



# County of San Diego

**MARK WARDLAW**  
DIRECTOR

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

**KATHLEEN FLANNERY**  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

April 3, 2019

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

1. Title; Project Numbers; Environmental Log Number:  
  
Aventine at Sweetwater Springs; PDS2018-SPA-18-002, GPA-18-004, TM-5627, REZ-18-002, STP-18-013, MUP-70-299W1M32; PDS2018-ER-18-19-003
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 Denise Russell, Project Manager
  - b. Phone number: (858) 694-2019
  - c. E-mail: denise.russell@sdcounty.ca.gov
4. Project location:  
  
2770-2792 Sweetwater Springs Blvd., Spring Valley, within unincorporated San Diego County  
  
Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1271, Grid E/7
5. Project Applicant name and address:  
  
Lennar Homes, Alex Plishner  
16465 Via Esprillo, Suite 150  
San Diego, CA 92127
6. General Plan  
Community Plan: Spring Valley  
Regional Category: Village  
Land Use Designation: General Commercial  
Proposed LU Designation: Village Residential (VR-10.9)  
Density: N/A

Proposed Density: 8.7 du/acre  
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) N/A

7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: C36, General Commercial  
Proposed Use Regulation: RM, Multifamily Residential  
Minimum Lot Size: N/A  
Special Area Regulation: B – Community Design Review

8. Description of project:

The applicant is proposing the development of 92 detached condominium units on approximately 10.57 acres of land within the Spring Valley Community Plan area. The project site has an existing shopping center that will be demolished and removed.

The project will require the following discretionary actions:

- a General Plan Amendment (GPA);
- a Specific Plan Amendment (SPA);
- a Rezone;
- a Site Plan;
- a Major Use Permit (MUP) Minor Deviation; and
- a Tentative Map.

The General Plan Amendment would change the General Plan Land Use Designation from General Commercial to Village Residential (VR-10.9). The Regional Category of Village applies to the property; no change to the Regional Category is proposed with the Project. The GPA would also amend the Spring Valley Community Plan maps and text to be consistent with the project. The SPA would amend the Rancho San Diego (Sweetwater-Avocado) Specific Plan (SP-74-01) to amend the land use designation from General Commercial to Multi-Family Residential, for consistency with the proposed GPA. The Rezone would change the zoning designation from General Commercial (C36) to Multi-Family Residential (RM). A Site Plan is required due to the “B” special area designator, ensuring the project is reviewed for community design consistency. A Minor Deviation will be processed to remove the property from MUP-70-299. This MUP was approved in 1970 for Sweetwater Village, a Planned Residential Development covering the area west and northwest of the project site along Austin Drive. Finally, the Tentative Map is required for the condominium subdivision.

The project site is located west of Sweetwater Springs Blvd. and south of Austin Drive in the Spring Valley Community Plan area. Access to the site would be provided by a private driveway along Austin Drive, and an existing private driveway along Sweetwater Springs Blvd. Earthwork will consist of cut and fill of approximately 23,200 cubic yards. Offsite improvements consist only of upgrading the Sweetwater Springs Blvd. crosswalk to meet accessibility requirements.

The Project Site is currently developed as a neighborhood retail center, which is defined as a shopping complex, comprised of approximately 118,750 square feet, with a supermarket or drugstore as an anchor tenant. However, this site has been unable to attract a mainstream grocery or pharmacy tenant as a necessary anchor. Instead, the neighborhood retail center is currently anchored by a church. Other uses include with an ATM, liquor store and small pizza restaurant. The center has a total vacancy rate of 53%, based on leasable square footage. It has historically underperformed in terms of ownership and tenant stability, vacancy and lease rates (Meyers Research- 2018).

The project would be served by the Otay Water District and San Diego County Sanitation District. No extension of sewer and utility lines is proposed at this time. Two recreation areas are proposed for resident use, totaling 14,880 square feet, and each dwelling unit has 100 square feet of private open space. The project will install 1.8 kilowatt solar/photovoltaic systems on each dwelling unit and will plumb each dwelling unit for the future installation of a Level 2 electric vehicle charging station.

Two garage parking spaces will be provided for each detached condominium unit, and a total of 16 spaces will be provided adjacent to the two proposed onsite recreation areas. This includes two parking spaces complying with the American Disability Act located adjacent to the proposed active recreation areas. No offsite parking is proposed. Landscaping in accordance with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance will be installed, including two new trees planted per dwelling unit.

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

The Project site is in the community of Spring Valley within unincorporated southwestern San Diego County. The Project site is bounded by Austin Drive, a two-lane road, to the north, Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, a four-lane roadway to the east, and Avenida Bosques, directly adjacent to the west. Lands surrounding the project site are used for residential and commercial/office and light industrial uses.

