



GARY L. PRYOR
DIRECTOR
(858) 694-2962

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

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

SAN MARCOS OFFICE
338 VIA VERA CRUZ • SUITE 201
SAN MARCOS, CA 92069-2620
(760) 471-0730

EL CAJON OFFICE
200 EAST MAIN ST. • SIXTH FLOOR
EL CAJON, CA 92020-3912
(619) 441-4030

March 26, 2004

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

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

GPA04-02; SP04-01; R04-004; TM5354; S04-005, 006 and 007; ER04-02-004;
Meadowood

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact Lori Spar, Environmental Planner II

b. Phone number: (858) 694--8838

c. E-mail: lori.spar@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project is located just east of I-15 at the S76 exit and Pankey Road, in the community planning area of Fallbrook within the unincorporated portion of the County of San Diego.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1029, Grid 5 and 6/A

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Latitude 33 Planning & Engineering
4933 Paramount Dr., 2nd Floor
San Diego, CA 92123

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:

Land Use Designation:

Fallbrook

18 (Multiple Rural) (Northern portion)

Density: 21 (Specific Planning Area (Southern sliver)
1 du/ 4, 8, 20 acre(s)

7. Zoning

Use Regulation: A70 (Northern portion)
S90 (Southern sliver)
Density: .5, .125 du/ acre(s)
Special Area Regulation: B

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

The application includes a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Specific Plan, Tentative Map and Site Plans relating to the proposed development of 390-acres to include multi and single-family residential lots totaling 1244 dwelling units. The application also includes proposed recreational parks and trails, biological open space, agricultural areas, and an elementary school with all associated roads.

General Plan Amendment, Rezone and Specific Plan

The General Plan Amendment (GPA04-02) proposal includes changes to the Land Use Designations applied to the site. The western 92 acres of the site, which are in the SSA, are in the (21) Specific Plan Land Use Designation. The eastern 298 acres, which are in the RDA, are in the (18) Multiple Rural Use Land Use Designation. The General Plan Amendment proposes to change the Land Use Designations to (21) Specific Plan Area with density of 3.2 dwelling units per acre.

The current zone on the western 92 acres is S90, Holding Area Use Regulations, which require a net minimum lot size of 20 acres. The current zone on the eastern 298 acres is A70, Limited Agriculture, Use Regulations, which require a net minimum lot size of 2 acres. The entire site is subject to the 'B' Special Area Regulations Designator, which requires review of the proposal pursuant to the I-15 Corridor Design Guidelines and the Fallbrook Design Guidelines for multi-family development. The rezone (R04-04) proposal is to change these Use Regulations to the S88, Specific Plan Area Use Regulations. No development designators are proposed.

The Specific Plan (SP04-01) proposes 393 single-family residential units, 124 single-family 'alley' residential units, and 727 multi-family units on about 185 acres of the 390-acre site. A school site is proposed on about 12 acres. Natural open space is proposed on approximately 126 acres. Active agricultural uses will remain on about 57 acres. The Specific Plan identifies 8 Planning Areas, with development designators to control development in each

Site Plans

The Vesting Site Plan (S04-005) proposes vesting development pursuant to Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.1201 through 81.1212.

The Site Plan S04-006 proposes setbacks to implement the 'V' Setback Designator that is proposed by the Specific Plan. The Site Plan proposes 10' setbacks from property lines for multi-family residential lots, and varying setbacks for residential development.

The Site Plan S04-007 has been submitted in order to demonstrate that the project has been designed in conformance with the 'B' Special Area Regulations Designator that covers the site.

Tentative Map

The tentative map application (TM5354) proposes 600 single-family residential lots and 644 multi-family units. Specifically, the proposal includes 393 single family residential lots ranging in size from 4,221 square feet to more than 15,000 square feet, 124 single family 'alley' residential lots ranging in size from 3,287 square feet to 5,000 square feet, 20 multi-family, condominium lots. Additionally, a school site lot, 6 open space lots, and 7 park lots are proposed.

The project will require annexation to the Rainbow Municipal Water District for water and sewer services. The North County Fire Protection District currently serves the project.

