



# County of San Diego

**MARK WARDLAW**  
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123  
(858) 505-6445 General • (858) 694-2705 Codes • (858) 565-5920 Building Services  
www.SDCPDS.org

**KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY**  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

June 4, 2020

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

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

Perrin Oak Ranch; PDS2016-AD-16-023; PDS2019-ER-19-09-008

2. Lead agency name and address:

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

3. a. Contact: Jessica Madamba, Project Manager  
b. Phone number: (858) 495-5453  
c. E-mail: Jessica.Madamba@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The Project site is located north of Highland Valley Road in the Ramona Community Plan, within the unincorporated County of San Diego (APN: 276-101-14-00).

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Perrin Oak Ranch (Attn: Bennett Martin), 23562 Arnold Drive, Sonoma, CA 95476

6. General Plan

Community Plan:	Ramona Community Plan
Land Use Designation:	Rural Lands 20 (RL-20)
Density:	1 du/20 acre(s)
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	N/A

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	General Agriculture (A72)
Minimum Lot Size:	8 acre(s)
Special Area Regulation:	N/A

8. Description of Project:

The proposed Perrin Oak Ranch project (Project) is an Administrative Permit (AD) for a small winery facility. The Project site is located on 16168 Highland Valley Road in the Ramona Community Plan within the unincorporated County of San Diego. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Rural, Land Use Designation Rural Lands 20 (RL-20). Zoning for the site is General Agricultural (A72).

The Project consists of a 25,000 square foot (SF) winery facility, 5,000 SF crush pad, 12,000 SF hospitality building, 1,500 SF climatized storage building, and 5 units of vineyard worker housing. The hospitality building would include a tasting room, event space, private tasting lounge, and retail sales and offices. The vineyards on site would supply 60% of grapes required for annual wine production volume, and staff up to 15 full-time and part-time employees. The winery would host up to 70 annual events for up to 250 people each, two annual wine release events, and one wine auction. The anticipated daily tours would be 75 people. Small winery facilities are authorized in the A72 Use Regulation upon approval of an Administrative Permit pursuant to Section 2723 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The site is developed with 22 acres of vineyard. Access would be provided by three gated driveways connecting to Highland Valley Road. The Project would be served by on-site septic systems and the Ramona Municipal Water District.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Lands surrounding the Project site are used for residential and agricultural purposes. There are single-family dwellings to the north, south, and west of the Project site, and vacant land to the east of the site. There are two other wineries in a one-mile vicinity of the site, located northwest and immediately west of the Project site. Additionally, a wedding and event venue is located directly north of the Project site. The topography of the Project site is relatively flat towards the front of the property, where the development is located, and sloped downwards towards the rear of the property. The site is located northwest of the Ramona Airport in the Ramona community.

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

<b>Permit Type/Action</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Administrative Permit Borrow Pit Grading and Clearing Lot Area Averaging	County of San Diego
Water District Approval	Ramona Municipal Water District
Fire District Approval	County Fire Authority

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

YES

NO

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, public lead agencies, and proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and to reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code §21083.3.2). Information is also available from the Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code §5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code §21082.3(e) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

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

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

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

- On the basis of this Initial Study, 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.

*Jessica Madamba*

Signature

June 1, 2020

Date

Jessica Madamba

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project is located near or within the viewshed of a scenic vista. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying land cover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The visual environment of the subject scenic vista includes State Route 78 which is considered a State and County Scenic Highway, which is located 5.72 miles east of the Project site. Additionally, Highland Valley Road is considered a County Scenic Highway and is directly adjacent to the Project site.

The Project would not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the Project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and would not contribute to a cumulative impact because: the Project does not include any work near the front of the site. Therefore, the Project would not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project is located immediately adjacent to Highland Valley Road which is considered a County Scenic Highway and has the potential to impact visual resources. Based on photo simulations submitted for the Project and reviewed by staff on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2018 as well as GIS aerial imagery, the Project would be partially obscured, obscured, or not visually seen from Highland Valley Road. Additionally, the Project is located 5.72 miles west of State Route 78 which is considered a State and County Scenic Highway, however due to distance and intervening topography, it would not afford views of the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not have an adverse effect on visual resources.

The Project would not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the Project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista’s viewshed and would not contribute to a cumulative impact. Therefore, the Project would not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views at the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized, area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project site is within a non-urbanized area of the Ramona Community, located off of Highland Valley Road, approximately 5 miles east of Interstate 15 within the unincorporated County of San Diego. The existing visual character and quality of the Project site and surrounding can be characterized as low-density development with interspersed

residential and agricultural use types. The site and surrounding lands contain relatively flat to moderately sloped topography. The Project is a small winery and is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality of the surrounding area for the following reasons: the proposed use type is allowed by both the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and would not introduce any visually dominant features which would detract from the visual quality of the site or surrounding area and the proposed use type is consistent with existing use types within the area. Earthwork, including grading and export of material, is proposed on the Project site, however exposed slopes would only be present on a temporary basis and would not significantly detract from the visual character or quality of the surrounding area.