Village Residential condominiums and higher density residential development tracts are located nearby to the northeast, south, west and northwest, including multi-family residential use (apartments) to the northwest and single-family residential use to the northeast across Austin Drive. Adjacent to the south is an apartment complex, with single-family residential uses located further to the south and southwest. The Sweetwater Springs Community School and multi-family residential uses are located directly to the west of the site across Avenida Bosques. To the east, buffered by Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, uses include commercial/office [medical use (physical therapy office)] and light industrial use (e.g., toy store, laser cutting service, spirits distillery, church, auto repair, hearing aid store, fire protection system supplier, pre-made stone countertop store, window/door installation store, metal refinishing, motorcycle repair, etc.) located to the east/southeast across Sweetwater Springs Boulevard and Via Orange Way.

The topography of the project site is relatively flat, and surrounding land is sloping. The site is located within 1 mile of SR-94.

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

<b>Permit Type/Action</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Final Map Modifications	County of San Diego
General Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit Minor Deviation	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego
Site Plan	County of San Diego
Specific Plan Specific Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit Grading Permit Plan Change	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm Water Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Otay Water District
Sewer District Approval	San Diego County Sanitation District
Fire District Approval	San Miguel Fire District

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 project 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 type="checkbox"/> <u>Biological Resources</u>            | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Cultural Resources</u>               | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Energy Use</u>                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Geology &amp; Soils</u>             | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u>         | <input checked="" 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</u>                   | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Tribal Cultural Resources</u>                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Wildfire</u>                         | <input checked="" 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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Denise Russell  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
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. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099** -- 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.

As described in the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPU EIR; County of San Diego 2011), the County contains visual resources affording opportunities for scenic vistas in every community. Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) are identified within the GPU EIR and are the closest that the County comes to specifically designating scenic vistas. Many public roads in the County currently have views of RCAs or expanses of natural resources that would have the potential to be considered scenic vistas. Numerous public trails are also available throughout the County. New development can often have the potential to obstruct, interrupt, or detract from a scenic vista.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is located within the Spring Valley Community Planning area (CPA), approximately one mile south of State Route 94 (SR-94), a County General Plan Designated Scenic Corridor. The County has not designated any RCAs with the Spring Valley CPA. However, the existing site is developed with a commercial shopping center and is surrounded by single and multi-family residential and commercial/office developments. Based on a site visit by County staff on May 30, 2018, and photosimulations of the proposed development provided by the applicant, the proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and will not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. Therefore, the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed 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 will not contribute to a cumulative impact because all projects are designed

to be compatible with the overall visual character of the area. Therefore, the project will 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:** Based on a site visit completed on May 30, 2018, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The project site is located approximately one mile south of SR-94 and 2.5 miles east of Highway 125, a State scenic highway. Due to the distance and intervening topography, the Project site would not be visible. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed 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 will not contribute to a cumulative impact because all projects are compatible with the existing viewshed. Therefore, the project will 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 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 an urbanized area of the Spring Valley community, located at the intersection of Austin Drive and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard and is currently a commercial center. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings can be characterized as highly developed and diverse land use types such as industrial, commercial and high density residential with relatively flat or slightly sloped grades. Both Sweetwater Springs Boulevards and Austin Drive support comparable high-density residential units to the proposed Project. Viewer groups of the Project site include those traveling along the County Roadways of Austin Drive, Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, and Avenida Bosques. The viewer exposure is either limited due to travel speed or is extended for vehicles stopped at the traffic light of Austin Drive and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard.

The proposed Project within the landscape would not detract from or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of the surrounding area for the following reasons: the height, setbacks, and design of the proposed condominiums are consistent to the height designator, setbacks and design of the residential development of the surrounding area; the proposed development is subject to design review by the County through a discretionary Site Plan for conformance with the Spring Valley Design Guidelines; and landscaping has been incorporated within the project along Sweetwater Springs Boulevard and Austin Drive for screening purposes from viewers. The location, size, and design of the proposed use would be compatible with adjacent uses due to the following reasons: the proposed condominium development is similar to surrounding "Village Residential" condominiums and higher density residential development tracts nearby to the northeast, south, west and northwest. Moreover, a Site Plan is required to implement the site's architectural component and is used as a mechanism for input and review with the Spring Valley Design Review Board and community. Viewer exposure to the Project would not be a significant effect since the Project is proposed in a highly developed area and has been designed in a way to be compatible with the surrounding use types. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in a substantial effect on the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

