County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

DARREN GRETLER
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

September 11, 2014

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

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

   North County Environmental Resources (NCER) Recycling Facility; PDS2008-3500-08-015; PDS2013-BC-13-0019; Environmental Review Number PDS2008-3910-08-08-012

2. Lead agency name and address:

   County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
   5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
   San Diego, CA 92123-1239

   a. Contact Beth Ehsan, Project Manager
   b. Phone number: (858) 694-3103
   c. E-mail: Beth.Ehsan@sdcounty.ca.gov

3. Project location:

   25568 Mesa Rock Road in the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area (Twin Oaks Sponsor Group Area), within unincorporated San Diego County
   Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1109, Grid 3/E

4. Project applicant name and address:

   Arie DeJong, Hilltop Group Inc
   807 E Mission Rd
   San Marcos, CA 92069

5. General Plan

Community Plan:	North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan
Land Use Designation:	High Impact Industrial (I-3)
Density:	N/A
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	N/A

6. Zoning

Use Regulation:	M54
Minimum Lot Size:	N/A
Special Area Regulation:	B (review by the I-15 Design Review Board)

7. Description of project:

The project is a recycling facility for tree waste chipping and grinding; wood and construction debris ("C&D wood"); and concrete, asphalt and inert demolition debris (CDI) in the northern unincorporated area of San Diego County within the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area.

The project site is located at 25568 Mesa Rock Road immediately west of I-15, north of State Route 78 (SR-78). Regional access is provided by I-15 and local access to the site is provided by a private easement road via Mesa Rock Road. The project site encompasses six commonly owned separate parcels of real property identified as San Diego County Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 187-100-23, 187-100-31, 187-100-33, 187-100-35, 187-100-37, and 187-100-38. A boundary adjustment is proposed between APNs 187-100-35 and 187-100-37. Combined, the project site totals 139.5 gross acres (135.6 net acres). The proposed NCER Recycling Facility would be constructed on the 35.5-acre parcel in the southeast corner of the site.

In the late 1960's and early 1970's California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) initiated and completed the construction of I-15 utilizing a portion of the project site as a "borrow pit" during construction of I-15. These excavated areas are located in two locations; the primary location is located in the southeastern portion of the project site adjacent to the west side of I-15, and a smaller area is located just west of the center of the property. Topographically, the site is in an easterly valley surrounded on the north, west, and south by steep slopes between 100 to 500 feet above the proposed site pad elevation. The site is approximately 80 feet above the elevation of I-15 to the east. Due to its isolated location, the site has been subjected to unauthorized dumping, vagrant camps, and other illegal activity. The current owners, which include the applicant, cleaned up the property and secured the perimeter.

Project Objectives

Twenty to thirty percent of the waste that goes to landfills in San Diego County is construction and demolition debris. This amounts to approximately 100,000 tons annually for the unincorporated areas of the County and approximately 700,000 tons countywide (County of San Diego 2014). Reusing and recycling CDI debris reduces landfill solid waste disposal and contributes to compliance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act (CIWMA) of 1989. Title 6, Division 8, of the San Diego County

Code of Regulatory Ordinances was amended in 2007 to establish the Construction and Demolition Materials Diversion Program in the unincorporated area of the County. The County program is intended to increase diversion of construction and demolition materials from landfills, conserve landfill capacity, extend the useful life of local landfills, and to aid in compliance with the State's IWMA waste diversion requirements (County of San Diego 2007). The objectives for the proposed NCER Recycling Facility project are as follows:

- Increase recycling activity and reduce landfill use in the waste management stream of San Diego County.
- Localize production of reusable and recycled building materials for use in local or regional residential, commercial, and industrial construction projects.
- Re-use local resources to foster local economic development.
- Support and advance key policies of the County General Plan associated with diverting solid waste from landfills, encouraging recycling, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions (compliance with AB32).
- Contribute to a reduction in waste hauler emissions by reducing truck trips to landfills.

Project Components

The proposed NCER Recycling Facility would engage in three forms of recycling: (1) chipping and grinding of trees and logs; (2) the recycling of wood and construction debris (C&D wood); and (3) the recycling of concrete, asphalt, and inert material from demolition projects (CDI debris). The NCER Recycling Facility will not engage in composting, or accept solid waste. Only pre-sorted, non-contaminated wood and construction debris would be accepted for processing. The proposed project consists of a 12,000-square foot steel building, 100,000 gallon water tank, a security, and truck scales. The recycling facility would be built on the 35.5 acre parcel in the southeast portion of the site. The facility would operate six days a week, Monday through Saturday, from 5:00 AM to 7:00 PM.

The proposed project would also establish an open space easement onsite, protecting 44.1 acres of natural habitat. The open space easement will serve to visually separate the project site from "Bear Rock," a local landmark.

Timeline of Processing Materials

A typical load of incoming material would enter the facility and stop on the inbound truck scale. The driver would be required to provide proper documentation of the load materials location, source, generator, and hauler. The load would then be weighed, inspected and documented by a trained receiving employee, and relocated to the receiving area where product would be unloaded into a receiving container. Raw material would be held in storage in order to collect a sufficient amount of source material to supply the processing equipment. When sufficient input debris is available, the process equipment would then begin processing the materials and placing finished product in either onsite storage containers, or transport containers. Per CCR Title 14 (14CCR), CDI debris would have to be processed within 15 days of receipt.

Tonnage of Materials

As proposed, the NCER facility would likely be categorized as a Medium Volume CDI facility, regulated by 14CCR, Division 7, Chapter 3.0, Article 5.9 Section 17383.5. A separate permit would be required for the proposed tree waste processing: Compostable Materials Chipping and Grinding permit or the equivalent permit at the time of opening. NCER is anticipated to ship approximately 48 tons per day (15,000 net tons annually) of finished product. The daily maximum combined tonnage of C&D wood debris and/or CDI debris allowed under 14CCR Section 17381(t) for Medium Volume CDI facilities is 174 tons. Storage volumes vary from process and output volumes due to the maximization of process equipment. For example: if the facility receives one load per day of CDI raw materials and the process equipment needs four loads to operate, then on the fourth day four loads would be processed at once; even though the facility's average input and output reflects one load per day in and one load per day out. The processed concrete and asphalt can only remain on-site for up to one year, and on-site storage is limited to 5,220 tons (174 tons x 30 days). Records of all incoming and outgoing tonnages will be maintained on-site at the administrative offices for LEA review

Storage of Materials

The proposed project would require approximately twenty onsite adjustable storage containers. Onsite storage containers would be 60 feet wide by 60 feet long by 18 feet tall. The project would also require approximately 80 transport containers to move the finished product off the property. The transport containers would be 22 feet long by 8 feet wide by 7 feet tall. All storage and transport containers would be moveable. At a Medium Volume CDI facility, all incoming feedstock must be processed within 15 days from date received. C&D mulch resulting from C&D wood debris chipping and griding may be stored up to 90 days from date of processing. Other CDI debris that has been processed and sorted for resale or reuse may be stored up to 12 months from date of processing. Per current regulations, compostable materials must be processed and removed from the site within 48 hours of receipt, or up to seven days with LEA approval.