Off-site improvements are required for the extension of water and/or sewer lines.

The proposed grading for the project totals 2,500,000 cubic yards, including off-site grading required for proposed sewer line extension.

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

Surrounding land uses include undeveloped and citric and avocado groves. South of SR-76 is a residential community, southwest is a mobile-park development. West of the I-15 are small commercial areas, with the Pala Mesa village and Resort to the north.

Approximately 250-acres of the project site is currently agricultural operations with areas of native habitat on the steeper slopes within the northeastern areas, including Riversidian sage scrub, chaparral, non-native grassland, and a small area of oak woodland.

The project site is located within the upper San Luis Rey River flood plain.

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

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
General Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego
Site Plan	County of San Diego
Specific Plan	County of San Diego
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
Construction Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Groundwater Wells and Exploratory or Test Borings Permit	County of San Diego
Water Well Permit	County of San Diego
Annexation to a City or Special District	Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
State Highway Encroachment Permit	CalTrans
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Section 7 - Consultation or Section 10a Permit – Incidental Take	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
Air Quality Permit to Construct	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Industrial Storm water Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Rainbow Water District
Sewer District Approval	Rainbow Sewer District
School District Approval	Bonsall/ Fallbrook School Districts

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

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

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

LORI SPAR

Printed Name

Date

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

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways. The proposed project is located within Segment 4 of the I-15 Corridor Subregional Plan area. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying landcover, establish the visual environment for Segment 4 of the I-15 Corridor Subregional Plan area. The visual environment of the I-15 Corridor extends approximately 20 miles from the Escondido City limits to the Riverside County Line. It contains the ½ acre to 2 mile viewshed area on either side of the freeway, which is what generally can be seen while driving along the corridor. Segment 4 extends from West Lilac Road to Reche Road. It is uncertain whether this project, as proposed, would have a potentially significant adverse effect on the scenic highway. Therefore, a visual analysis will be conducted to identify and describe potential impacts to the adjacent scenic highway and adjacent properties from which the project can be viewed. The analysis will also propose mitigation, if necessary, to determine how any impact can be successfully reduced to a level below significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to I(a), above.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The area of the project site, east of Interstate 15, is undeveloped. The proposed project will change the visual character of the area because it proposes urban densities and intensities of use in an area where none exist. As discussed in (a) above, a visual analysis will be conducted to identify and describe potential impacts to the adjacent scenic highway and adjacent properties from which the project can be viewed.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located partially within Zone A as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 15 miles from the Palomar Observatory. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the Zone A lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

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

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

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project conforms to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna

observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Moreover, the project's additional outdoor lighting and glare is controlled and limits light pollution to the project site or directly around the light source and will not contribute to a cumulative impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code, in combination with the outdoor lighting and glare controls listed above ensure that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site has land designated as A70 and County of San Diego mapping applications has identified the site as having Farmland of Statewide Importance, as well as prime agricultural soils. Approximately 250-acres of the 360-acre project site is presently involved in the active production of agriculture, primarily citrus and avocado. The project proposes the development of 1244 residential units, both single and multi-family, retaining approximately 53-acres of the agriculture. The conversion of agricultural production to non-agricultural uses may result in a potentially significant impact to this resource. Therefore, an agricultural analysis will be required in the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site is partially zoned A70, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because single-family residential is a permitted use in the A-70 zones and will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project is proposing a rezone and general plan amendment to change the zoning to CUDA. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to II(a), above.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes a General Plan Amendment and Rezone in order to increase allowable density within the project site. This development was not anticipated in SANDAG growth projections that were used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project may result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. Therefore, because the proposed project may conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP, an air quality analysis must be prepared and included in the EIR in order to identify

potentially significant impacts to air quality. Likewise, the analysis shall address the project's contribution to a cumulatively impact.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

The project has the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of air quality standards or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, primarily related to construction operations, and operational emissions. Therefore, the project is required to provide an air quality analysis and discuss the project's potential impacts in the EIR and supporting air quality analysis.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. Although, 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 could result in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions above the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3.

