at the plant is estimated at 96 acre-feet annually for this production rate. A single water truck would be required for dust control. Water required to suppress dust from the mining operations is estimated to require 74 acre-feet of water per year. Irrigation of the landscaping near the entrance and as supplemental water on revegetated areas is estimated to utilize approximately 54 acre-feet per year. Total water consumption for the project, including evaporation, is estimated at 227 acre-feet per year. Water for processing, dust control, and irrigation would be supplied by on-site groundwater wells.

Eight groundwater wells on the property currently provide irrigation water for the golf courses on the property. These wells would be used to provide water for the mining operation. Existing use of groundwater by the golf courses has been estimated at approximately 702 acre-feet per year based on pump ratings and irrigation schedules. Mining operations would significantly reduce this groundwater use. In addition, the project’s water requirement would be limited to 12 years for mining operations and reclamation period irrigation. Upon completion of mining and reclamation activities, the project would discontinue extracting water from the on-site wells. The reclaimed open space would consist of porous soils that would allow rainwater to infiltrate into the groundwater table. Therefore, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

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

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site through removal of material during mining operations. During mining, the project site would contain de-siltation basins that would prevent sediment from leaving the site while allowing water to pass through to existing drainage features. Mining and reclamation grading would direct runoff from the disturbed areas towards the basins.

The existing Sweetwater River channel would be avoided and silt fences would be installed five feet from the outer edge of each side of the channel. Additionally, as noted in IX.a, the project would be required to obtain a NPDES Industrial General Permit, which would outline ways to reduce pollutant discharges, including those related to erosion and sedimentation. Impacts associated with erosion and siltation would be less than significant during operations.

The Sweetwater River channel would be widened as a result of the mining activity. The channel and associated graded slopes would be established with native riparian and upland vegetation, which would stabilize soil and minimize the potential for erosion and siltation. The project analysis will include a Drainage/Hydrology Study to address drainage function of the site during mining activities and for the reclaimed project condition including analysis and discussion of
measures to prevent erosion and siltation. A summary of this analysis will be included in the EIR.

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

[ ] Potentially Significant Impact  [ ] Less than Significant Impact
[ ] Less than Significant With Mitigation  [ ] No Impact

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would significantly alter established drainage patterns of the project site through the alteration of Sweetwater River and extensive grading and excavation during mining activities; however, such alterations are not anticipated to substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff because the project would not increase the amount of impervious surface on site. Temporary impacts associated with runoff and flooding during mining activities will be evaluated in a hydrology study and discussed further in the EIR.

Upon completion of mining operations, the Sweetwater River channel would be widened. The project would not permanently increase impervious surfaces and would therefore not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The project analysis will include a Drainage/Hydrology Study to address drainage function of the site during mining activities and for the reclaimed project condition. A summary of this analysis will be included in the EIR.

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

[ ] Potentially Significant Impact  [ ] Less than Significant Impact
[ ] Less than Significant With Mitigation  [ ] No Impact

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not generate an increase in runoff water because the project would not increase the amount of impervious surface on site. Runoff from rain events during mining operations would be directed into de-siltation basins and then to existing drainage features. Temporary impacts associated with runoff during mining activities will be evaluated in the Drainage/Hydrology Study and discussed in the EIR.

Upon completion of mining operations, the site would be reclaimed to open space and would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Permanent long-term impacts would be less than significant.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

[ ] Potentially Significant Impact  [ ] Less than Significant Impact
[ ] Less than Significant With Mitigation  [ ] No Impact
Less Than Significant. During the project’s mining operations, potential pollutants, such as gasoline, lubricants, solvents, and oils associated with mining equipment maintenance, as well as sediment associated with grading and excavation activities, would be present on site. Proper BMPs and project design features, such as the on-site de-siltation basins, would be required to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable. Furthermore, as noted in IX.a., the project would be required to obtain a NPDES Industrial General Permit, which when implemented would prevent pollutants from entering receiving waters. Impacts associated with polluted runoff during mining activities would be less than significant.