Process Equipment

The different forms of recycling identified above require different processes and, in some cases, require different kinds of equipment. Each waste stream would have its own set of equipment. However, processing would be performed outdoors in the same process area as identified on the Figure 3-3, Plot Plan. Maintenance of process equipment would be conducted inside the building.

The machinery necessary for wood debris and tree waste recycling include the following: one front end wheel loader (Caterpillar 928 or equivalent), one grinder (Doppstadt AK535 or equivalent), one tub grinder (Morbark 1600 or equivalent), one trommel screen (Vermeer TR510 or equivalent), and two small conveyer/stackers to move finished product into storage containers.

The machinery necessary for processing concrete and asphalt include the following: one front end wheel loader (Caterpillar 928 or equivalent), one crusher (Powerscreen® Trakpactor 250 or equivalent), one shaker screen (Spyder 512T or equivalent), and two small conveyer/stackers to move finished product into the storage area. This equipment requires APCD review and permitting.

Each form of recycling that the facility would engage in is described in further detail below.

Wood Debris Recycling

Wood debris (C&D) could be processed to produce woodchips, mulch, or into a usable form to create chipboard or middle-density fiberboard (MDF). The processed wood product would then be sold wholesale to potential markets within San Diego County and potentially to surrounding counties (e.g., suppliers of chip groundcover, commercial landscaping contractors, or manufacturers of lumber products). Sources of wood debris would be construction recycling contractors and demolition contractors. The materials would be delivered to the proposed NCER Recycling Facility by the individual or contractor supplying the materials, or by NCER approved haulers. Prior to unloading at the NCER facility, loads would be weighed, inspected for contamination, and source documentation would be checked. No public dumping would be allowed and all incoming materials would be under contract with the hauler and or the producing individual or contractor.

Acceptable and Unacceptable Materials

The following list of acceptable materials would be permitted at the proposed NCER Recycling Facility:

- Non-treated common lumber
- Plywood, particle board, or chip board
- Furniture and millwork waste

The following list of unacceptable materials would not be permitted at the proposed NCER Recycling Facility:

- Treated lumber
- Lead based painted wood
- Asbestos materials
- Treated wood waste
- Hazardous materials

Materials with Lead, Asbestos, Oil Products, Treated Lumber, Creosote, or hazardous materials would not be accepted at the site. These materials would be rejected at the entrance upon inspection by trained employees. When salvaging wood from a structure built before 1978, there is the potential that the paint contains lead and most homes built before 1960 are likely to contain lead-based paint. Paints produced before 1960 contain higher concentrations of lead than paints produced in later years. If the lumber

is painted, it may not be accepted or may have to be tested for lead content at salvage, milling, reuse, or wood processing facilities (CalRecycle 2014).

The proposed facility would not accept painted woods from sites constructed before 1960 and would require clean test documentation for any wood construction materials from structures built between 1960 and 1978. Building Construction dates would be required for receiving construction wood materials.

The wood C&D materials would be unloaded at a designated inspection area where the load can be properly assessed for safety and contamination. Potential sources of asbestos contamination in wood include certain reflective paints, overspray of acoustic ceiling material or insulating / fireproofing material onto the wood, and asbestos-containing floor tile adhered to a wood floor. When deemed safe, a wheel loader would be used to load the raw materials into a grinder where materials would be hammered or chipped to the desired output size. The material would then go through a trommel screen which sorts the material into multiple sizes, and outputs product onto separate conveyer belts where the finished product would be stock piled in appropriate containers or covered retrieval bays.

Tree Waste Chipping and Grinding

The Compostable Materials Chipping and Grinding portion of the operation would accept tree branches and trimmings, logs and large tree debris. Leafy material would not be accepted. Sources of tree debris would be arborists and tree removal contractors. Products and markets from tree debris would be the same as for construction wood. Excluding green leaves and limiting time on-site would reduce the potential for composting to occur onsite. Because Compostable Materials Chipping and Grinding is permitted separately from CDI recycling, tree waste would be kept entirely separate from construction wood, using separate equipment, separate storage bins, and careful record keeping to ensure the respective timelines are met. If construction wood were to be mixed with tree waste, the more restrictive requirements would apply.

Concrete and Asphalt Recycling

The proposed NCER Recycling Facility would also process demolition-related concrete and asphalt for reuse as road base. A blend of clean concrete and asphalt would be desired to create the proper granular makeup for California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Class 2 Aggregate Road Base. The road base could be sold wholesale to Caltrans, contractors, or other parties with the proper resale license, for roadway improvement projects. The source concrete and asphalt would come from general engineering, demolition, and paving contractors. Similar to the process described above, incoming materials would be delivered to the facility by the individual or contractor supplying the materials, or by NCER approved haulers. Prior to unloading, truck loads would be weighed, inspected for contamination, and source documentation would be checked.

Acceptable materials include "Type A Inert debris," which includes, but is not limited to, concrete (including fiberglass or steel reinforcing bar embedded in the concrete), fully

cured asphalt, glass, fiberglass, asphalt or fiberglass roofing shingles, brick, slag, ceramics, plaster, clay and clay products. Type A inert debris is waste that does not contain soluble pollutants at concentrations in excess of water quality objectives and has not been treated in order to reduce pollutants. The DEH, upon consultation with the State Water Resources Control Board, will determine on a case by case basis whether materials not listed in this subdivision qualify as Type A inert debris (CCR Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 5.9 Section 17381). The materials would be unloaded in an inspection area where the load can be properly assessed for safety and contamination. This is important because asbestos could be present in mastics and floor tiles adhered to the concrete, asbestos-containing transite pipe could be embedded in concrete, and in rare circumstances asbestos may have been added to the concrete itself for special applications (bridges, tower foundations, pools). A wheel loader would be used to load the raw materials into a crusher where materials would be hammered or chipped to the desired output size. The material would then go through a shaker screen which sorts the material into multiple sizes, and outputs product onto separate conveyer belts where the finished product would be stock piled in appropriate containers or covered retrieval bays.

Hazardous Load Check Program

The management would be responsible for implementing the necessary actions plans and reporting and/or hiring the necessary parties to perform the cleanup and disposal of any contaminated materials that are brought to the site. Inspection and Safety Training protocols and programs would be updated annually and kept in the administrative office. All employees would be professionally trained and equipped to identify sources of contamination. Employees would be trained in the Emergency Safety Incident Response Protocols for mitigating any event where contaminants are identified. Receiving inspectors (employees) would be trained to identify and equipped with lead testing kits to test any painted materials in question.

To identify hazardous wastes brought to the facility, the facility would conduct visual load checks for each truck load brought to the site prior to unloading. Each incoming load would be visually inspected for hazardous waste, e-wastes, questionable waste, and unacceptable items. Entry to the NCER facility will prominently display signage stating what wastes are not acceptable, and that all loads are subject to search. All NCER supervisors, equipment operators, and employees will be trained in the recognition of hazardous waste or suspicious loads, including being trained as Certified Asbestos Consultants. Supervisors and select employees would be trained in the handling, containment, and storage of hazardous waste, as well as use of personal protective equipment and required reporting procedures.