The EIR will address whether the project will result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Based a site visit conducted by Lori Spar on February 19, 2004, 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; however, the proposed project is proposing the construction of an elementary school and may generate significant levels of air pollutants due to increased operational activities, especially from the four lane major road that is proposed to run adjacent to the school. As such, the project could expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants. Therefore, the air quality analysis shall address carbon monoxide hot spots and other potentially significant impacts to sensitive receptors as a result of any increased pollutant concentrations.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The site is known to support several sensitive habitats, including Riversidian Sage Scrub, Chaparral, and Non-Native Grasslands, which have the potential to support endangered, threatened animal species. Additionally, the project site contains sensitive soils, which have the potential to support endangered, threatened, or rare plant species.

Pursuant to CEQA, and the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) (in addition to state and federal laws), impacts to listed, or otherwise rare species must be minimized and often avoided entirely. In order to evaluate these impacts, biological surveys must be completed during the appropriate time period for the plant and wildlife species listed below by biologist(s) with demonstrable knowledge in field detection of the subject species (focused surveys for Federally listed species shall be in compliance with USFWS protocol, when such protocol exists, and must be done by a USFWS permitted biologist).

Spring plant surveys and biological surveys must be completed for the following:

<i>Taxidea taxus</i>	American badger
<i>Bufo microscaphus californicus</i>	Arroyo toad
<i>Amphispiza belli belli</i>	Bell's sage sparrow
<i>Nyctinomops macrotis</i>	Big free-tailed bat
<i>Elanus caeruleus</i>	Black-shouldered kite
<i>Athene cunicularia hypugea</i>	Burrowing owl
<i>Salvadora hexalepis virgultea</i>	Coast patch-nosed snake
<i>Charina trivirgata roseofusca</i>	Coastal rosy boa
<i>Accipiter cooperi</i>	Cooper's hawk
<i>Piperia cooperi</i>	Cooper's rein orchid
<i>Eumeces skiltonianus interparietalis</i>	Coronado skink
<i>Chaetodipus californicus femoralis</i>	Dulzura California pocket mouse
<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	Golden eagle
<i>Holocarpha virgata elongata</i>	Graceful tarplant
<i>Ammodramus savannarum</i>	Grasshopper sparrow
<i>Eumops perotis californicus</i>	Greater western mastiff bat
<i>Lycaena hermes</i>	Hermes copper
<i>Eremophila alpestris actis</i>	Horned lark
<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	Loggerhead shrike
<i>Perognathus longimembris brevinasus</i>	Los Angeles little pocket mouse
<i>Danaus plexippus</i>	Monarch butterfly
<i>Felis concolor</i>	Mountain lion
<i>Crotalus ruber ruber</i>	Northern red diamond rattlesnake
<i>Chaetodipus fallax fallax</i>	Northwestern San Diego pocket mouse
<i>Cnemidophorus hyperythrus</i>	Orange-throated whiptail
<i>Brodiaea orcuttii</i>	Orcutt's brodiaea
<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>	Pallid bat
<i>Harpagonella palmeri</i>	Palmer's grappling hook
<i>Nyctinomops femorosaccus</i>	Pocketed free-tailed bat
<i>Aimophila ruficeps canescens</i>	Rufous-crowned sparrow
<i>Coleonyx variegatus abbottii</i>	San Diego banded gecko
<i>Lepus californicus bennettii</i>	San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit
<i>Neotoma lepida intermedia</i>	San Diego desert woodrat
<i>Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei</i>	San Diego horned lizard
<i>Diadophis punctatus similis</i>	San Diego ringneck snake
<i>Acanthomintha ilicifolia</i>	San Diego Thornmint
<i>Accipiter striatus</i>	Sharp-shinned hawk
<i>Anniella pulchra pulchra</i>	Silvery legless lizard
<i>Onychomys torridus ramona</i>	Southern grasshopper mouse
<i>Odocoileus hemionus</i>	Southern mule deer
<i>Dipodomys stephensi</i>	Stephen's kangaroo rat
<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i>	Townsend's big-eared bat
<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	Tricolored blackbird