Upon completion of mining operations, the site would be reclaimed to open space and would not provide substantial sources of polluted runoff. Permanent long-term impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

No Impact. The project does not include housing. No impacts would occur.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project site is within Regulatory Floodway Zone AE, within a special flood hazard area (Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] 2012). The project does not propose permanent structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. Impacts associated with the presence of temporary structures associated with the processing plant during mining operations will be fully analyzed and discussed in the Drainage/Hydrology Study and in the EIR.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project site is within a special flood hazard area and therefore has the potential to expose mine workers and equipment to risk during the project's
10-year mining operation period. Flood-related impacts during mining operations will be further analyzed and discussed in the Drainage/Hydrology Study and in the EIR.

I) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

i. Seiche

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

No Impact. The closest water body to the project site capable of producing a seiche is the Sweetwater Reservoir, located approximately 4.5 miles downstream to the southwest. Based on this distance, the project site is not at risk of inundation by seiche.

ii. Tsunami

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

No Impact. The project site is located over 14 miles from the Pacific Ocean. Based on this distance, the project site is not at risk of inundation by tsunami.

iii. Mudflow

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Mudflow is type of landslide. As described in Section VI.a.iv, there is no evidence of landslides at the site, and the risk associated with ground movement hazard due to landsliding is low (GEOCON 2019). Impacts would be less than significant.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide (or isolate) an established community?

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

No Impact. The project site is currently used as a golf course that is only available for use by visitors to the course. It does not provide pedestrian access through the site for nearby residents. The project site is currently bisected by Steele Canyon Road that connects Willow Glen Drive to communities along Jamul Drive and Campo Road to the south. During mining operations, no roadways would be closed or hindered, and access would be unchanged within the community. Similar to existing conditions, the site would remain unavailable for pedestrian use during mining activities. Following
reclamation of the site, community infrastructure such as trails would be provided for access to nearby residents. Impacts related to division or isolation of an established community would be less than significant.

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?

- [x] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant With Mitigation
- [ ] No Impact

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project requires approval of a Major Use Permit and Reclamation Plan to allow the proposed mining operations as required by the Zoning Ordinance, Grading Ordinance, and SMARA. Approval of a Major Use Permit requires certain findings to be made pursuant to Section 7358 of the Zoning Ordinance. Making findings for the proposed project will require the review of various goals and policies of the Valle de Oro Community Plan and General Plan, County ordinances and Board of Supervisors' Policies.

The site is currently designated as Open Space (Recreation) in the County General Plan and Valle de Oro Community Plan. No General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, or rezone is proposed or required as part of the project, as the project would remain as open space following mining operations. The site is currently zoned as S88 (Specific Plan), S80 (Open Space), and S90 (Holding Area). Extractive use is allowed within the S80 and S90 classifications if the Major Use Permit is approved.

Mining activity would be located within the S90 zone. This zone is intended to prevent isolated or premature land uses from occurring on lands for which adequate public services and facilities are unavailable, or for which the determination of the appropriate zoning regulations is precluded by contemplated or adopted planning proposals or by a lack of economic, demographic, geographic, or other data.

S88 zoning restricts extractive uses to site preparation, which allows the off-site removal of materials when it is secondary to the future use of the site. Within the two parcels zoned as S88, material would be removed from approximately 8.2 acres of the 32 acres (approximately 25 percent) in order to improve the channel; increase the area of native, riparian vegetation footprint; and construct community trails. Portions of the parcels not mined but within the project or Reclamation Plan boundary that are currently used by the golf course, would also be reclaimed and revegetated to a more natural condition. The part of the channel on these parcels is currently a choke point for water as it exits the property and the existing vegetation is dominated by invasive plant species. Expanding the channel at this location and revegetating the area would improve drainage and replace non-native, invasive species with native species. The end use for both parcels would be open space, consistent with the Specific Plan.