The Project would not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XX. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XX are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and would not contribute to a cumulative impact. Therefore, the Project would not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project would use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. However, it would not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the Project would 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.

The Project would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the Project would 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 would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the Project would not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a Project or cumulative level.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project site has land designated as Farmland of Local Importance, as well as Unique Farmland according to the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). The site does not contain any Prime soil candidates, nor does it contain Farmland of Statewide Importance soil candidates as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance. The proposed use is for a winery and vineyard. The Project site has an existing 22-acre vineyard, and the agricultural resources on-site would be maintained. Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use would occur as a result of this Project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The site is zoned A-72 and is an agricultural zone. The Project site is not under a William Act Contract or part of an agricultural preserve. The nearest preserve lands, as well as lands under Williamson Act Contract #72-31 are located approximately .2 miles directly west of the Project site. The Project is for a winery and vineyard which is a compatible use type to the agriculture use types in the area and thus would not create interface conflicts associated with the existing surrounding agricultural uses. 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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project site does 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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project site does 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. Portions of the Cleveland National Forest are located approximately 4.7 miles to the northeast. However, project implementation would not result in the disturbance, loss or conversion of these resources to a non-forest use because no off-site improvements are proposed for the project and the use is allowed per current zoning and the General Plan.

- 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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site and surrounding area within a radius of 0.5 mile contains active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance. The Project is for a winery and vineyard and is compatible with the surrounding land use types. Moreover, for indirect impacts, vineyards are not intensive agricultural use types which are incompatible with residential land. The majority of vineyard maintenance required is by hand. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project is for a 25,000 square foot production facility, 12,000 square foot hospitality building, 5,000 square foot crush pad, 1,500 square feet of storage, and 5 units of vineyard worker housing for a Small Winery. The Project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan and thus anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the Project would result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. As such, the Project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, unlike many other agricultural operations, grape production does not require extensive or constant use of farming equipment. Moreover, the Average Daily Trips (ADT) for the Project would be less than 200, below the screening levels, and subsequently would not violate ambient air quality standards. Larger events of up to 250 people would occur up to approximately 70 times throughout the year. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants. The Project falls below the screening levels and is consistent with the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance, thus the Project would not violate ambient air quality standards.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project is for a Small Winery with wine production and events. The Project would require 3 new winery buildings to be constructed, along with a crush pad and 5 units of vineyard worker housing. The Project would include 7,000 cubic yards of cut, 2,000 cubic yards of fill, and 5,000 cubic yards of export. Emissions from the grading and

construction phases would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

The operational emissions for the Project would be associated with vehicle trips to and from the site for events and to a lesser extent from employee trip generation and from farm equipment. Due to the small production of the winery and minimal maintenance needed for the vineyard, few employees are needed onsite and would not be expected to contribute to a substantial number of vehicle trips. Additionally, the vehicle trip generation for the Project is expected to have fewer than 200 ADT. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The Project ADT would be below this threshold and would therefore not have a significant impact from vehicle emissions. Moreover, vineyards are not considered intensive agriculture use types.

As provided in the above analysis, the Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, the emissions associated with the Project are not expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** As stated in response III.b, the Project proposes 3 new winery buildings to be constructed, along with a crush pad and 5 units of vineyard worker housing. The Project would include 7,000 cubic yards of cut, 2,000 cubic yards of fill, and 5,000 cubic yards of export. The Project would generate minimal PM<sub>10</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs from construction/grading

activities, as well as VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the Project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM<sub>10</sub> and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The vehicle trips generated from the Project would result in less than 200 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance for VOCs and PM<sub>10</sub>.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The Project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance for VOCs and PM<sub>10</sub>, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the Project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM<sub>10</sub>, or any O<sub>3</sub> precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and would not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. The Project is for a commercial winery and vineyard and is allowed pursuant to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, the Project's ADT is less than 200 and is below the threshold established in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance. Therefore, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Report dated September 3, 2019 prepared by Helix Environmental Planning, County staff biologist has determined that the site supports native vegetation, namely, Coast Live Oak Woodland. However, staff has determined that removal of 0.6 acre of this habitat would not result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, to any candidate, sensitive, or special status species with the incorporation of mitigation. Mitigation for the project would include 0.6 acre of Tier I habitat to be secured at an offsite location within the MSCP. Additionally, No federal or state endangered or threatened species, nor County List A or B plant species or Group 1 animal species are known or expected to occur on site.

