and XVI. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XIX. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

Hydrology Study, prepared by Raymond Escobar or Hunsaker & Associates, dated July 24, 2012

Stormwater Management Plan, prepared by Raymond Escobar or Hunsaker & Associates, dated December 2, 2012

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 & Development Services. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ((www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

BIOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

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

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance,

Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted August 3, 2011. (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.

MINERAL RESOURCES

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

Subdivision Map Act, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)

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

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

NOISE

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

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

County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, effective August 3, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)

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

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

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

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

POPULATION & HOUSING

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

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

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

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

RECREATION

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority ALUCP'S http://www.san.org/sdcraa/airport_initiatives/land_use/adopted_docs.aspx

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

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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