<i>Cathartes aura</i>	Turkey vulture
<i>Myotis yumanensis</i>	Yuma myotis

Therefore, based on the fact that the site supports and/or has the potential to support several endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats the project may have a potentially significant impact on biological resources. As such any potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats must be addressed in the EIR and the biological technical study and surveys.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Due to the site's proximity to the San Luis Rey River, the site may support wetland habitats and wetland buffers that were identified by a review of the application material, and County mapping applications. If it is determined that the project site does support wetland habitats and/or buffers, after the completion of a Biological Technical Study and wetland delineation, the project must be in conformance with the wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance. As proposed the project may significantly impact potential wetlands and wetland buffers and may not conform to the wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance. Impacts to any wetlands and wetland buffers and conformance with the Resource Protection Ordinance must be demonstrated in the EIR and the biological technical study and surveys.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The site may contain drainages that potentially meet state and/or federal definitions of wetland habitat. If impacted, these drainages may result in significant alterations to known watersheds or wetlands that may be considered California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and would potentially require a Section 1603 "Streambed Alteration Agreement" and/or 404 Permit. Impacts to these potential wetlands or watersheds may not be avoidable and as a result may be a significant and unmitigable impact, unless mitigation alternatives can be proposed. Therefore, all significant drainages and wetland areas must be defined and addressed in the EIR and the biological technical study and surveys.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Potential wildlife corridors may exist on the project site. Specifically, open expanses of sage scrub and chaparral connecting to undeveloped neighboring sites could support wildlife linkages and/or corridors. The current project design may potentially impact these areas and may create additional indirect impacts through increased noise, lighting and activity. The wildlife corridors may be vital in linking off-site open space preserves. Impact to the corridors may be significant with the current project design. Therefore, any potentially significant impacts to wildlife dispersal corridors must be discussed in the EIR and the biological technical study and surveys.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The EIR will address the project's 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).

The EIR will address all impacts to sensitive habitat and biological resources providing an analysis and recommendation for mitigation in order to assure compliance with County ordinance.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Archaeological/ historical resources have been identified within a mile radius of the site and the site has the potential to support significant archaeological/ historical resources. Additionally, there may be a number of archeological sites on the property of which the historical significance is unknown. Therefore, an archaeological/historical survey must be completed to analyze whether the proposal will grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site. The results of these surveys must be discussed in the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History, combined with available data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations of cretaceous plutonic, which have low resource potential. Low resource potential is assigned to geologic formations that, based on their relative young age and/or high-energy depositional history, are judged unlikely to produce important fossil remains. Because the geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources, it has been determined that the proposed development of

the project site would have a less than significant impact on paleontological resources.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

It is unknown at this time whether archaeological resources are present that could contain interred human remains. Therefore, the archaeological/historical survey and EIR must include a section that discusses the potential for interred human remains and analyze whether the proposal will impact this resource.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site is not located within hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. However, review of the site's geology shows that it is relatively close to active and potentially active seismic areas of the County (namely the Elsinore Fault Zone). The project will be developed on steep slopes that may become unstable in the event of seismic activity. Additionally, the entire site is comprised of soils that are categorized by the Soil Survey of San Diego County as "Severely or Moderately Erodible". Some of the geologic effects created by poorly protected severely erodible soils can range from altering natural drainage features to creating environments suitable for landsliding and rockfall. A Geotechnical Evaluation must be completed in order to determine the potential impacts created by the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, rockfall, or landslides. The results of the Geotechnical study must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Preliminary review of the site's geology shows that it is relatively close to active and potentially active seismic areas of the County (namely the Elsinore Fault Zone). The project will be developed on steep slopes that may become unstable in the event of seismic activity. Additionally, the entire site is comprised of soils that are categorized by the Soil Survey of San Diego County as "Severely or Moderately Erodible". Some of the geologic effects created by poorly protected severely erodible soils can range from altering natural drainage features to creating environments suitable for landsliding and rockfall. Therefore, the project may result in significant adverse effects to people or structures from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of this project. A Geotechnical Evaluation must be completed in order to determine the potential impacts created by the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, rockfall, or landslides. The results of the Geotechnical study must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Preliminary review of the site's geology shows that it is relatively close to active and potentially active seismic areas of the County (namely the Elsinore Fault Zone). Alluvial deposits underlie the southern portion of the site. These deposits are within a river valley and, therefore, are also within an environment that has a relatively high groundwater table. Therefore, the project may result in significant adverse effects to people or structures from a known area susceptible to ground failure. A Geotechnical Evaluation must be completed in order to determine the potential impacts created by the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, rockfall, or landslides. The results of the Geotechnical study must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