Project implementation could result in significant impacts to raptors with the potential to nest on site or in the immediate vicinity. Potential significant impacts could result from direct disturbance and noise during the breeding season. The Project would be conditioned to implement breeding season avoidance for nesting birds and raptors throughout the duration of earth disturbing activities. If an active nest is observed, the Project would be required to implement applicable avoidance measures. Implementation of avoidance measures would reduce impacts to less than 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on a Biological Resources Report dated September 3, 2019 prepared by Helix Environmental Planning, the Project would temporarily or permanently impact 0.6 acre of coast live oak woodland and associated oak root protection zone, and up to 0.02 acre of non-vegetated channel/seasonal ponds. Impacts to coast live oak woodland would be mitigated with the purchase of 0.6 acre of Tier I habitat at an offsite location within the MSCP. Impacts to 0.02 acre of non-vegetated channel/seasonal ponds shall be mitigated through one or a combination of establishment, re-establishment, rehabilitation, and/or preservation mitigation on site, off-site, or through purchase of mitigation credits at the San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank or other location deemed acceptable by the USACE, RWQCB, and/or CDFW, as applicable, with final impact acreage and mitigation requirements to be determined by the USACE, RWQCB, and/or CDFW as part of the 404/401 and/or 1600 permitting process. In order to comply with applicable laws, the Project shall notify and obtain all necessary permits from the appropriate state and federal agencies prior to issuance of a grading permit, unless otherwise approved by Planning & Development Services (PDS). Copies of the CWA Section 404 permit, CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification, CFG Code Section 1602 SAA, and/or documentation from the relevant agency indicating no permit is necessary shall be submitted to PDS prior to grading permit issuance, unless otherwise approved by PDS.

Temporary construction fencing shall be installed at the limits of Project impacts adjacent to sensitive habitat to avoid impacts to sensitive resources during construction. Any inadvertent impacts that could occur to sensitive areas beyond the approved fence shall be mitigated as determined by PDS in coordination with the USFWS, USACE, RWQCB, and/or CDFW. Temporary construction fencing shall be removed upon Project completion.

The Project has the potential to result in significant impacts to sensitive natural communities; however, Project design features, adherence to project conditions, and implementation of mitigation measures to fully compensate the loss of habitat would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:**

No riparian habitat or wetlands are present within the Project site; however, the ephemeral drainage ditch and man-made seasonal ponds have been determined to qualify as non-wetland waters of the U.S./State under USACE and RWQCB jurisdiction, and unvegetated streambed under the jurisdiction of the CDFW. Based on a Biological Resources Report dated September 3, 2019 prepared by Helix Environmental Planning, the Project would temporarily or permanently impact up to 0.02 acre of non-vegetated channel/seasonal ponds. Mitigation and avoidance measures have been incorporated regarding jurisdictional non-vegetated channel/seasonal ponds and are described above in IV.a.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of the County’s Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Report dated September 3, 2019 prepared by Helix Environmental Planning, County staff biologist has determined that the Project has a low probability to interfere with movement, use of established corridors, or use of nursery sites for native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. The Project would not impede wildlife access to on- or off-site areas that may be used for foraging, breeding, and/or obtaining water or access to areas necessary for reproduction. The site is not located within a wildlife corridor or movement area and does not support significant foraging or breeding habitat. The area does not support critical populations of animal species or known nursery sites. Breeding season avoidance would be implemented and if an active nest is observed, avoidance measures would be implemented as detailed above in IV.a. Implementation of avoidance measures would reduce impacts to less than 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated May 29, 2020 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved historian, Brian F. Smith, 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, *Cultural Resources Study for The Perrin Oak Ranch Winery Project San Diego County, California PDS2016-AD-16-023* (October 30, 2018).

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site has been surveyed by a County approved archaeologist, Brian F. Smith, and it has been determined that there is one archaeological resource present. This resource consists of a bedrock milling site. An archaeological technical study titled, *Cultural Resources Study For The Perrin Oak Ranch Winery Project San Diego County, California* (October 30, 2018), prepared by Brian F. Smith evaluated the significance of the archaeological resources based on subsurface testing, analysis of recovered artifacts, and other investigations and has determined that the archaeological resource is not significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. However, the milling features within the core of CA-SDI-16508a represent a good example of Late Prehistoric resource exploitation. As such, the project will be conditioned to place this resource in a dedicated open space easement. There is also the potential for the

presence of undiscovered, buried resources; therefore, the project will be conditioned with an Archaeological Monitoring Program as outlined below.