Source material will be generated from permitted construction sites. Permit numbers and source documentation must be provided prior to NCER receiving materials. The federal Asbestos NESHAP requires an asbestos survey be performed prior to demolition of regulated facilities; however, there are many residential structures that fall outside of this survey requirement, primarily single family homes, duplexes, and small apartment buildings. These structures could still be contaminated with asbestos. Furthermore, there are frequent cases where surveys were not performed on regulated

structures in violation of the Asbestos NESHAP. Therefore, all materials accepted at the recycling facility must be accompanied by a copy of an asbestos survey, performed by a CAC, documenting that no asbestos is present. This requirement would apply to all sources, not just the ones under the scope of the federal Asbestos NESHAP.

Inspections of loads will be conducted by the receiving inspector. If any potentially contaminated material is identified, management will be notified, and materials will be tested with onsite testing kits. If the result is positive or unable to identify, a state licensed remediation service provider will be contacted to remove contaminated materials, and it will be documented on file within the administrative office. Materials shall not be moved onsite once identified as potentially contaminated to prevent cross contamination of clean materials. Inspection and Safety Training protocols and programs will be updated annually and kept in the administrative office.

Integrated Pest Management

The proposed project would adopt an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Plan for the buildings and grounds associated with the project site. IPM is an approach that establishes a sustainable approach to managing pests by combining biological, physical, and chemical tools in a way that minimizes economic health and environmental risks. The IPM Plan outlines procedures to be followed to protect the health and safety of staff and visitors from pests and pesticide hazards.

The Chief Operating Officer (COO) or designee would be proposed project's IPM Coordinator and be responsible to implement the IPM Plan and to coordinate pest management-related communications between NCER, its landlords, service providers, and staff. The IPM Coordinator would be responsible to annually notify employees and enforcement agency of the facility, requesting notification of planned and emergency applications of pesticides in facility buildings and on facility grounds. The NCER facility will maintain records of all service provider visits and pest control treatments for at least three years. Information regarding pest management activities would be made available to the public at the facility's administrative office. Requests to be notified of pesticide applications may also be made to this office.

All pesticide storage, transportation, and application will be conducted in accordance with the requirement of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 United States Code136 et seq.), Environmental Protection Agency regulations in 40 CFR, Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, NCER policies and procedures, and local ordinances. No person shall apply, store, or dispose of any pesticide on NCER-managed property without an appropriate pesticide applicator license. All pesticide applicators will be trained in the principles and practices of IPM and the use of pesticides approved for use by the local enforcement agency and NCER. All applicators must comply with the IPM policy and follow appropriate state and local regulations and label precautions when using pesticides in or around NCER facilities.

<u>IPM Strategies</u>

Pest management strategies may include education, exclusion, sanitation, maintenance, biological and mechanical controls, and pre-approved, site-appropriate pesticides. The following IPM strategies will be implemented:

1. Minimize import of materials with sources known to harbor pests.
    a. Source site approval prior to receiving materials.
    b. Appropriate training of receiving inspector to identify pests.
    c. Certification of woods from known host locations (eg. Pine bark beetle from forest woods).
    d. Check AWM's website http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/awm/ monthly for updated quarantine information and do not accept logs or tree waste from quarantined areas.
2. Identify onsite pest species.
3. Estimate pest populations and compare to established action thresholds.
4. Select the appropriate management tactics based on current on-site information.
5. Assess effectiveness of pest management.
6. Keep appropriate records for a minimum of three years.

Odor Management

The proposed NCER Recycling Facility would prepare and implement an Odor Impacts Minimization Plan (OIMP) according to Title 14 California Code of Regulations Division 7, Chapter 3.1 17863.4. The main sources of potentially odor-carrying particles would be from wood grinding and chipping operations should anaerobic decomposition begin. The OIMP would require approval by the LEA.

Lighting for Outdoor Operations

Lighting for outdoor operations would adhere to the County's guidelines for industrially zoned areas. No lighting would be directed toward residential areas or open space areas. All structures and equipment would consist of non-reflecting material or would be painted with non-reflective paint. Typical lighting required would be low mounted, downward casting and shielded lights that do not cause spillover onto adjacent properties and motion detection systems would be utilized where feasible. No flood lights would be utilized. Lighting on the process equipment would be self-contained on the apparatus. Additionally, lighting would be limited to the areas that would operate during night-time hours; with all recycling operations and truck trips limited to between 5:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Furthermore, the proposed project would comply with the site design and lighting standards as identified in the I-15 Corridor Subregional Plan and listed below.

1. Site lighting shall minimize emission of light rays into both the night sky and neighborhood properties, especially as it pertains to the Mt. Palomar Observatory.
    a. Site lighting shall be limited to that necessary for security, safety, and identification, and shall be integrated with project landscape design.
    b. Excessive building or site lighting for decorative purposes shall be discouraged.

2. Site lighting plans that conflict with the character of the community shall be discouraged.

Project Construction

Construction of the proposed NCER Recycling Facility would begin in 2017 and be completed in 2018. Grading activities will take six months. Construction activities will occur Monday through Friday between the hours of 6:00 am and 5:00 pm. Earthwork would consist of 96,000 cubic yards of cut and 182,000 of fill, for a net import of 72,000 cubic yards.[1] The entire graded pad will be used for storage and all construction debris will be stored in metal containers. During construction of the proposed project, the project could generate as many as 44 truck trips per day for all the necessary import haulage required by the project.

Construction would require two loader/tractors, two water trucks, a dozer, two scrapers, and a grader. Blasting and rock crushing would require one hoe ram, two rock drills, and a small crushing facility. Blasting and crushing is anticipated for some isolated portions of the site. Blasting related activities are not anticipated to exceed 30 days.

Approximately 20 acres would be graded for five pads and an access road to be used for processing and storing recycling materials. The access road to the recycling facility would be a 24-foot wide paved road in a 60-foot private road easement off Mesa Rock Road through five of the commonly owned parcels. During grading, the existing concrete pad with patio cover (634 square feet) and septic system would be removed. The existing trailer (480 square feet) would be relocated onsite prior to grading and would be occupied for security purposes during the duration of construction activities. There are six permitted wells onsite and the wells that are not in use would be capped at ground level during construction.

Temporary water would be supplied by an onsite tank during the construction of the facility for dust control and fire suppression. A 100,000 gallon water tank for site fire suppression and for filling water trucks would be constructed early in the project timeline followed by installation of utilities and paving. Paving would include a large entryway and improved private access road for traffic to the project site. Street improvements for ingress and egress, and construction of a 12,000 square foot steel building would follow. Installation of a septic system, site improvements, construction of retaining walls, landscaping, and screen planting would complete construction of the proposed facility.