The project will 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 XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XIX are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because the project would be visually integrated into the surroundings in an unobtrusive manner. Therefore, the project will 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 proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 34 miles from the Mount Laguna Observatory and approximately 42 miles from Palomar Observatory. However, the project will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209), including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Planning & Development Services Department and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planner from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

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

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

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (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?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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 contains soils which have been mapped by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency. The mapped soils are Farmland of Statewide Importance and are in the northeastern portion of the site. However, the project site is entirely developed and is surrounded by developed commercial and residential lots. Additionally, the project site does not contain lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of local importance as mapped by FMMP. Due to the existing development and lack of available resources on the site, no agricultural resources would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

**No Impact:** The project site is zoned C36, which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. The project site's land is also not under a Williamson Act Contract, nor is not surrounded by any such land. The closest preserve or Williamson Act Contract is approximately 3.15 miles northeast from the project site. Therefore, the project would 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))?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

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

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

**No Impact:** The project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore project implementation would

not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of offsite forest resources.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

**No Impact:** The project site and surrounding area within a radius of one-quarter mile does not contain any active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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                               |

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project involves 92 residential condominium units. An Air Quality Study was prepared by Ldn Consulting Inc. on March 4, 2019. The project proposes development that was anticipated and considered by SANDAG growth projections used in development of the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The project's current allowed zoning (C36) was found to be more intensive than the proposed development with 118,700 SF of commercial space currently onsite. The project is considered consistent with both the RAQS and SIP because it will be less intensive than the existing commercial uses on the site and would not interfere with the SDAPCD's goals for improving air quality in the SDAB. The project would not create a direct or cumulatively considerable impact.

- b) 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?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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                               |

San Diego County 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:** Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions from both construction and operation of the project.

Construction emissions for the project were quantified in pounds per day from the construction operations and equipment identified in the Air Quality Assessment. It should also be noted that as a design feature, and condition of the Project, Tier IV or better construction equipment would be utilized during all phases of the grading and construction phases. The emissions for each pollutant type (i.e. ROG, CO, PM) are well below the significance threshold set forth by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). Therefore, construction of the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant and impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the project is expected in 2022. The Project traffic generation estimates roughly 736 trips per day. The air quality model run for the project has default values for operational trips and was updated using these estimates. Additionally, the model was run for the winter and summer scenarios to determine operational impacts for the first year of operation.

The estimated daily pollutant generation can be calculated utilizing the product of the average daily miles traveled and the expected emissions inventory calculated by air quality modeling software. The daily pollutants calculated for summer and winter are shown in the air quality assessment. The SDAPCD significance criteria for operations is also provided. Whenever calculated emissions are less than requisite screening thresholds, a less than significant impact would be expected. The project's daily pollutant generation is well below the SDAPCD operational air quality significance thresholds. Therefore, operational air quality impacts associated with the cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant would be less than significant.

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 XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM<sub>10</sub>, or any O<sub>3</sub> precursors.

c) 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 following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: Sweetwater Springs Community School, adjacent to Project site to the west and Encompass Medical Plaza, across Avenida Bosques to the east. Based on the Air Quality Assessment prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc., March 2019, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. In addition, the proposed Project is less intensive than the existing commercial center and is expected to generate fewer ADTs. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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:** Potential onsite odor generators would include short term construction odors from activities such as paving and possibly painting. Odors created during short term construction activities would most likely be from placing asphalt which has a slight odor from the bitumen and solvents used within hot asphalt. Since odors generated during construction are short-term, they would not be considered a significant impact.

For operations, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality (County of San Diego, 2007) includes a list of odor-producing uses that are typically recognized. Residential uses are not listed and would therefore not be a significant odor causing source. Based on this, the Project would not result in significant odors during operations, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

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

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

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

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

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

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

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

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

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

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

**No Impact:** Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP). The project is consistent with the MSCP, Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO), and Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO).

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

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to historical resources.

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

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

**No Impact:** Based on analysis of County of San Diego resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow, it has been determined that the project site is fully developed which includes a fill of 25-30 feet. The proposed project would not grade beyond the first five feet of fill. As such, the project does not contain any archaeological resources and would not impact buried resources.

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

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

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

**VI. ENERGY USE** -- 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?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would result in the use of electricity, natural gas, petroleum, and other consumption of energy resources during both the construction and

operation phases of the project; however, the consumption is not expected to be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary for the following reasons.