Full discussion of compatibility with land use plans, policies, and regulations will be provided in the EIR.
XII. 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
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact. Prior to 2017, the project site had two classifications as determined by the Generalized Mineral Land Classification Map for San Diego County (California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology 1996). Portions of the site were classified as areas of "Potential Mineral Resource Significance" (MRZ-3) and areas where information indicates that no mineral deposits are present (MRZ-1). However, a California Geological Survey special report reclassified the Cottonwood Golf Course to MRZ-2, which is defined as an area where “adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists” (California Geological Survey 2017).

The project proposes the extraction of aggregate sand, which is a known mineral resource that is of value to the region. The project would extract these resources for local uses, and therefore provides value to the region. Because the project proposes the extraction of the mineral resources as a needed material for various residential, commercial, and industrial uses, the material would not be “lost” for those uses. Therefore, because the project proposes extractive uses, impacts would be less than significant.

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
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

No Impact. As noted above, the project site is located in an area designated as MRZ-2 by the California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology. However, the project site is not a delineated mineral resource recovery site on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. In addition, because the project proposes the extraction of local mineral resources for various uses, the availability of the resources would not be “lost” for those uses. Therefore, the proposed project has no impact.

XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact
Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would generate noise from demolition, grading, excavation, materials handling, processing equipment, and traffic associated with mining and reclamation activities. The project would not, however, involve rock crushing or blasting, which are mining activities that generally produce high noise levels. Noise sensitive land uses (NSLU) that may be subject to noise generated by the project include residences located immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of the project site and to the north of the site across Willow Glen Drive. The project may expose the residential NSLU to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County Noise Ordinance. The County Noise Ordinance specifies that the one-hour average sound level limit applicable to extractive industries is 75 decibels (dB) at the property line regardless of the zone in which the extractive industry is located.

A Noise Technical Report will be prepared for the project to analyze noise levels associated with the project's mining activities and its compatibility with the 75-dB threshold. Analysis of noise generating sources and potential mitigation measures (if necessary) will be conducted, to identify potentially significant noise impacts to neighboring residential land uses. The analysis will also evaluate traffic noise levels associated with the project along roadways in the vicinity of the project site. This information will be fully discussed in the EIR.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project does not involve activities generally associated with high levels of vibration, such as blasting or pile driving. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on site or in the surrounding area.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The project may result in an increase in noise levels for 10 years during mining operations. Noise from excavation activities will migrate from west to east across the site over those 10 years as the phased mining progresses. However noise generation associated with aggregate processing and transportation will remain fairly constant to localized areas on and near the project site. All noise generating sources will be evaluated and analyzed in the Noise Technical Report and in the EIR. Following the completion of mining and reclamation activities, the project site would return to an open space use and would not generate noise.
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels during the 10-year mining operation period for the reasons stated above in the response to XII.c). Noise levels associated with mining operations would have the potential to exceed the applicable 75-dB noise limit set forth in the County Noise Ordinance and will therefore be analyzed in a Noise Technical Report, as discussed in Item XII.a, above.

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

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

**No Impact.** The nearest airport to the project site is Gillespie Field, located approximately 6.2 miles to the northwest. The project site is not within a noise contour associated with Gillespie Field (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 2010). Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive 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?

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

**No Impact.** The nearest private airstrip to the project site is the helipad associated with the Sharp Grossmont Hospital, located approximately 5.3 miles to the northwest. Based on this distance, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING** — Would the project:

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation
- No Impact
Less Than Significant Impact. Growth inducement is a change in physical circumstance or regulatory issues that would remove a restriction to or encourage an increase in human population or development. A project can be determined to have a growth-inducing impact if it directly or indirectly causes economic or population expansion through the removal of obstacles to growth, actions that are sometimes referred to as "growth accommodating."

The project does not propose the development of housing, businesses, or other components that would directly induce population growth. In addition, the nine mining employees that would be required for the project are anticipated to be from the existing population of the surrounding region. Additionally, aggregate mining operations respond to ongoing market demands of the construction industry, rather than creating such demand. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. One residential structure on site would be demolished by the project. This structure is severely dilapidated and is not occupied. Therefore, the project would not displace housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing. No impact would occur.