iv. Landslides?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Preliminary review of the site's geology shows that it is relatively close to active and potentially active seismic areas of the County (namely the Elsinore Fault Zone). The project will be developed on steep slopes that may become unstable in the event of seismic activity. Additionally, the entire site is comprised of soils that are categorized by the Soil Survey of San Diego County as "Severely or Moderately Erodible". Some of the geologic effects created by poorly protected severely erodible soils can range from altering natural drainage features to creating environments suitable for landsliding and rockfall. Therefore, the project may result in significant adverse effects to people or structures from a known area susceptible to landslides. A Geotechnical Evaluation must be completed in order to determine the potential impacts created by the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, rockfall, or landslides. The results of the Geotechnical study must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as follows:

Soil Type	Abbr	Erosion Index
Wyman loam, 9 – 15% slopes	WmD	Moderate 2
Wyman loam, 2 – 5 % slopes	WmB	Moderate 2
Arlington coarse sandy loam, 2 - 9% slopes	AvC	SEVERE 16
Las Posas stony fine sandy loam, 2 – 9% slopes	LrG	SEVERE 1
Las Posas fine sandy loam, 9 – 15 % slopes, eroded	LpD2	Moderate 2
Las Posas fine sandy loam, 15 – 30% slopes, erodes	LpE2	Moderate 1
Fallbrook sandy loam, 15 – 30% slopes, eroded	FaE2	SEVERE 16
Ramona sandy loam, 5 – 9% slopes	RaC	SEVERE 16
Cieneba very rocky coarse sandy loam, 30	CMrG	SEVERE 1

- 75% slopes		
--------------	--	--

A majority of these soils have SEVERE erodibility and as proposed the project may result in unprotected erodible soils, may alter existing drainage patterns, may be located in a wetland or significant drainage feature, and may develop steep slopes. Even though the project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations, the project may result in significant erosion. Therefore, erosion potential must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

As discussed above in Section a) i-iv, the project may result in significant adverse effects to people or structures from a known area susceptible to landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, or liquefaction. A Geotechnical Evaluation must be completed in order to determine the potential impacts. The results of the Geotechnical study must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Soil Type	Abbr	Shrink/ Swell
Wyman loam, 9 – 15% slopes	WmD	Moderate
Wyman loam, 2 – 5 % slopes	WmB	Moderate
Arlington coarse sandy loam, 2 - 9% slopes	AvC	Low
Las Posas stony fine sandy loam, 2 – 9% slopes	LrG	HIGH
Las Posas fine sandy loam, 9 – 15 % slopes, eroded	LpD2	HIGH
Las Posas fine sandy loam, 15 – 30%	LpE2	HIGH

slopes, erodes		
Fallbrook sandy loam, 15 – 30% slopes, eroded	FaE2	Moderate
Ramona sandy loam, 5 – 9% slopes	RaC	Moderate
Cieneba very rocky coarse sandy loam, 30 – 75% slopes	CMrG	Low

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. Although, the project will be required to comply with the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils, the project could result in significant risks due to the proposed grading of 2,500,000 cubic yards. Therefore, risk potential must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project is for the development of 1,244 dwelling units comprised of both single and multi-family residences. The project is proposing annexation to the Rainbow Municipal Water District for sewer service. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Although the project proposal includes an elementary school within the project site, the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

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

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. The project has the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project is neither within a fire district, nor within the sphere of influence of a fire district and will require annexation. The EIR must address the availability of fire protection services and discuss what protections will be used to serve the proposed development. The project shall comply with all regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County and Appendix II-A, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, or building permit process. Additionally, the EIR must address whether the project will contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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. lagoons, 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 Lori Spar on February 19, 2004 there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not expose people to significant risk of injury or death involving vectors.