- Pre-Construction
  - Contract with a County approved archaeologist to perform archaeological monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all earth-disturbing activities. The Project Archaeologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, during and after construction.
  - Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.
- Construction
  - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor are to be onsite during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor will evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources
  - If cultural resources are identified:
    - Both the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
    - The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of discovery.
    - The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
    - Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation.
    - Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Kumeyaay Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.
    - If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).
  - Human Remains.
    - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.

- Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. If the human remains are to be taken offsite for evaluation, they shall be accompanied by the Kumeyaay Native American monitor.
  - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
  - The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
  - Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.
- Rough Grading
    - Monitoring Report. Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to the South Coastal Information Center and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
  - Final Grading
    - Final Report. A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center, the Pechanga Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the Rincon Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
    - Cultural Material Conveyance
      - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe.
      - The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

Because the resource is not considered a significant archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5 but would be preserved in open space, the proposed project would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** A review of the County’s Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County’s geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

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

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

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

If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that the fossil or fossil assemblage is significant; a mitigation program involving salvage, cleaning, and curation of the fossil(s) and documentation shall be implemented.

If no fossils or fossil assemblages of greater than 12 inches in any dimension are encountered during excavation, a "No Fossils Found" letter will be submitted to the County Planning & Development Services identifying who conducted the monitoring and that no fossils were found.

If one or more fossils or fossil assemblages are found, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a report documenting the mitigation program, including field and laboratory methodology, location and the geologic and stratigraphic setting, list(s) of collected fossils and their paleontological significance, descriptions of any analyses, conclusions, and references cited.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**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, 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 historical resources report titled, *Cultural Resources Study for The Perrin Oak Ranch Winery Project San Diego County, California PDS2016-AD-16-023* (October 30, 2018).

**VI. ENERGY** – Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would result in the use of electricity, petroleum, and other consumption of energy resources during grading, construction, and operation phases of the Project; however, the consumption is not expected to be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary for the following reasons.

Construction of the facility would require 7,000 cubic yards of cut, 2,000 cubic yards of fill, and 5,000 cubic yards of export for building pads for the proposed structures, widening of the existing driveway, and a paved parking area to accommodate 26 all-weather parking spaces. Offsite improvements consist of improving the existing driveway that takes access from Highland Valley Road. The operational aspect of the Project which would result in the most energy use would be petroleum of vehicle trips and electricity usage for the small winery. However, the Project is below thresholds set for air quality standards as well as GHG standards. Please see responses for section III. Air Quality and VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Additionally, the Project is consistent with the County’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) and General Plan through the implementation of the measures identified in the County’s CAP Checklist. Therefore, the construction and operation of the Project is not expected to result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** Many of the regulations regarding energy efficiency are focused on increasing the energy efficiency of buildings and renewable energy generation, as well as reducing water consumption and VMT. As stated in response VI. (a), the Project is employing the use of various energy efficient and savings features, as well as roof top solar photovoltaics that meet and exceed the regulatory requirements. The Project would be consistent with several energy reduction policies of the County General Plan, including policies COS-14.1, COS-14.3, and COS-16.2. Additionally, the Project would be consistent with sustainable development and energy reduction policies such as policies COS-14.3 and COS-15.4, through compliance with the most recent Title 24 standards at the time of Project construction. Therefore, the Project would implement energy reduction design features and comply with the most recent energy building standards consistent with applicable plans and policies. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant

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

- a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or

based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the Project would 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 would not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project site is not located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Therefore, there would be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Cieneba-Fallbrook rocky sandy loams and Vista rocky coarse sandy loam that have a soil erodibility rating of severe to moderate 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. According to the Drainage Report prepared by EBA Engineering and dated November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019, the Project would not significantly alter drainage patterns on site or alter a stream or river that would increase erosion and siltation on- of off-site.

However, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the Project would be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which would ensure that the Project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, would not alter existing drainage patterns, and would not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the Project would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.

In addition, the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE

- EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2013-0001 (NPDES No. CAS 0109266), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on May 8, 2013; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 10410); and County BMP Design Manual adopted on February 26, 2016, and amended January 1, 2019. Refer to XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Due to these factors, it has been found that the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project proposes 7,000 cubic yards of cut slopes, 2,000 cubic yards of fill, and 5,000 cubic yards of export. In order to assure that the buildings 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on-site are Cieneba-Fallbrook rocky sandy loams and Vista rocky coarse sandy loam. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, the Project would 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. A Wastewater Feasibility Study was prepared for the Project dated November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2019. For events which would exceed 75 maximum visitor guests, portable toilets would be utilized. 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 December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019 and 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 would comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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.

**VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project is for a Small Winery to include a 25,000 square foot production facility, 12,000 square foot hospitality building, 1,500 square feet of storage, a 5,00 square foot crush pad, and 5 units of vineyard worker housing. The Project would involve earthwork including blasting, grading, and export of material. The Project would produce GHG emissions through grading and construction activities, as well as operation GHG emissions from vehicle trips and operation of minimal existing gas and diesel farm equipment on the Project site. However, the Project falls below the screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that would have less than cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.