General Plan and Zoning Designation

The project site is within the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area. The project site's General Plan land use designation is High Impact Industrial (I-3). The project site's zoning designation is General Impact Industrial Use (M54), and these regulations "are intended to create and preserve areas where manufacturing and

[1] These figures are based on a 15% bulking factor applied to the cut volume.

industrial uses not having high nuisance characteristics may locate (County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance, updated through 2/14)." According to the Zoning Ordinance, Section 2542(b), recycling facilities are expressly permitted on land zoned for M54 uses. Additionally, pursuant to County Zoning Ordinance Section 6975(a)(2)(ii), light recycling operations, such as those proposed at NCER, "may be conducted outside of buildings if the property on which the facility is located does not abut a property zoned or planned for residential use." The proposed project qualifies as a light recycling facility and with the approval of the boundary adjustment, will not be adjacent to residential property. In compliance with Zoning Ordinance section 6975, the facility shall have no more than an average of two outbound truck shipments of material per day. For this reason, the project does not require a plan amendment, zone change, or use permit.

Regulatory Requirements

The proposed NCER Recycling Facility operations would be required to comply with a broad range of applicable regulations related to waste handling, air quality, water quality, noise, and hazards, identified below in Table 1. Some regulations require subsequent permits and regular inspections, some would be implemented through the conditions of approval for the project's administrative permit (easements or design requirements), and some would be required by future circumstances (complaints related to dust or noise).

Table 1
Applicable Regulations

Applicable Regulations
General
CCR Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 3.0, Article 6.2 Sections 17407.2-17407.4, 17408.5-17409.1, 17409.4, 17409.5
CCR Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 5.0, Article 3.0, commencing at Section 18100.
CCR Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 3.0, Article 5.9 commencing at Section 17380
CCR Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 3.0, Article 6.1, Sections 17406.1, 17406.2
CCR Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 3.0, Article 6.3, Sections 17414
CCR Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 3.0, Article 6.35, commencing at Section 17415.1
County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance Section 6975
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 68.508-68.518 (Construction and Demolition Recycling Ordinance)
Aesthetics
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 86.601-86.608
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 59.101-59.115
County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance Sections 5200-5212
County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance Sections 5750-5758
County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance Sections 5900-5910
County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance Section 6320
County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance Section 6322
County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance Section 6324
Air Quality
Federal Clean Air Act
California Assembly Bill 32 Section 38500
Senate Bill 375
SDAPCD Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS)
California State Implementation Plan (SIP)

13 CCR 2449, 2449.1, 2449.2, 2449.3 (diesel regulations for off-road equipment)
13 CCR Division 3, Article 4.5, Chapter 1, 2025 Regulation for In-Use Heavy-Duty Diesel-Fueled Vehicles
Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Chapter I, Subchapter C, Part 60, Subpart IIII: New Source Performance Standards for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines
CCR Title 13, Division 3, Chapter 9, Article 5, Commencing at section 2450: Portable Equipment Registration Program
CCR Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 7.5, Section 93115: Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Stationary Compression Ignition Engines
SDAPCD Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 52: Particulate Matter
SDAPCD Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 54: Dust and Fumes
SDAPCD Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 69.4.1: Stationary Engines – Best Available Retrofit Control Technology
CCR Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 7.5, Section 93116: Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Portable Engines Rated at 50 HP and Greater
SDAPCD Regulation II: Permits; Rule 10: Permits Required
SDAPCD Regulation II: Permits; Rule 20.1: New Source Review—General Provisions
SDAPCD Regulation II: Permits; Rule 20.2: New Source Review—Non-Major Sources
SDAPCD Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 50: Visible Emissions
SDAPCD Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 51: Nuisance
SDAPCD Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 55: Fugitive Dust
SDAPCD Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 67.0: Architectural Coatings
SDAPCD Regulation XII: Prohibitions; Rule 1200: Toxic Air Contaminants—New Source Review
Biological Resources
Federal Endangered Species Act
Migratory Bird Treaty Act
Federal Water Pollution Control Act
California Fish and Game Code
California Endangered Species Act
County of San Diego Board of Supervisors Policy I-123
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 67.801-67.814
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 86.601-86.608
Hydrology and Water Quality
Federal Clean Water Act
Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations
Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
California Assembly Bill 3030
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 67.701-67.703, 67.710-67.711, and 67.702-67.722
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 67.801-67.814
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 86.601-86.608
County of San Diego Code of Regulations, Title 8, Division 7, Sections 87.414 and 87.417
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 9424
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 9426
SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001
Noise
California Noise Act Sections 46000 through 46080
California Streets and Highway Code Sections 215.5-216.5
County of San Diego Ordinance Title 3, Division 6, Chapter 4, Sections 36.401-36.435
San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code Section 3301.2
County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance Section 6306-6314
Greenhouse Gas
CCR Title 24, Part 6

California Assembly Bill 1493
Executive Order S-3-05
Executive Order S-01-07
Senate Bill 97
Senate Bill 375
Senate Bill 1368
Senate Bill 1078
Western Regional Climate Action Initiates
Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
International Fire Code
Emergency Planning Community Right-to-Know Act Sections 301-312
Hazardous Materials Transportation Act
Government Code Section 65962.5
California Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.95
California Health and Safety Code, Sections 116110-116112
CCR Title 14, Division 1.5
CCR Title 22, Chapter 6.5
CCR Title 27
Senate Bill 1889
California Fire Code Title 24, Chapter 9
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 68.401-68.406
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 96.1.005 and 96.1.202
County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code
Fire Prevention in Project Design Standards
Traffic
County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance Sections 6750-6799
County of San Diego Public Road Standards
County of San Diego Private Road Standards
County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code Section 902.2
County of San Diego Ordinance No. 77.201-77.220
County of San Diego Board of Supervisors Policy J-36
2030 Regional Transportation Plan
County of San Diego Congestion Management Plan

According to State regulations, CDI debris consists of specific types of solid waste that present a different potential threat to public health and safety, and the environment than green waste or typical municipal solid waste, thus, can be handled with different regulatory oversight.

The LEA inspects facility operations monthly to verify compliance with minimum standards. To the greatest extent possible, all inspections are unannounced and conducted at irregular intervals. The operator specifies the operation's boundary area in the operating record. The prescribed defensible open space would be inspected and maintained on an annual basis prior to the common high fire season.

8. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is located in an area of steep native habitat, generally surrounded by semi-rural residential development, vacant land, and agriculture. The surrounding

terrain peaks to the east and south of the site and slopes downhill to the I-15, which runs along the east side of the site. An island of City of Escondido jurisdiction is adjacent to the project site to the southeast.

9. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Implementation of the project may require that the Applicant obtain approval, permits, licenses, certifications, or entitlements from various federal, state, and other local agencies, including but not limited to those listed in Table 2.