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

- a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposed project is a single-family and multi-family home residential development and not anticipated to violate waste discharge requirements; however, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. Therefore, compliance with waste discharge requirements must be discussed as part of the EIR and Stormwater Management and Maintenance Plan.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project lies in the Bonsall hydrologic sub-area (903.12) and the Pala hydrologic sub-area (903.21), of Lower San Luis hydrologic area, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit. According to the 2002 CWA Section 303(d) list there are no impaired water bodies within the project hydrologic sub-area; however, in general, the San Luis Rey watershed is impaired for coliform bacteria as a result of urban runoff, agricultural runoff, and domestic animals wastes. As proposed, the project could contribute additional pollutants to the San Dieguito hydrologic unit.

The EIR and Stormwater Management and Maintenance Plan must discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMP's and/or treatment BMP's that will be employed as required by the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO). Additionally, the EIR must discuss how 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the

existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Bonsall hydrologic sub-area (903.12) and the Pala hydrologic sub-area (903.21), 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.

As proposed, the project could cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses

Therefore, the EIR and Stormwater Management and Maintenance Plan must discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMP's and/or treatment control BMP's that will be employed as required by the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO). Also, the EIR and Stormwater Management and Maintenance Plan must discuss how potential pollutants will be reduced in any 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project is proposing to use onsite groundwater resources for agricultural and landscape irrigation. This is will be a water intensive use within the County and may result in the overdrafting of the local groundwater system. These potential significant effects will be discussed as a part of the EIR along with a supporting Groundwater Investigation.

Additionally, the project is proposing that Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD) **needs for the 1,244 homes will meet the residential water**¹. Currently, Meadowood Specific Plan Area is outside the service boundary of RMWD and is partially within the San Luis Rey Municipal Water District. Prior to service, the project must annex into the District and provide all necessary facilities. A Water Study will be needed in order to determine if RMWD's allocation of imported water is sufficient to meet the needs of the project. Therefore, at this time, the water availability from imported sources is not known. These potential significant effects will be discussed as a part of the EIR along with a supporting Water Study for imported water availability.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Although the project must include measures that will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), The proposed project could substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The project could have an adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff because it could propose to change or accelerate flow in the watercourse. Therefore, the EIR and supporting hydrology analysis must address any substantial drainage impacts that may occur as a result of the project including but not limited to erosion, siltation, and runoff, both on-site and off-site.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

¹ EDIT?

The proposed project could 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. The project could have an adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff because it could propose to change or accelerate flow in the watercourse. Therefore, the EIR and supporting hydrology analysis must address any substantial drainage impacts that may occur as a result of the project including but not limited to hydraulics/hydrology, flooding, and runoff, both on-site and off-site.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project is not anticipated to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems, however, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, existing or planned storm water drainage systems must be discussed as a part of the EIR, Stormwater Management and Maintenance Plan and supporting hydrology analysis.

- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes known potential sources of polluted runoff as a result of construction activities, as well as increased impervious surface from driveways and roads.

Therefore, the EIR and Stormwater Management and Maintenance Plan must discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMP's and/or treatment control BMP's that will be employed as required by the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO). Also, the EIR and Stormwater Management and Maintenance Plan must discuss how potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the

maximum extent practicable such that the project will not result in any substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Drainage swales, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site. The EIR shall address whether residences or other structures are proposed within the floodplain and discuss impacts and associated mitigation related to this potential impact.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to VIII(i), above.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project lies within a special flood hazard area as identified on the County Flood Plain Map. Hazardous effects may be attributed to project elevations, erosion and sedimentation hazards that could result in a potential flooding hazard. The EIR shall address flood prevention measures to reduce the potential for people or property to be exposed to flooding.

l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

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

ii. TSUNAMI

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

iii. MUDFLOW

Refer to VI(a)(iv), above.