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

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

No Impact. As noted above, the residence located on site is not occupied; therefore, the project would not displace people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing. No impact would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
   i. Fire protection?
   ii. Police protection?
   iii. Schools
   iv. Parks?
v. Other public facilities?

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is served by the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District. The closest fire station to the project site, Station 22, is located approximately 0.3 mile to the north near the intersection of Brabham Street and Via Rancho San Diego. Mining operations at the project site are not expected to generate an increased demand for fire protection; the anticipated number of events requiring emergency response is anticipated to be very low. Therefore, the project would not affect fire protection response times or substantially increase demand. The construction of new fire facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not be required to serve the project.

The project site is served by the County Sheriff’s Department. The closest sheriff station to the project site, the Rancho San Diego Station, is approximately one mile to the west along Campo Road. The project does not propose uses that typically generate a demand for police protection services, such as a housing development. Limited police protection may be required during project operation if theft or vandalism of mining equipment or the project site were to occur; however, these types of events would not affect police protection response times or substantially increase demand. The construction of new police facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not be required to serve the project.

The project would not result in the introduction of a temporary or permanent population and would therefore not place increased demand on schools, parks, or other public facilities.

XVI. RECREATION – Would the project:

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not result in the introduction of a temporary or permanent population and would therefore not place increased demand on parks. The project would result in phased removal of an existing privately-owned golf course, where patrons pay to play. Although golf course closure would result in the loss of a private recreational resource, given the specific nature of the resource, its loss is not anticipated to result in an increased demand on neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The potential increased demand on other private golf course facilities is anticipated to be readily accommodated, and would result in the generation of additional revenues for the facilities to offset potential maintenance needs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would construct community trails in two parcels in the southeastern corner of the reclamation plan boundary that are included in the Rancho San Diego Specific Plan. Construction of the trails would be performed in conjunction with habitat enhancement activities that would involve improvements to the channel and expansion of riparian vegetation in an area currently dominated by invasive plant species. Construction of the trails is not anticipated to have an adverse effect on the environment; however, all ground disturbing activities proposed by the project will be addressed in the various technical reports for the project and in the EIR.

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** – Would the project:

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

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines) establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. These Guidelines incorporate standards from the County’s General Plan Mobility Element, the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program, and the Congestion Management Program.

The proposed project is anticipated to generate a total of 176 round trip haul truck trips, 28 employee vehicle trips, and 8 vendor vehicle trips on a given weekday. Trucking operations for material sales would occur during the week from 9:00 am to 3:30 pm to avoid peak traffic periods in the area. No material sales or trucking will occur on weekends. Employee and vendor trips are assumed to occur during commuter peak hours. Because haul trucks have a greater traffic impact than passenger cars due to their size, a passenger car equivalent (PCE) factor of 2.5 will be applied to the daily haul truck trip number. Project traffic would access the project site via the existing driveways along Willow Glen Drive, east of Steele Canyon Road, and a new driveway at the intersection of Willow Glen Drive and Muirfield Drive.

The project-generated increase in ADT may have impacts related to performance measures and measures of effectiveness of the circulation system, as adopted by the County’s General Plan Mobility Element. Project trips would be distributed on Mobility Element roadways in the County, some of which currently operate, or are projected to operate, at inadequate levels of
service. Therefore, the project would have the potential to cause a direct impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