Table 2
Discretionary Approvals Required

Discretionary Approval/Permit	Agency Description	Agency Status	Notes/Explanation
Certificate of Compliance	County of San Diego	Lead Agency	Must show compliance with all county required documentation.
Boundary Adjustment	County of San Diego	Lead Agency	Boundary adjustment between APNs 187-100-35 and 187-100-37.
LEA Permit	County of San Diego	Lead Agency	County of San Diego Solid Waste LEA Permit. LEA is the designated enforcement agency for CalRecycle for the unincorporated areas of San Diego County.
Construction and Encroachment Permit(s)	County of San Diego	Lead Agency	Construction and encroachment permits are required for work performed within the County's road right-of-way.
Grading Permit	County of San Diego	Lead Agency	All grading within the County of San Diego must be completed in accordance with approved plans and permits.
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego	Lead Agency	Required for installation of onsite septic tank.
Habitat Loss and Incidental Take (HLIT) Ordinance Permit	County of San Diego	Lead Agency	Issuance of a permit or approval authorizing the disturbance or removal of coastal sage scrub.
License, Easement, Entry Permit, Encroachment Permit, Land Sale, Land Exchange, or Other Similar Action	County of San Diego	Lead Agency	Paving of private easement road.
Site Plan and Landscape Plan	County of San Diego	Lead Agency	A Site Plan and Landscape Plan are required.
Air Quality Permit	SDAPCD	Responsible Agency	Stationary source permits for the process equipment used on this site
NPDES Permit; General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit, including the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan	RWQCB	Responsible Agency	Action required for development projects.

NPDES General Groundwater Extraction Waste Discharge Permit	RWQCB	Responsible Agency	Permit would be applicable if groundwater disposal is proposed during construction.
General Construction Storm Water Permit	RWQCB	Responsible Agency	Action required for development projects.
Fire District Approval	Deer Springs FPD	Responsible Agency	Fire clearances to be completed and inspected prior to blasting activities during construction.
Water District Approval	VWD	Responsible Agency	VWD approval required to serve the project.

Caltrans = California Department of Transportation; RWQCD = Regional Water Quality Control District; LEA = Local Enforcement Agency; SDAPCD = San Diego Air Pollution Control District; NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System; FPD = Fire Protection District; VWD = Vallecitos Water District; CalRecycle = California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery

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

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

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

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

Beth Ehsan
Signature

9/8/14
Date

Beth Ehsan
Printed Name

Land Use/Environmental Planner
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

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

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

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project includes the construction and operation of wood debris and CDI recycling facility located along Interstate 15 (I-15). The project will be seen from I-15 and from the Jesmond Dene neighborhood, and visual impacts must be analyzed. The site was graded and used as a Caltrans borrow pit during the construction of I-15 and the proposed project would be located primarily within the previously graded area. A visual analysis is required to identify potential impacts of the project on scenic resources and vistas, including an evaluation of proposed landscaping and grading techniques and the potential for cumulative impacts on scenic vistas and this issue will be addressed in the EIR.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings from scenic highways?

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

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway. The highway is not state scenic, but the County also has a scenic highway designation.

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is located adjacent to and visible from the composite viewshed of a County designated scenic highway, I-15. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape of the scenic highway includes the underlying landform and overlaying landcover, which establish the visual environment. The visual environment of the

subject scenic highway and resources extends from State Route 78 all the way to Riverside County and is dominated by steep hills supporting native vegetation, avocado orchards, and rock outcroppings, interspersed with pockets of residential and commercial areas. A visual analysis is required to identify potential impacts of the project on scenic resources and scenic highways and this issue will be addressed in the EIR.

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

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is a light recycling facility for wood debris and CDI debris. The project site is located within a site that was already disturbed by a Caltrans borrow pit and the site is located above the freeway such that there will be limited views of the recycling operation from the I-15. The project grading will include an access road. The site will contain a 200-foot by 60-foot building (12,000 square feet), parking, materials storage (stock piles), truck scales, a security trailer and a processing area. A visual analysis is required to identify potential impacts of the project on the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings and this issue will be addressed in the EIR.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209), including the Zone B 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 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 will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Planning & Development Services 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. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures 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.

In addition, the project's outdoor lighting is controlled through the Site Plan Permit, which further limits outdoor lighting through strict controls. Therefore, compliance with the Code, in combination with the outdoor lighting and glare controls listed above ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

No Impact: The project site is zoned M54, which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Less than Significant Impact: The project site and surrounding areas, within a radius of a quarter mile, contain housing, evidence of construction activities, limited agricultural lands mixed with housing and vacant open space land uses. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by Dennis Campbell, County Agricultural Specialist, and was determined not to have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland,

Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance or active agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons:

- The limited surrounding active agricultural operations consist of avocado orchards and/or citrus groves, which commonly operate in this area and create minimal land use conflicts, due to the nature of the use. The addition of a recycling facility would not introduce a change in the existing environment that would impact the surrounding area.
- Within the quarter mile radius, there are no lands that qualify for the Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, as designated by the FMMP. The land area surrounding, and including, the project site is identified as either Urban/Built-Up or Other Lands, by the FMMP.

Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

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

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes development with density levels that are less than densities anticipated in the SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. However, construction and operation of the project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that could contribute to violation of ambient air quality standards. Impacts from the proposed project would need to be evaluated in an Air Quality Technical Study. As such, the proposed project could conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP, and a conflict would be considered a significant impact.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule

20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) is used.

Potentially Significant Impact: The Project proposes a light recycling processing facility to handle wood debris and CDI debris on a 35.5-acre site. Construction activities associated with the project would consist of grading which would include blasting, trenching, fine grading and building construction. Earthwork will consist of cutting approximately 96,000 cubic yards which will include some blasting and filling of 182,000 for a net import of 72,000 cubic yards which accounts for expected swell quantities. Construction activities would lead to emissions of criteria pollutants and ozone precursors that could exceed the County's screening criteria for daily emissions. These impacts would need to be analyzed in an Air Quality Technical Study.

Similarly operational emissions would be generated through vehicle trips generated by the site, heavy duty equipment used onsite and from the composting and recycling operations. Operational emissions have the potential to exceed the County's screening criteria and would need to be quantified and assessed in the Technical Study.

As such, the project has the potential to violate ambient air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_X and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also as the

result of operation of the recycling facility. As discussed in (b) above, construction and operational emissions from the project have the potential to exceed the County's screening criteria for daily emissions. These emissions, along with emissions from past, present and future projects within the surrounding area could contribute to cumulatively considerable concentrations of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors. Impacts from the proposed project along with past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, need to be assessed against screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. Therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project have the potential to create a cumulatively considerable impact. The impact is considered potentially significant.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project would expose sensitive receptors in the vicinity to emissions during construction and operations. Construction emissions would consist of criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants, primarily diesel particulate matter (DPM). Blasting onsite would also lead to emissions of these pollutants. Additionally, operation of the project would lead to emissions of DPM from operation of heavy equipment onsite. Toxic emissions could also be created due to recycling operations onsite from toxic compounds present in recycled materials. In particular, crushing and grinding operations could lead to asbestos and crystalline silica particles becoming airborne. These impacts need to be analyzed in the Technical Study through a health risk assessment. As described, the project has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction and operational phases. The project's main sources of potentially odor-carrying particles would be from wood debris processing should anaerobic digestion begin. Anaerobic digestion is not anticipated to occur because the project does not include composting or compost handling operations. Feedstock management onsite would be source of potential