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

a) Physically divide an established community?

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

The project proposes to introduce either new infrastructure such as major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. However, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community for the following reasons: The new water supply and sewer treatment infrastructure will not be located so as to create physical barriers within the vicinity. Therefore, the project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
|--|---|

- Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

The applicant has prepared a discussion of the project's consistency with the General Plan and Fallbrook Community Plan as part of the General Plan Amendment Report and Specific Plan. There may be potential conflicts with environmental plans and/or policies adopted by the County of San Diego. The EIR will address all applicable environmental plans and policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project and discuss all potentially significant conflicts.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of "Identified Mineral Resource Significance" MRZ-2. The Pankey Ranch was classified by petition submitted under the provisions of the Act in 1989 (DMG Open – File Report 89-15). The classification report concluded that the area is comprised of high quality aggregate resources. Additionally, as stated with the report, the primary objective of mineral land classification is to assure that the significance of the mineral resources is recognized and considered before land-use decisions that could preclude mining are made. The site is also located within an alluvial river valley that has a significant source of replenishment.

A Geologic Report will be required to evaluate the projects proposed land use (a residential subdivision) and its compatibility with the land's current classification, MRZ-2 and to determine if the project will result in the future inaccessibility of these regionally significant aggregate deposits. The results of the geologic report must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Identified Mineral Resource Significance” MRZ-2. The Pankey Ranch was classified by petition submitted under the provisions of the Act in 1989 (DMG Open – File Report 89-15). The classification report concluded that the area is comprised of high quality aggregate resources. Additionally, as stated with the report, the primary objective of mineral land classification is to assure that the significance of the mineral resources is recognized and considered before land-use decisions that could preclude mining are made. The site is also located within an alluvial river valley that has a significant source of replenishment.

A Geologic Report will be required to evaluate the projects proposed land use (a residential subdivision) and its compatibility with the land’s current classification, MRZ-2 and to determine if the project will result in the future inaccessibility of these regionally significant aggregate deposits. The results of the geologic report must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project is the development of a residential community of approximately 1244 new dwelling units comprised of single and multi-family homes. The project proposes a 4-lane major road bisecting the southern portion of the project. Additionally, the project site is adjacent to S76 and located along the I15 corridor and within ¼ mile from an extractive operation. The project could 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. A noise analysis must be completed and included in the EIR to address potential impacts and recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce any such impacts to a level below significant, if necessary.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes development of a residential community comprised of both single and multi-family homes, as well as an elementary school. The project proposes the construction of a four lane major road that will traverse the southern half of the project site, running adjacent to the elementary school that will connect SR-76 to I-15, the result of which could be excessive groundborne vibration and/ or noise levels. This issue shall be addressed in the noise analysis and the results be included in the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: 4 lane major road bisecting the lower portion of the property site, as well construction related noise. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project could 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. A noise analysis must be completed and included in the EIR to address potential impacts and recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce any such impacts to a level below significant, if necessary.

The project could also result in cumulative noise impacts. A list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity will be evaluated in the noise analysis and EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to construction related activities including blasting, crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, and grading.

General construction noise may exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. The noise analysis and EIR will address construction operations including permitted hours of operation.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project involves the annexation of sewer and water service to the Rainbow Municipal Water District which will require the extension of sewer and water pipes into a previously unserved area. This extension would provide increased capacity beyond existing conditions and may result in additional build out beyond the proposed project resulting in growth above that anticipated by the General Plan and zoning designations because of the increased capacity. Therefore, the associated growth inducing impacts from the annexation and extension must be analyzed in the EIR.

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

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

The property currently has 4 houses, which will be removed. Potentially a total of 1,244?? single-family and multi-family dwellings will exist when the project is developed.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The property currently has 4 houses, which will be removed. Potentially a total of 1,244 single-family and multi-family dwellings will exist when the project is developed. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause

significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposed project could result in the need for significantly altered school, police, park, and fire services or facilities. Specifically, the North County Fire Protection District (NCFPD) has stated that the project does not reside within the current jurisdictional boundaries of the NCFPD; however the project site is within the district's sphere of influence and annexation to the district is required. The NCFPD is further requiring a vegetation management plan addressing on-going vegetation clearance and management. The EIR shall address the availability of public services, the process for annexation and an analysis of the vegetation management plan.