During construction, Tier IV certified construction equipment would be utilized during all phases of construction. Tier IV diesel engine standards are the strictest EPA emissions requirement for off-highway diesel engines. This requirement regulates the amount of particulate matter (PM), or black soot, and nitrogen oxides (NOx) that can be emitted from an off-highway diesel engine. Tier IV equipment also runs more efficiently and thus uses less energy resources. In addition, the project will be required to comply with the Construction and Demolition Materials Diversion Ordinance (Sections 68.508 through 68.518 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances). The ordinance requires that 90% of inert material and 70% of all other materials must be recycled from the project. In order to comply with the ordinance, applicants must submit a Construction and Demolition Debris Management Plan and a fully refundable Performance Guarantee prior to building permit issuance. This ultimately will result in less energy use overall as the demolished materials will be reused after recycling.

The operation of the residential project is expected to reduce both average daily trips (and associated gasoline usage) and carbon dioxide equivalent than the current commercial center. Implementation of the proposed project would therefore generally decrease the demand for electricity and natural gas at the project Site, and gasoline consumption in the project area during construction and operation relative to existing conditions. The project would be designed according to the most recent 2016 Title 24 or future, more stringent versions of Title 24 that are applicable as the project is built out. Part 6 of Title 24 specifically establishes energy efficiency standards for residential buildings constructed in the State of California to reduce energy demand and consumption.

Additionally, the proposed 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. These measures consist of various energy efficiency and design features, water efficient appliances and installation of rain barrels and trees per residence. Additional measures such as efficient outdoor water usage, solar panels, energy efficient outdoor lighting, electric vehicle charging stations, "cool parking", building efficiency standards, recycling areas, bike parking racks, and available informational materials for residents on various topics, such as ride share programs and recycling, will be employed by the project. Therefore, the construction and operation of the residential 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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         |

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

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, a Geotechnical Investigation for the Project prepared by GEOCON dated April 2018, indicated that the potential for manifestation of liquefaction or settlement was considered negligible due to the dense formational material encountered, remedial grading recommended, and lack of a shallow groundwater condition. Therefore, there will 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. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is considered low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

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

**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. In addition, a geotechnical investigation for the project by GEOCON dated April 2018 indicated that based on the generally flat topography and no mapped landslides within or near the site, the potential for landslides is considered low. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** According to the “Updated Geotechnical Investigation” prepared by GEOCON April 2018, the site is underlain by previously placed fill, colluvium/older alluvium, and granite rock. The soil erodibility rating is “moderate” on the northeastern portion of the site and “severe” on the southwestern portion of the site as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San

Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Storm Water Quality Management Plan dated July, 2018, prepared by Hunsaker & Associates San Diego Incorporated. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site:
  - the County Standard lot perimeter protection detail and the County Standard desilting basin will be used as the erosion control method for disturbed flat areas
  - hydraulic stabilization hydroseeding will be used as the erosion control measure on disturbed slopes
  - Sediment control measures such as silt fence, fiber rolls, sand bags, storm drain inlet protection and an engineered desilting basin will be used for all disturbed on-site areas;
  - A stabilized construction entrance and street weeping and vacuuming will be used to prevent offsite tracking of sediment
  - For runoff or dewatering operation that is concentrated, water velocity will be controlled using an energy dissipater outlet protection
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

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

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 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 XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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 proposed project involves 23,200 cubic yards of grading that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. In order to assure that any proposed buildings (including those proposed on the project site) are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect 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                               |

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project is located on expansive soils as defined by 2016 California Building Code (CBC) Section 1803.5.3. This was confirmed by GEOCON through lab testing. The soils on-site are based from previously placed fill, colluvium/older alluvium, and granite rock. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

**No Impact:** The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. Service availability letters have been received from the San Diego County Sanitation District, dated December 6, 2017, and from the Otay Water District, dated December 7, 2017, indicating that the facility has adequate capacity for the project's wastewater disposal needs. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed. Additionally, no extension of sewer and utility lines is proposed at this time.

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         |

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

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

The project has high potential for containing paleontological resources and will excavate more than 2,500 cubic yards for the subject project. However, the project site is fully developed which includes a fill of 25-30 feet. The proposed project would not grade beyond the first five feet of fill. As such, the project would not excavate into the substratum and/or bedrock below the soil horizons.

**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:

**Overview**

The project would produce GHG emissions during construction activities, as well as during the operation of the project through vehicle trips, use of the residential buildings, and other associated uses. From an operational perspective, the project is less GHG intensive than the existing commercial center due primarily to the reduction in vehicle trips and would reduce the current carbon dioxide equivalent annual emissions. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact for that, and other reasons, as detailed below.

**Background on CAP and Litigation**

The County of San Diego adopted a Climate Action Plan on February 14, 2018 which outlines actions that the County will 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. In March 2018, several petitioners filed a lawsuit against the County, alleging that the CAP

and, in particular, M-GHG-1 were inconsistent with General Plan Goal COS-20 and Policy COS-20.1.