odors. Odor impacts will need to be assessed in the Technical Study and an Odor Management Plan will be required. The project has the potential to expose receptors to objectionable odors due to the nature of the operation. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site supports native vegetation, namely, Diegan coastal sage scrub, mafic southern mixed chaparral, and willow scrub, as well as a large disturbed area due to the site's previous use as a Caltrans borrow pit. Some of this vegetation is sensitive biological habitat with the potential for use by sensitive and/or protected species. A Biological Resources Report will be completed and summarized in the DEIR and will address direct and/or cumulative impacts to sensitive species resulting from the project. The project analysis will be done in compliance with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance, the Resource Protection Ordinance, and the Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance, and the State's Natural Communities Conservation Program (NCCP). The project has the potential to have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status due to the required habitat modifications. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site supports native vegetation, namely, Diegan coastal sage scrub, mafic southern mixed chaparral, and willow scrub, as well as a large disturbed area due to the site's previous use as a Caltrans borrow pit. Some of this vegetation is sensitive biological habitat (Diegan coastal sage scrub, mafic southern mixed chaparral, and willow scrub which qualifies as an RPO wetland and CDFG jurisdictional streambed). The project impacts total 11.8 acres of mafic southern mixed chaparral, 1.9 acres of coastal sage scrub, 0.02 acre of willow scrub, and 6.8 acres of disturbed habitat. It was determined that there were unauthorized impacts prior to project application which include 0.9 acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub, 6.5 acres of mafic southern mixed chaparral and these have been included in the total project impacts. The mitigation for impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub is preservation and management of habitat at a 2:1 ratio. By agreement with the Wildlife Agencies, the unauthorized impacts to coastal sage scrub will be mitigated at an increased 3:1

ratio. Mitigation for sensitive mafic southern mixed chaparral is at a 3:1 ratio for project impacts or an increased 4:1 for the previous unauthorized impacts. Mitigation for impacts to willow scrub would be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio including a 1:1 creation component. A Biological Resources Report will be completed and summarized in the DEIR and will address direct and/or cumulative biological resources impacts resulting from the project. The project analysis will be done in compliance with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance, the Resource Protection Ordinance, and the Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance, and the State's Natural Communities Conservation Program (NCCP). The project has the potential to impact sensitive habitats or natural communities. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

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

No Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, site photos, and a site visit by County biologist Beth Ehsan on April 20, 2010, the site does not contain any federal jurisdictional wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site supports native vegetation, namely, Diegan coastal sage scrub, mafic southern mixed chaparral, and willow scrub, as well as a disturbed area due to the site's previous use as a Caltrans borrow pit. The high quality native habitat of the site is part of what is known as the I-15 wildlife corridor. However, due to the project's location within the previously disturbed area, the project has minimized impacts to wildlife corridors, linkages, and wildlife nursery sites. The project also includes 44 acres of biological open space with connectivity to a dedicated open space easement off-site. and the project includes The open space would not be fenced except for barriers on existing trails and fencing where the open space borders an existing residential pad, so there will be minimal new barriers to wildlife movement. A Biological Resources Report will be completed and summarized in the DEIR and will address direct and/or cumulative biological resources impacts resulting from the project. The project analysis will be done in compliance with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance, the Resource Protection Ordinance, and the

Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance, and the State's Natural Communities Conservation Program (NCCP). The project has the potential to interfere with the movement and breeding activities of native or migratory wildlife species due to the removal of habitat and, and construction of the facility and access road. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project has the potential to be inconsistent with adopted Habitat Conservation Plans (if the North County MSCP has been adopted), the Natural Communities Conservation Program for Coastal Sage Scrub, Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and the Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance. Consistency with these policies and ordinances will be discussed in the Biological Resources Report and if the proposed project is found to conflict with these regulations, it would be a significant impact.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego approved archaeologist Brian F. Smith on July 23, 2008, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in an historical resources report titled, "*Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report, The Mesa Rock Nursery Project*", prepared by Brian F. Smith and Sara Clowery-Moreno, revised date June 1, 2009.

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

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

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist Brian F. Smith on July 23, 2008, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. The results of the survey are

provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, "*Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report, The Mesa Rock Nursery Project*", prepared by Brian F. Smith and Sara Clowery-Moreno, revised date June 1, 2009. In addition, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

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

San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

No Impact: The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

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

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

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

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

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

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist Brian F. Smith on July 23, 2008, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, "*Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report, The Mesa Rock Nursery Project*", prepared by Brian F. Smith and Sara Clowery-Moreno, revised date June 1, 2009. In addition, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the

Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

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

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

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

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

ii. seismic ground shaking?

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

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

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

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

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

iv. Landslides?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. According to the Report of Geotechnical Investigation for the site dated November 1, 2012 and Addendum No. 2 to the report dated May 7, 2013, the report concluded that there is no evidence of past slope failure on site or in the historic aerial photographs reviewed. Additionally, the report concluded that cut slopes are to be cut in very dense granitic bedrock and would be stable. Therefore, impacts from landslides at the project site are considered to be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Cieneba very rocky coarse sandy loam and Ramona sandy loam that have a soil erodibility rating of "moderate" and/or "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature.
- The project has prepared a Storm Water Management Plan dated May 20, 2013, prepared by Robert Dentino. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: silt fence, desilting basin, fiber rolls, gravel bag berm, street sweeping and vacuuming, sandbag barrier, storm drain inlet protection, material delivery and storage, stockpile management, spill prevention and control, solid waste management, concrete waste management,

stabilized construction entrance/exit, water conservation practices, paving and grinding operations, and covering minor slopes.

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

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

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project involves 95,710 cubic yards of cut and 182,430 cubic yards of fill as part of the grading of the site. According to the Report of Geotechnical Investigation for the site dated November 1, 2012 and Addendum No. 2 to the report dated May 7, 2013, the report concluded that there is no evidence of past slope failure on site or in the historic aerial photographs reviewed. Additionally, the report concluded that cut slopes are to be cut in very dense granitic bedrock and would be stable. In order to assure that any proposed buildings (including those proposed on the project site) are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on-site are Cieneba very rocky coarse sandy loam, 30 to 75 percent slopes and Ramona sandy loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes, eroded. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property. 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.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves the installation of two onsite wastewater treatment systems to accommodate the employees, a security trailer. The employee facilities comprise a 2,000 gallon septic tank connected to a 208-foot horizontal seepage pit with 100 percent reserve area. The security trailer/caretaker's residence would be a 1,000 gallon septic tank connected to a 50-foot horizontal seepage pit with 100 percent reserve area. This system will require the installation of a pump system. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on April 19, 2013. Therefore, the project has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems as determined by the authorized, local public agency. In addition, the project will comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project

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

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

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

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. A regional GHG inventory prepared for the San Diego Region[2] identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

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

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

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

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

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

The project would generate GHG emissions during construction and operations. Construction emissions would be associated with operation of heavy duty equipment onsite, blasting and vehicle trips onsite. Operational emissions would be associated with vehicle trips generated by the site, energy use, water consumption, recycling operations, and composting. Emissions would need to be quantified and assessed in a Climate Change Technical Study. The project has the potential to generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

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

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

To implement State mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The County General Plan, updated in 2011, incorporates climate change policies.