XIV. RECREATION

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes 1,248 single and multi-family residential dwelling units. Parks are proposed, as well as payment of PLDO fees. However, the project proposal for parks does not meet the goals and objectives of the Public Facility Element. This must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project includes construction of on-site parks and trails. The physical effect on the environment as a result of this construction shall be included in the EIR.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposal may result in a potential degradation of the Level of Service (LOS) of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity. A traffic impact analysis is required to assess all potentially significant impacts related traffic volumes and road capacity on SR-76 and other County roads. The traffic impact analysis shall address ADT generated by the project, impacts, if any, on the Level of Service of affected County roadway segments and intersections. Additionally, The results of the traffic impact analysis shall also be discussed in the context of the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Although, road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards, the proposed project may alter traffic patterns, roadway design, and place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways due to agriculture that will remain on-site. Site distance studies at all driveways and intersections shall be included in the EIR's traffic analysis.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

As proposed, the project relies on a single access point. Although additional access points are proposed, they are not presently existing and the applicant has not provided evidence that the site has legal access via those points. In addition, development of those access points is contingent on an adjacent development and a mechanism to implement construction of the coordinated access points between that project and this proposal has not been defined. The EIR shall provide discussion and analysis of emergency access, providing mitigation and/or changes in the project design in an attempt to reduce any impacts to below significant.

e) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

For single-family residences, the Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

For multi-family units, the Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires provision for on-site parking spaces based upon the types of dwellings proposed. The project description provides an analysis for the total parking requirement for the proposed project, which is consistent with the requirements of the Parking Schedule. Therefore, the proposed project is providing adequate on-site parking.

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6766 Parking Schedule requires provision for on-site parking spaces. The project is consistent with the Ordinance for total parking requirements; therefore, the proposed project will not result in insufficient parking capacity.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The proposal may result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any potential impacts to pedestrians or bicyclists must be discussed as a part of the traffic impact analysis and the results of this analysis should also be discussed in the context of the EIR.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project facility availability form has been received from Rainbow Municipal Water District that indicates that district is currently unable to serve the project. The district is requiring the completion of a sewer study, the conclusions of which must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to XVI(a), above.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project involves new and/or expanded storm water drainage facilities. The new and/or expanded facilities include biofilters. Although a Storm Water Maintenance and Management Plan will be approved for the project by the Department of Public Works, the project may construct new storm water facilities that could result in adverse physical effects on the environment. Therefore, the EIR shall address all storm water related impacts from the proposed project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes annexation to the Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD); however, approvals have not yet been received. Additionally, the RMWD is requiring the completion of a water study, the results of which must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The project will require annexation to the Rainbow Municipal Water District for sewer facilities. A Service Availability Letter has been provided, indicating that a sewer study must be performed prior to service. The results of this study and analysis relating to whether adequate wastewater service capacity will be available to serve the project's demand must be included in the EIR.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. As a result of this initial study, potential significant effects related to habitat modification, impacts to riparian areas and/ or wetlands, wildlife corridors, historical and archeological resources and interred human remains will be analyzed in the context of the EIR.

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
|--|---|

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to the following resources: aesthetics, agriculture, air quality, biology, cultural/ historical, geologic, hydrology, mineral, noise, public services, traffic, and utilities. A list of past, present and future project will be provided and a detailed analysis will be included in the context of the EIR to address these potentially significant cumulative impacts.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to XVII(a) and (b), above.

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

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

AESTHETICS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

BIOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17

- Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)
- Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.
- Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)
- Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)
- HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**
- American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government
- California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)
- California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.
- California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>)
- County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)
- County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.
- Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.
- National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)
- National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)
- San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- LAND USE & PLANNING**
- California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)
- California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

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

MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

NOISE

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)

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

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)

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

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

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

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

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcountry.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.