The EIR will fully discuss and analyze transportation-related impacts on the effectiveness of the County's circulation system, and identify appropriate mitigation measures, based on the evaluation presented in a Transportation Impact Analysis report.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), of which the Congestion Management Program (CMP) is an element, to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced CEQA review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more ADT or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. Because the proposed project would not generate over 2,400 ADT or 200 peak hour trips, a CMP analysis is not required. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the applicable congestion management program, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The main compatibility concerns for the protection of airport airspace are related to airspace obstructions (building height, antennas, etc.) and hazards to flight (wildlife attractants, distracting lighting or glare, etc.). The closest airport to the project site is Gillespie Field, located approximately 6.2 miles to the northwest. The project site is not within the Airspace Protection Surfaces, including the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Height Notification Boundary or the Part 77 Airspace Surfaces, of Gillespie Field, and is therefore not subject to height restrictions or review. In addition, the project does not involve tall structures or other components that could cause airspace obstructions or hazards to flight. The project would result in no impact to air traffic patterns.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
Less Than Significant Impact. Access to the project site would be provided via driveways in western and eastern portions of the project site along Willow Glen Drive. In the eastern portion of the site, the two driveways and parking lot near the existing clubhouse would be modified to allow for safe and effective ingress and egress for vehicles associated with the project and ongoing golf activities during Phases I and II. The western driveway and parking area would be limited to use by the mining and processing operations, while the eastern driveway and parking areas would be limited to golf activities. The western parking area would include a looped haul-truck access road that would allow for efficient haul truck movements and avoid vehicle stacking within Willow Glen Drive.

A second access point for mining-related activities would be constructed at the intersection of Willow Glen Drive and Muirfield Drive to provide access to the western portion of the project site. This second access point is necessary because the bridge along Steele Canyon Road that traverses the project site has a clearance height of 11 feet, which is not sufficient to allow for passage by heavy trucks or off-road equipment. Intersections and driveways in both the eastern and western portions of the project site would be constructed with adequate sight distance. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. Operation of the project would occur within the project site boundaries and would not involve road closures. Steele Canyon Road, which traverses the project site, would remain functional during project operation. Although the project would generate an increase in on-road traffic in the form of haul trucks and worker commute vehicles, the increase is not expected to substantially disrupt travel along existing roadways in the project area. In addition, the proposed driveways near the existing clubhouse and at the intersection of Willow Glen Drive and Muirfield Drive would allow for sufficient emergency access to both the mining and golfing portions of the project site. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts would be less than significant.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?
Less Than Significant Impact. Bicycle lanes and sidewalks are currently present along Willow Glen Drive and bus stops associated with Metropolitan Transit System bus route 816 are present at the intersection of Willow Glen Drive and Jamacha Road. The project is not anticipated to disrupt these facilities or decrease their performance or safety. The project would not introduce a population to the area and would therefore not increase demand for bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native tribe, and that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register or historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

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

Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact. Numerous archaeological resources have been identified within a one-mile radius of the project site. Based on the cultural sensitivity of the project area, tribal cultural resources may be present on site and may be impacted during grading and excavation activities associated with the project’s mining operations. Therefore, the potential for impacts to tribal cultural resources will be evaluated in a Cultural Resources Survey Report. The County also will provide applicable noticing regarding the opportunity for Native American consultation. This issue will be fully discussed in the EIR.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

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

Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact. Wastewater generated by the project would be limited to temporary portable restrooms. Water used for mining operations would remain on site. Upon closure of the golf courses and decommissioning of the club house and associated wastewater-generating facilities, the amount of wastewater generated at the project site would likely decrease. Upon completion of mining and reclamation activities, the portable restrooms
would be removed, and the open space would not generate wastewater. Therefore, the project would not produce wastewater in a manner that would exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB; impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

No Impact. As discussed in Item XVII.a, above, the project would not generate a substantial amount of wastewater. In addition, water required for the project's mining operations, including water for material processing operations, dust control, and irrigation, would be provided by on-site groundwater wells. Therefore, the project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, and no impacts would occur.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact. During mining operations, the project would include on-site de-siltation basins that would accommodate runoff and prevent sediment from leaving the site while allowing water to pass through to existing drainage features. The construction of the de-siltation basins is not anticipated to cause significant environmental effects; however, all ground disturbing activities proposed by the project will be addressed in the various technical reports for the project and in the EIR. The project would not require or result in the construction of new off-site storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact. Water would be required during the project's mining operations for material processing, dust control, and irrigation. Water usage would depend on production volume, which would vary year-to-year with market demand; however, the project's estimated water usage assumes the maximum annual production of 550,000 tons. Water
usage is estimated at 96 acre-feet annually for this production rate. A single water truck would be required for dust control. Water required to suppress dust from the mining operations is estimated to require 74 acre-feet of water per year. Irrigation of the landscaped earthen berm near the entrance and as supplemental water on revegetated areas is estimated to utilize approximately 54 acre-feet per year. Total water consumption, including evaporation, for the project is estimated at 227 acre-feet per year. Water for processing, dust control, and irrigation would be supplied by onsite groundwater wells.