The project's consistency with the County's policies will be assessed through the Technical Study. As detailed in (a) above, the project has the potential to generate GHG emissions that have a significant impact on the environment and could possibly conflict with the General Plan. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project requires a plan for truck inspection, with procedures for rejecting construction materials that may be hazardous. Even though the project must be permitted by the DEH Local Enforcement Agency, and the permit conditions will preclude the facility from accepting any hazardous materials including lead-based paint or asbestos, the analysis should evaluate the potential for impacts from transport storage, or

disposal of hazardous materials. Finally, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities. The project has the potential to create a public hazard that may have a significant impact on the environment. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements

of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. Storage of wood and CDI debris may increase the potential for fires:

- Wood, wood products and CDI debris onsite could potentially introduce volatile flammable chemicals.
- Process equipment onsite would operate using gas or diesel fuel, which are highly flammable. Additionally, process equipment could create a spark or cause a fire to start, which could spread to the surrounding area if not put out immediately.

A Fire Protection Plan will be prepared and implemented and the plan will evaluate the potential for fire risk with proposals for mitigation to comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in Public Resources Code Sections 4290 and 4291. A Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated November 19, 2012 were received from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District (DSFPD). The conditions from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District include:

- A fuel break of 100 feet (brush and weed abatement) around all sides of the structure prior to construction which will be maintained all year long.
- Roadways graded to a width of 28 feet with an improved width of 24 feet, roadway and driveway accesses shall be a minimum vertical clearance of 13 feet 6 inches.
- Roadways and driveways shall not exceed 150 feet in length and shall have an approved turn around at the terminus.
- Cul-de-sacs shall be required for access roadways when determined by the DSFPD and shall have a minimum improved turning radius of 36 feet and 40 feet graded.
- Roadways and driveways shall not exceed 20 percent grade.
- Roadways and driveways exceeding 15-20 percent grade will be accepted only with a mitigation of a surface of Portland Cement Concrete (PCC) with a heavy broom finish perpendicular to the direction of travel.
- Roadway improvements are to be installed and serviceable prior to issuance of building permit.
- A minimum 20,000 gallon water tank shall be installed prior to construction which means DFSPD approval
- All new developments shall provide map updates (1": 400') compatible with current department mapping services

Fire lane curbs shall be painted red and must comply with California Vehicle Code 22500.1. Gates serving 5 or more residences shall be installed with an Opticom emergency traffic control activating light sensor and a Knox over-riding system. Street name signs shall be installed as per County of San Diego standards and all private and or public roads serving this project shall be named. No parking fire lane signs shall be installed on access roadways and should be posted at locations designated by the DSFPD Fire Marshall.

The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be approximately 2 minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County Public Facilities Element is 5 minutes. The project has the potential to increase the risk of wildland fire that may have a significant impact on the environment. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is a recycling facility, which may provide shelter for vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies. In addition, airborne allergens may be spread by wood debris/construction material dust and the impact of potential pathogens that may be carried to the site on the materials must be examined. The proposed project would adopt an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Plan for the buildings and grounds associated with the project site. IPM is an approach that establishes a sustainable approach to managing pests by combining biological, physical, and chemical tools in a way that minimizes economic health

and environmental risks. The IPM Plan outlines procedures to be followed to protect the health and safety of staff and visitors from pests and pesticide hazards.

The analysis must evaluate the potential for impacts to increase the current or future residents' exposure to vectors. The project has the potential to increase the public's exposure to vectors that may have a significant impact on the environment. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes a wood debris and CDI recycling facility, which requires grading, construction, and outdoor storage and processing.

The project applicant is required to provide a Stormwater Protection Plan (SWPP) which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the Watershed Protection Ordinance. These measures will become mitigation and conditions of approval for the project and will include site design, source control and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. These may include silt fences, desilting basins, fiber rolls, gravel bag berms, street sweeping and vacuuming, sandbag barriers, storm drain inlet protections, material delivery and storage stockpile management, spill prevention and control, solid waste management, concrete waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, water conservation practices, slope protection, preservation of trees and green/open space areas, re-tilling soils compacted by construction vehicles/equipment, collection and re-use of site's upper soil layers containing organic materials, curb-cuts to landscaping**,** rural Swales, using bioretention system to treat flow from street and parking areas and permeable pavements, pitching pavements toward landscaping, placing downspouts to swales, installing smart irrigation systems, minimizing disturbance of existing slopes, incorporation of retaining walls to reduce steepness of slopes or to shorten slopes, rounding and shaping slopes to reduce concentrated flow, collection of concentrated flows in stabilized drains and channels, marking inlets with "No Dumping! Flows to Ocean!" These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

There are also requirements from the State Water Resources Board specific to recycling facilities. These will be implemented through the required permit from the Local Enforcement Agency. This issue will be address in the DEIR including the potential for cumulative impacts related to waste discharges affecting human health and water quality.

The project has the potential to be inconsistent with waste discharge requirements that protect water resources. Consistency with these requirements will be discussed in the CEQA Drainage

Study and if the proposed project is found to conflict with regulations, it would be a significant impact.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The portion of the project site that includes the facility footprint lies in the Escondido hydrologic subarea, within the Carlsbad hydrologic unit. However, other portions of the site (proposed as biological open space) are within the Richland hydrologic subarea which is impaired for Manganese, Phosphate, Total Dissolved Solids, DDT, Enterococcus, Fecal Coliform, Selenium, Sulfates, Total Nitrogen as N (16707), and Toxicity. This issue will be address in the DEIR including the potential for cumulative impacts related to waste discharges affecting human health and water quality. The project has the potential to increase pollutants in an already impaired water body and that may have a significant impact on the environment. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact: Because the project includes storage of waste materials, there is the potential for infiltration of chemicals into the local surface- or ground-water systems. This will require further analysis to evaluate the potential for impacts. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit. The project lies in the Escondido hydrologic subarea, within the Carlsbad 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 service supply; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; commercial and sport fishing; aquaculture; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; shellfish harvesting; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat. The project proposes potential sources of polluted runoff including roads, parking, and the processing of green waste and construction materials including outdoor materials storage. This issue will be address in the DEIR including the potential for cumulative impacts to surface or groundwater receiving water quality affecting RWQCB water quality objectives or possible degradation of stated beneficial uses. Impacts would be potentially significant.

d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the

local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

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

Less than Significant Impact: The project will obtain its water from the Vallecitos Water District, which receives its water from surface reservoirs or other imported water sources, and from on-site groundwater wells for irrigation of landscaping. The project is expected to need roughly 2,400,000 gallons of water per year for which 1,200,000 would be delivered from Vallecitos Water District and 1,200,000 would be extracted from onsite water well(s). Pre-existing well users located on nearby properties also have access to water from the Vallecitos, Rincon Del Diablo, and Valley Center Water District. Therefore, if 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, water from those water districts would be available. Therefore, there will be sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and nearby pre-existing well users.