The County of San Diego adopted a Climate Action Plan on February 14, 2018 which outlines actions that the County would undertake to meet its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions targets. Implementation of the CAP requires that new development projects incorporate more sustainable design standards and implement applicable reduction measures consistent with the CAP. To help streamline this review and determine consistency of proposed projects with the CAP during development review, the County has prepared a CAP Consistency Review Checklist (Checklist). The Project would implement all applicable measures identified in the Checklist and would therefore be consistent with the County's Climate Action Plan.

Additionally, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) prepared a white paper which recommends a 900 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2e</sub>) per year screening level to determine the size of projects that would be likely to have a less than considerable contribution to the cumulative impact of climate change. The expected ADT for the Project is fewer than 200 and the Project includes minimal operational components attributed to diesel- and gas-powered farm equipment that would emit GHGs. Additionally, all farm equipment would be replaced with electric equipment as feasible pursuant to the SDAPCD's farm equipment incentive program. Given this, the Project is far below the CAPCOA screening lever of 900 MT CO<sub>2e</sub> annually. Due to the aforementioned factors, the Project would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

To implement State mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The County of San Diego's General Plan incorporates various climate change goals and policies. These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets identified in the Climate Action Plan. The County's Climate Action Plan (CAP) includes GHG reduction measures that, if fully implemented, would achieve an emissions reduction target that is consistent with the state-mandated reduction target embodied in AB 32. A set of project-specific implementing thresholds are included in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance and are used to ensure project consistency with the County's CAP, GHG emission reduction target, and the various General Plan goals and policies related to GHG emissions that support CAP goals.

The Project is an allowed use type by the zone and the General Plan. Additionally, as discussed in VII(a) above, the Project would implement all applicable measures identified in the Checklist and would therefore be consistent with the County's Climate Action Plan. As such, the Project would not conflict with the County CAP or GHG goals and policies of the General Plan. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

**IX. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Mount Woodson Elementary is the nearest school to the site and is located approximately 2 miles to the southeast. Therefore, the Project would not have any effect on an existing or proposed school. Furthermore, the Project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the Project would 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Based on a regulatory database search, the Project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The Project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and

Brownfields Reuse Program Database (“CalSites” Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA’s Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA’s National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the Project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. The Project site has been historically used for agriculture, however the Project is for a winery and vineyard, which is a low-intensity agricultural use type and would not introduce any new sensitive receptors. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project is not located within 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 would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the Project’s consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

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

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

f) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant:** The Project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the Project would comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 16 Fire Protection Districts in the County of San Diego. Implementation of these fire safety standards would occur during the Administrative Permit or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter, dated August 4th, 2016, has been received from the Ramona Municipal Water District. The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the Project site to be 12.9 minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the Safety Element is 20 minutes. Therefore, based on the location of the Project; review of the Project by County staff; and through compliance with the San Diego County Fire Authority, the Project is not expected to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the Project does not involve or support uses that would produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, livestock agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Therefore, the Project would not substantially increase current or future resident’s exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

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

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The Project would increase winery operations, including wine production and events. Site disturbance activities would include 7,000 cubic yards of cut, 2,000 cubic yards of fill, 5,000 cubic yards if export, including grading for a paved parking area to accommodate 26 parking spaces.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Under the small winery categorization, the Project is required to implement water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) to address site design, source control, and construction BMP requirements. A PDP SWQMP was submitted for the Project dated November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019, which demonstrates that the Project would comply with all requirements of the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual.

During the construction phase, the Project would prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would implement the following typical erosion control BMPs: hydraulic stabilization and hydroseeding on disturbed slopes; County Standard lot perimeter protection detail and County Standard desilting basin for erosion control on disturbed flat areas; energy dissipater outlet protection for water velocity control; silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel and sand bags, storm drain inlet protection and engineered desilting basin for sediment control; stabilized construction entrance, street sweeping and vacuuming for offsite tracking of sediment; and measures to control materials management and waste management.

The SWPPP would be prepared in accordance with Order No. 2009-009-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Order CAS000002 Construction General Permit (CGP) adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) on September 2, 2009. During the post-construction phase, as outlined in the SWQMP, the Project would implement site design, source control and structural BMPs to prevent potential pollutants from entering storm water runoff. The SWQMP has been prepared in accordance with the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual and SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (2013), as adopted by the RWQCB on May 8, 2013.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The Project is for a small winery to include a 25,000 square foot production facility, 12,000 square foot hospitality building, 5,000 square foot crush pad, 1,500 square feet of storage and 5 units of vineyard worker housing.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would obtain potable water from the Ramona Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source for winery operations as well as vineyard operation. In addition, the Project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to, the following: the Project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile).