Eight groundwater wells on the property currently provide irrigation water for the golf courses on the property. These wells would be used to provide water for the mining operation. Existing use of groundwater by the golf courses has been estimated at approximately 702 acre-feet per year based on pump ratings and irrigation schedules. Mining operations would substantially reduce this groundwater use. In addition, the project's water requirement would be limited to the 10-year mining operation period. Upon completion of mining activities, the project would discontinue extracting water from the on-site wells. Therefore, sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project, and no new entitlements are needed.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☑ Less than Significant Impact
   Less Than Significant With Mitigation ☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Item XVII.a, above, the project would not generate a substantial amount of wastewater and would therefore not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's demand. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☑ Less than Significant Impact
   Less Than Significant With Mitigation ☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact. Solid waste generated by the project would include limited domestic refuse generated during the 10-year mining operation period and additional two years for final reclamation and revegetation. The amount of domestic refuse generated by nine employees would be minimal. Vegetative waste would be properly diverted to a green waste facility in accordance with the County Solid Waste Ordinance. Material extracted from the site not designated as saleable product would be utilized as backfill. Therefore, the project would not generate substantial amount of solid waste and 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?
Less than Significant Impact. Implementation of the project would generate minimal 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 21440 et seq.). The project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentration from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project would not contain project occupants that could be exposed to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire. However, the project EIR will evaluate whether the project could exacerbate wildfire risks that could expose surrounding occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire and propose mitigation measures as necessary.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
Less than Significant Impact: The project will not require installation of new infrastructure that would exacerbate wildfire risk.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Potentially Significant Impact: See questions e, f, j, and k above under Hydrology and Water Quality.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
Potentially Significant Impact. The project may have potentially cumulative impacts related to biological and cultural resources, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and transportation/traffic. The respective technical reports and EIR will include and discussion of project's potential to contribute to any 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. In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, IX Hydrology and Water Quality XII. Noise, XIII. Population and Housing, and XVI. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects related to these resource areas. Substantial adverse effects on human beings will be fully analyzed and discussed in the EIR.

XX. ATTACHMENTS

See Notice of Preparation Attachments

XXI. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UPDATE CHECKLIST FORM


California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Fish and Wildlife Code, Section 1600 et. seq.


California Environmental Quality Act, 2018 CEQA Guidelines.

County of San Diego. 2010. County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance – Biological Resources. Fourth Revision.
http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/ProjectPlanning/docs/Biological_Guidelines.pdf


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

Multiple Species Conservation Program MSCP Plan. 1998.
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PROJECT PHASING
Phase 1 will include site development for the construction of the access road, road grading, benching, grading, and water development.

Phase 2 will include the operation of the mining equipment, including the installation of the mining equipment, benching, and grading.

Phase 3 will include the reclamation of the disturbed land.
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DECLARATION OF RESPONSIBLE CHARGE
This project is performed by Cottonwood, LLC, 10550 E. 13th St., Suite 200, Broomfield, CO 80020, with Wayne W. Chang in charge.

EARTH PULSE QUANTITIES

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW
This project is reviewed by Cottonwood, LLC, with Wayne W. Chang in charge.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
The project is located in the Pajaro District, San Benito County, California.