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 Impact: The project is a site plan that proposes a light recycling processing facility to handle green waste, construction and demolition waste. As outlined in the Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) dated July 8, 2013 and prepared by Excel Engineering, the project will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: bioretention areas. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMP's that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons, based on a Drainage Study prepared by Excel Engineering on July 8, 2013: Drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: roads, parking, outdoor materials storage and processing. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: preserve significant trees, preserve critical areas, restrict heavy construction equipment access to open space areas, re-till compacted soils, collect and re-use upper soil layers, curb-cuts to landscaping, rural swales, Bioretention system, permeable pavements, pitch pavements toward landscaping, downspout to swale, smart irrigation systems, minimize slope disturbance, incorporate retaining walls, rounding and shaping slopes to reduce concentrated flow, collect concentrated flows in stabilized drains and channels. The potential for polluted runoff and the treatment of onsite generated polluted runoff will be address in the

DEIR including the potential for impacts to surface water quality. Impacts would be potentially significant. Refer to IX Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

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

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

No Impact: No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 100 acres were identified on the project site. Furthermore, the project is not proposing to place structures with a potential for human occupation within these areas and will not place access roads or other improvements which will limit access during flood events or affect downstream properties.

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

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

No Impact: No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 100 acres were identified on the project site. Furthermore, the project is not proposing to place structures with a potential for human occupation within these areas and will not place access roads or other improvements which will limit access during flood events or affect downstream properties.

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

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

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

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

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

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

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

i. SEICHE

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

ii. TSUNAMI

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

iii. MUDFLOW

Less Than Significant Impact: Though the project does propose land disturbance that will expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils. Unless upstream areas were to become completely denuded in an event such as a fire, mudflow would not present a substantial risk to the planned building pad areas at the site. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

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

a) Physically divide an established community?

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

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

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

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

Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the General Plan Semi-Rural Regional Category and contains lands within the High Impact Industrial (I-3) Land Use Designation. The project is also subject to the policies of the North County Metro Subregional Plan. The property is zoned M54 which permits light recycling processing facilities pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance Section 6975. The project is consistent with applicable policies of the General Plan, the North County Metro Subregional Plan, and the I-15 Design Review Guidelines.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of "Potential Mineral Resource Significance" (MRZ-3). However, the project site has land uses to the south including single-family residences which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

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

No Impact: The project site is not delineated in the County General Plan, specific plan, or other land use plan as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, this project will have no impact on the availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

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

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

Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The project may produce noise during construction and operation phases of the project. A Noise Analysis Report will be prepared for the project in conformance with the County Requirements for Noise that will evaluate noise generating sources of the project for conformance with the County Noise Ordinance and General Plan, and in comparison with existing noise levels on the project site, consistent with the County Guidelines for Determining Significance. The project has the potential to generate significant noise that may have a significant impact on the environment. The impact is considered potentially significant.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project may produce noise during construction and operation phases of the project. A Noise Analysis Report, consistent with County Guidelines and Requirements, will be prepared for the project that will evaluate noise generating sources of the project for conformance with the County Noise Ordinance and General Plan, and in comparison with existing noise levels on the project site. Analysis will include the project's potential for significant groundbourne vibration and groundbourne vibration noise levels during the construction phase. This impact is considered potentially significant.

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

Potentially Significant Impact: The project may produce noise during construction and operation phases of the project. A Noise Analysis Report will be prepared for the project that will evaluate the project's potential for significant noise generating sources and conformance with the County Noise Ordinance and General Plan, and in comparison with existing noise levels on the project site. This impact is considered potentially significant.

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 Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project will produce noise during construction and operation phases of the project. The primary noise source associated with construction

operations would be from rock crushing activities. With the nearest existing residences being located about 1,500 feet to the south, and sensitive biological habitat offsite to the east, a Noise Analysis Report will be prepared for the project that will evaluate the project's potential for significant noise generating sources and conformance with the County Noise Ordinance and General Plan, and in comparison with existing noise levels on the project site. This impact is considered potentially significant.

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

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

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

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

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

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

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

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

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

No Impact: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has an unoccupied trailer, which is to remain as a security trailer for the recycling facility. This project would not displace any amount of existing housing.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has an unoccupied trailer, which is to remain as a security trailer for the recycling facility. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance 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 does not propose residential use and is not expected to significantly alter the need for schools, parks, or sheriff facilities. A Fire Protection Service Availability Letter has been received from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District.

XV. RECREATION

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

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

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

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

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

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

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

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

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

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project will result in an additional 110 ADT (passenger car equivalents). However, the project will not have a direct impact related to a conflict with any performance measures establishing measures of effectiveness of the circulation system because the project trips do not exceed any of the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for direct impacts related to Traffic and Transportation. As identified in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation, the project trips would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not have a direct impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

The proposed project generates 110 ADT. These trips will be distributed on Mobility Element roadways in the County some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. The TIF program creates a mechanism to proportionally fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. These new projects were based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing Mobility Element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, State, and Federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. By ensuring TIF funds are spend for the specific roadway improvements identified in the TIF Program, the CEQA mitigation requirement is satisfied and the Mitigation Fee nexus is met. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

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 Incorporated	☐	No Impact

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes an increase of 110 ADTs. The additional 110 ADTs from the proposed project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program. Additionally, the project does not involve a new primary use. The additional access or support structures will not generate ADTs on a daily basis. Therefore the project will not conflict with travel demand measures or other standards of the congestion management agency.

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

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

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter roadway geometry on Mesa Rock Road. A safe and adequate sight distance shall be required at all driveways and intersections to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. All road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The Deer Spring Fire Protection District, which is the Fire Authority Having Jurisdiction, and the San Diego County Fire Authority, have reviewed the proposed project and associated emergency access roadways and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access proposed. Additionally, roads used will be required to be improved to County standards.

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

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

Less Than Significant: The proposed project is a recycling facility and will generate 110 ADT. Project implementation will not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project will not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project will employ approximately eighteen full time workers and there will be one resident (security guard). Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH reviewed the Site Plan on August 22, 2013. Therefore, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency.

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

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

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Based on the service availability forms received, the project will not require construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate adequate water treatment facilities are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Vallecitos Water District dated February 27, 2013. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. The new facilities include a bioretention system. Refer to the Storm water Management Plan dated July 8, 2013 for more information. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form, the new facilities will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires water service from the Vallecitos Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Water District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

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

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

No Impact: The proposed project will rely completely on an on-site wastewater system (septic system); therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: 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?

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

Less than Significant Impact: 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.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

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

Potentially Significant: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining

levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. As a result of this evaluation, the project was determined to have potential significant effects related to biological resources and cultural resources. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVIII of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Water Quality, and Noise. While mitigation has been proposed in some instances that reduce these cumulative effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

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 Aesthetics, Air Quality, Hazards (Fire Service), Water Quality, and Noise. While mitigation has been proposed in some instances that reduce these significant effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulations refer to http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/. For State regulations refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulations 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, Planning & Development Services. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ((www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.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 Wildlife (CDFW). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFW 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 Wildlife 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 Wildlife, Sacramento, California, 1986.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

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

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

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998.

(www.dtsc.ca.gov)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

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

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted August 3, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

NOISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POPULATION & HOUSING

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

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

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

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

RECREATION

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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