These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site because storm water management plans are prepared for both the construction and post-construction phases of the development Project. During the construction phase, the Project would prepare and implement BMPs described in response X.a.

The SWQMP specifies and describe the implementation process of all BMPs that would address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream receiving waters. The Department of Public Works would ensure that these Plans are implemented as proposed. Therefore, it has been determined that the Project would not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and would not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site.

(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite

**Less than Significant Impact:** Pursuant to the Drainage Report prepared by EBA Engineering Inc. dated October 8, 2019, the Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The rate of runoff would not significantly increase, and drainage patterns would not be altered significantly from pre development conditions and would discharge runoff through existing 36-inch culverts within a seasonal creek along Highland Valley Road. Additionally, the site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and the proposed drainage system would be adequate to serve a 100-year storm event without flooding the site.

(iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff

**Less than Significant Impact:** Pursuant to the Drainage Report prepared by EBA Engineering Inc. dated October 8, 2019, the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern, with ultimate discharge from the site into an existing seasonal creek on the southern portion of the property, therefore, the Project would not contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The Project proposes minor changes to the topography. Improvement consists of the grading of pads, improvements to the private driveway providing access from Highland Valley Road, and biofiltration basins. According to the Hydrology and Hydraulic Review prepared for the Project, the change in discharge location would not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage system. The Project

has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs as indicated in response X.a. would be employed such that potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.

(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

**Less than Significant Impact:** No FEMA or County-mapped floodplains were identified on the Project site or off-site improvement locations. Therefore, the Project structures would not impede or redirect flood flows.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Discussion/Explanation:

i. FLOOD HAZARD

**No Impact:** No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the Project site or off-site improvement locations; therefore, no impact would occur.

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. 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.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** As described in response IX.a., the Project would be required to implement water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) to address site design, source control, and construction BMP requirements. A PDP SWQMP was submitted for the Project dated November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019. The SWQMP has been prepared in accordance with the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual and SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (2013), as adopted by the RWQCB on May 8, 2013.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project is subject to the General Plan Rural Lands Regional Category and contains lands within the Rural Lands 20 (RL-20) Land Use Designation. The Project is also subject to the policies of the Ramona Community Plan. The plan has goals of preserving the rural character of the communities and the natural ambience of the subregion; maintaining and enhancing the future of agriculture as well as careful management of environmental resources including maintenance of adequate water supplies. The Project is consistent with the policies of the Ramona Community Plan. The property is zoned A72 which permits small wineries with an Administrative Use Permit pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance Section 2703; therefore, the Project is consistent with the plan and zone.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** The Project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the Project site is currently developed and is surrounded by rural residential and agricultural land use types 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 would 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands or is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan would occur as a result of this Project.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is a proposed small winery and will be occupied by employees and public. Based on analysis and aerial review by County Noise Specialist, the surrounding area supports residential and agricultural uses and is occupied by residents. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

**General Plan – Noise Element**

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps, Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in

excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

In addition, according to the SANDAG Series 13 Traffic Forecast for the year 2020, Highland Valley Road is projected to have approximately 5,300 average daily trips (ADT). The project would result in an additional 75 ADT from the daily tour and tasting events. There will be a maximum of 70 events annually, which can accommodate up to 300 people. The added traffic generation from this project would not result in more than double the existing sound energy of any documented noisy site. A doubling of traffic noise or acoustical energy would result in a noise level increase of three dBA. In general, a three dBA change in the community noise levels is perceivable, while one or two dB changes generally is not perceived. Therefore, the project would not expose existing land uses to noise levels that exceed the noise standards.

#### Ramona Community Plan

Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the noise standards. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Ramona Community Plan.

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's MUP property lines. The site as well as surrounding adjacent parcels are zoned General Agriculture (A72) that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA daytime and 45 dBA nighttime. The main source of noise would be from the amplified music and mechanical units. The hours of operations would be limited to 7:00 am to 10:00 pm, where no amplified or live music are allowed after 10:00 pm. To ensure that the implementation of this project would not expose existing or future noise sensitive land uses to noise level that exceed noise standards, the project would be conditioned to adhere to these hours of operation. Amplified music would be located at two locations, the east corner of APN 276-101-14-00 and western area as shown in the approved AD-16-023 plot plan. The amplified noise at the west location would be monitored and controlled to not exceed 50 dBA, in addition, the speakers would not be distributed beyond the Hospitality and Winery Building. The closest property line to the western outdoor event area is approximately 130 feet to the south, however, that adjacent property line is part of the Perrin Winery operation. The nearest occupied NSLU property line is approximately 500 feet away from the project's noise source. That project site consists of greater than 25% slopes and is located at higher elevations than surrounding parcels. Based on review by County staff, the project is not expected to expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards.