PERMITS
This project requires a permit from the State of California, Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

CONTRACT
This project is contracted with Cottonwood, LLC, 10550 E. 13th St., Suite 200, Broomfield, CO 80020.
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SECTION B-B
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Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P. O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH #

Project Title: COTTONWOOD SAND MINING PROJECT

Lead Agency: COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
Contact Person: Robert Hingtgen
Mailing Address: 5510 Overland Ave., Suite 310
Phone: (858) 694-3712
City: San Diego Zip: 92123 County: San Diego

Project Location:
County: San Diego City/Nearest Community: Valley de Oro Community Plan / Rancho San Diego
Cross Streets: Willow Glen Drive and Steele Canyon Road Zip Code: 92019
Lat./Long.: 32° 44' 42" N / 116° 54' 48" W
Total Acres: 251

Assestor's Parcel No.: 22 APNs including 518-012-14 and 518-030-21
Within 2 Miles:
State Hwy #: SR-54, SR-94
Waterways: Sweetwater River
Airports: N/A Railways: N/A Schools: Jamacha, Vista Grande, Rancho San Diego, and Fuerte Elementary Schools,
Hillsdale Middle School, Valhalla and Steele Canyon High Schools

Document Type:
CEQA: [ ] NOP [ ] Draft EIR NEPA: [ ] NOI Other: [ ] Joint Document
[ ] Early Cons [ ] Supplement/Subsequent EIR [ ] EA [ ] Final Document
[ ] Neg Dec (Prior SCH No.) [ ] Draft EIS Other: [ ] Other
[ ] Mit Neg Dec [ ] FONSI

Local Action Type:
[ ] General Plan Update [ ] Specific Plan [ ] Rezone [ ] Annexation
[ ] General Plan Amendment [ ] Master Plan [ ] Prezone [ ] Redevelopment
[ ] General Plan Element [ ] Planned Unit Development [ ] Use Permit [ ] Coastal Permit
[ ] Community Plan [ ] Site Plan [ ] Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) [ ] Coastal Permit

Development Type:
[ ] Residential: Units Acres Employees [ ] Water Facilities: Type MGD
[ ] Office: Sq.ft. Acres Employees [ ] Transportation: Type
[ ] Commercial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees [ ] Mining: Mineral: Sand/Gravel: 5.7 million tons
[ ] Industrial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees [ ] Power: Type MW
[ ] Educational [ ] Waste Treatment: Type MGD
[ ] Recreational [ ] Hazardous Waste: Type

Project Issues Discussed in Document:
[ ] Aesthetic/Visual [ ] Fiscal [ ] Recreation/Parks [ ] Vegetation
[ ] Agricultural Land [ ] Flood Plain/Flooding [ ] Schools/Universities [ ] Water Quality
[ ] Archeological/Historical [ ] Geologic/Seismic [ ] Sewer Capacity [ ] Wetland/Riparian
[ ] Biological Resources [ ] Minerals [ ] Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading [ ] Wildlife
[ ] Coastal Zone [ ] Noise [ ] Solid Waste [ ] Growth Inducing
[ ] Drainage/Absorption [ ] Population/Housing Balance [ ] Toxic/Hazardous [ ] Land Use
[ ] Economic/Jobs [ ] Public Services/Facilities [ ] Traffic/Circulation [ ] Cumulative Effects

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:
Cottonwood Golf Course / S80 (Open Space), S88 (Specific Plan), and S90 (Holding Area) / Open Space (Recreation)

Project Description: (please use a separate page if necessary)
The project seeks approval of a Major Use Permit (MUP) and Reclamation Plan to conduct a sand mining operation on 251 acres of an approximately 280-acre property that has been and is currently known as the Cottonwood Golf Club. Sand mining would occur on approximately 214 of the 251 acres. Approximately 4.9 million cubic yards (CY) (7.05 million tons) of material would be extracted and processed, with approximately 3.8 million CY (5.7 million tons) of marketable aggregate produced for sale over a 10-year period. Extraction operations would be limited to a maximum production of 380,000 CY (570,000 tons) of construction grade aggregate per calendar year.

Note: The state Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.