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

The project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the

project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b, and Ramona Community Plan) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404 and 36.409) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Amplified music and mechanical units. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI.a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. The project will be conditioned to limit the hours of operations for the amplified noise. Events with amplified music will occur within 7:00 am to 10:00 pm, where no amplified, recorded, or live music are allowed after 10:00pm. Based on the County’s noise standards, ambient noise is not anticipated to be significant when noise levels from the project site are in compliance with the Noise Ordinance, Section 36.404. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise level, as the project will increase the ambient noise level by less than 3 dB CNEL. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Based on the Noise Report prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc. and dated January 7, 2020, Pursuant to Section 36.410 of the Noise Ordinance, impulsive noise from the rock drilling and break may exceed thresholds if drilling and breaking were to occur within 225 feet of a residential property line. To mitigate for impacts incurred by temporary rock crushing and drilling staged within 225 feet of a residential property line, a County approved Acoustician, shall prepare an acoustical analysis and submit to the County for review and approval. The acoustical study shall identify all noise-generating equipment and predict noise levels from all identified equipment at the applicable property line. If applicable, the analysis shall also identify mitigation measures shown to effectively reduce the noise levels to conformance, pursuant County’s Noise Ordinance, Section 36.408, 409, 410.

Furthermore, the report evaluated the general construction noise. Based on the modeling of the equipment to be utilized during Project construction, the Project is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**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. The closest airport is the Ramona Airport, which is approximately 3 miles to the southeast of the project site. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip. The closest airport is the Ramona Airport, which is approximately 3 miles to the southeast of the project site. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project would not displace any existing housing since the site is currently used for a vineyard and there are no existing residential use types on the Project site.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project would not displace a substantial number of people since the site currently does not contain a residence.

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on review by County staff, service availability forms, and concurrence received from agencies/departments for the Project, the Project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. The Project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the Project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the Project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

**XVI. 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 Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

**XVII. 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:** The Project would result in less than 200 ADT. The Project would 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. The Project site is located off Highland Valley Road which has been determined by County Traffic Specialist to provide adequate capacity for the Project. 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.

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines details new regulations, effective statewide July 1, 2020 that sets forth specific considerations for evaluating a project’s transportation impacts. Generally, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. VMT refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. Except as provided regarding roadway capacity, a project’s effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact.

**No Impact:** The County of San Diego has not adopted a threshold for VMT and is not expected to until July 2020, when the provisions of the section apply statewide. As the VMT threshold does not yet apply, no impact would occur. In addition, the primary intention of the VMT threshold

is to reduce GHG emissions associated with vehicle trips. For land uses expected to have varying trip generation on different days of the week it have been deemed appropriate to determine the average trip generation for purposes of determining if a project meets the small project screening criteria under VMT analysis. As stated previously in Section III. Air Quality, the ADT for the Project would be less than 200.

The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) prepared a white paper which recommends a 900 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year screening level to determine the size of projects that would be likely to have a less than considerable contribution to the cumulative impact of climate change. Given this, the Project is below the CAPCOA screening level of 900 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e annually. Due to the aforementioned factors, the Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project would not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impedes adequate site distance on a road. Additionally, the applicant would be required to submit a sight distance certification from a registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor prior to occupancy of the first structure built.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape,

sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. No tribal cultural resources were identified during consultation. As such, there are no impacts to tribal cultural resources.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. A Wastewater Feasibility Study was prepared for the Project dated November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2019. For events which would exceed 75 maximum visitor guests, portable toilets would be utilized. 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 December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project consists of a small winery with a 25,000 square foot production facility, 12,000 square foot hospitality building, 5,000 square foot crush pad, 1,500 square feet of storage, and 5 units of vineyard worker housing. A Wastewater Feasibility Study was prepared for the Project dated November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2019. The proposed OSWS was approved by DEH December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

Additionally, Project requires water service from the Ramona Municipal Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Ramona Municipal Water District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the Project would have sufficient water supplies available, and would not require substantial pipeline extensions to serve the Project. Thus, these extensions would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project site would require 5 new stormwater drainage systems including bioretention basins and biofiltration with hydromodification to serve the Project. Each system would discharge excess runoff through existing 36-inch culverts within an existing seasonal creek along Highland Valley Road. However, these extensions would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project requires water service from the Ramona Municipal Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Ramona Municipal Water District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the Project would have sufficient water supplies available, and would not require substantial pipeline extensions to serve the Project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project would rely completely on an on-site wastewater system (septic system); therefore, the Project would 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the Project would generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with

remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the Project would 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 would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project site is located in a very high Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ), and is surrounded by agricultural land and open space land, which have been identified as very high FHSZ. However, the Project would not substantially impair any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Project would be serviced by the Ramona Municipal Water District (RMWD). Pursuant to the fire service availability form submitted for the Project, the RMWD has indicated the Project is eligible for service and nearest fire station is located 7.2 miles from the Project. Response time to the Project site has been estimated to be thirteen (13) minutes, meeting the time allowed pursuant to the Safety Element of twenty (20) minutes. Therefore, the Project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

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

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

As indicated above in response xx.a., the Project is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone. However, the majority of the County is in the High and Very High FHSZ. Accordingly, the County has implemented fire safety measures depending on specific factors, such as location, vegetation, etc. The Project was approved by the San Diego County Fire Authority on September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2018. The Project would not exacerbate wildfire risk due to slope, prevailing winds or other factors because the Project area would be kept toward the front of the property where slopes are relatively flat to moderately sloped and is located near residences and agricultural fields. The Project would also be required to meet applicable fire measures such as fire sprinklers, site inspections, premises identification, fire apparatus access, access road requirements, fire hydrants and vegetation removal/clearance. Additionally, the County of San Diego Fire Authority has indicated the availability to serve the site in the case that a fire would occur. The nearest fire station is located 7.2 miles from the Project site and would meet the maximum travel time pursuant to the Safety Element.

- c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project is for a small winery and event space, with associated vineyard worker housing. No installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, such as roads, fuel breaks, or emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities would be required for the Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project proposes 7,000 cubic yards of cut slopes, 2,000 cubic yards of fill, and 5,000 cubic yards of export. In order to assure that the buildings are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process to evaluate the strength of underlying soils, make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems, and demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. Moreover, as indicated within response VII(a)(iv), the Project site is not within a landslide susceptibility area as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. The Project site has a low probability to become unstable. Therefore, the

Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes. Impacts are less than significant.

**XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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.

Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly Coast Live Oak woodland and seasonal ponds onsite. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes compliance with resource avoidance measures during the bird nesting season, offsite purchase of land within the MSCP, and a combination of purchase of mitigation credits, reestablishment of habitat, or habitat rehabilitation. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT TYPE	LOCATION	STATUS
Fenton Ranch Tract No 4979 RPL4	Administrative Permit (PDS2016-AD-16-001)	S of Bandy Canyon Road, Escondido, CA 92065	Out to Applicant

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 XX of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VII. Geology and Soils, IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, X Hydrology and Water Quality XIII. Noise, XIV. Population and Housing, and XVII. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. There is a potential for impacts from Project noise generation to be significant, however incorporation of Project mitigation would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

**XXII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

**TECHNICAL STUDIES: The following is a list of project specific technical studies used to support the analysis of each potential environmental effect:**

Brian F Smith and Associates, Inc., Brian Smith (October 2018). Cultural Resources Study for the Perrin Oak Ranch Winery Project, PDS2016-AD-16-023

EBA Engineering, Inc., Damon Morelli (November 2019). CEQA Preliminary Drainage Report, Perrin Winery

EBA Engineering, Inc., Damon Morelli (November 2019). Priority Development Project (PDP) SWQMP, Perrin Winery

Frank Springer and Associates, Inc., Frank Springer (November 2019). Revised Preliminary Domestic Wastewater Feasibility Study for the Perrin Oak Ranch Winery

Helix Environmental Planning, Beth Ehsan (September 2019). Biological Resources Letter Report for the Perrin Ranch Winery Project, PDS2016-AD-16-023, APN: 276-101-05-00

Ramona Municipal Water District, Stacey Ralston (March 2019). Project Facility Availability- Water, Gregory Perrin, PFI Realty, L.P., 16138 Highland Valley Road, 276-101-05-00

Ramona Municipal Water District, James Pine (August 2016). Project Facility Availability- Fire, Gregory Perrin, PFI Realty, L.P., 16138 Highland Valley Road, 276-101-05-00

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

#### 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](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

#### BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and 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](http://www.dfg.ca.gov))

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

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

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and 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 (5<sup>th</sup> Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov))

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook.

Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

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

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

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

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

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996.  
([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted August 3, 2011. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

#### MINERAL RESOURCES

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

Subdivision Map Act, 2011. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

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

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

#### NOISE

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

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

County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, effective August 3, 2011. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

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

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

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

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

#### POPULATION & HOUSING

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

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

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

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

#### RECREATION

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

#### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority ALUCP'S ([http://www.san.org/sdcraa/airport\\_initiatives/land\\_use/adopted\\_docs.aspx](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](http://www.gpoaccess.gov))

**UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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