In December 2018, the San Diego Superior Court ruled against the County. The Court issued a writ ordering the approval of the CAP and its EIR to be set aside, and enjoining reliance on the County CAP's mitigation measure M-GHG-1. In January 2019, the County appealed the San Diego Superior Court ruling which stayed the above described writ. Essentially, the CAP and its EIR are still in place during the appeal. Given the current legal instability concerning the County's CAP, the analysis prepared for the proposed project did not rely on the CAP to streamline the Project's environmental analysis under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Rather, the proposed project's significance determination used the criteria detailed above, (informed by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4) and mitigation strategies (informed by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(c)) that are independent of the CAP. As such, in the event that the CAP does not withstand judicial scrutiny, the project has undergone a separate, stand-alone analysis for determining whether the project's GHG emissions would significantly impact the environment.

Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, the two Appendix G checklist questions set forth above are utilized as the thresholds of significance when evaluating the environmental effects of the project's GHG emissions. In applying these thresholds, reference is made to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)(1)-(3), which states that, "a lead agency should consider the following factors, among others, when assessing the significance of impacts from greenhouse gas emissions on the environment: (1) the extent to which a project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting; (2) whether project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project; and, (3) the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions."

Recognizing that GHG emissions contribute to the cumulative impact condition of global climate change, Section 15064(h)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines is also applicable. Section 15064(h)(1) states that "the lead agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable." A cumulative impact may be significant when the project's incremental effect, though individually limited, is cumulatively considerable. "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of other past, current, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The existing commercial development has been in existence since well before GHG inventories have been tracked within the County of San Diego and would fall within the GHG emissions that were accounted for within County projections of the Climate Action Plan (CAP). The traffic study shows the existing facility located on the project site could generate as much as 9,496 average daily trips (ADT) when fully operational while the proposed project would generate 736 ADT (Linscott Law & Greenspan, 2018). A conservative analysis

was used that calculated the net difference between the GHG emissions of the project and the GHG emissions of the existing leased 44,470 SF commercial use.

#### Construction CO<sub>2</sub>e Emissions Calculation Methodology

The proposed project would demolish roughly 118,700 SF of existing buildings onsite. The project would then grade the site to allow for 92 residential units. After grading, trenching would be necessary to install new infrastructure and drainage. Once earthwork activities are completed, paving and building construction activities would follow. CalEEMod 2016.3.2, a computer model that estimates GHG emissions, was utilized for all construction calculations. CalEEMod was manually updated to include Tier 4 construction equipment with diesel particulate filters as the project applicant would include this as a project design feature.

During construction, grading activities will remove mostly asphalt and concrete areas with limited vegetation. (The site is currently comprised mostly of asphalt and concrete with less than two dozen trees.) The proposed project would add a minimum of 184 trees and shrubs throughout and all vegetation on the western portion of the site will remain. Given this, the project would ultimately sequester more carbon during operations than existing site sequestration. Though a credit would be expected, sequestration was not analyzed, and no vegetation credit was taken for this project.

Utilizing the CalEEMod inputs for the model, the total construction of the project will produce approximately 717.160 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e over the construction life of the project. Based on South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology, it is recommended to average the construction emissions over the project life which is assumed to be 30 years. Given this, the annual construction emission would be 23.91 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year.

#### Operational Emissions Calculation Methodology

It should be noted that the project requires the elimination of the existing commercial uses on the site which consists of an approximately 118,700 SF commercial facility. However, the existing commercial operations are underutilized with only 44,470 SF of the 118,700 SF being currently leased out. Also, it should be noted, the underutilized development currently generates 1,790 ADT. For purposes of this analysis, the GHG emission generation of the project is calculated as the net difference between the GHG emissions of the project and the GHG emissions of the existing leased 44,470 SF commercial use. CalEEMod calculations were prepared for this scenario using historic energy assumptions since the facilities were constructed years before the date of the report. The existing underutilized commercial (44,470 SF) annual GHG emissions as calculated by CalEEMod is 1,480.84 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

The Project traffic engineer estimated that there would be 736 daily trips from the proposed project (Linscott Law & Greenspan, 2018). The project would install enough solar to reduce projected emissions at least 90.93 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Based on calculations using standard data for the San Diego region, the project would install an equivalent photovoltaic system capable of producing 1.8 kWh per unit. In addition, the project's utilization of emissions reducing strategies recommended by CARB in its *Second Update to the Scoping Plan* all reasonable and

feasible on-site measures to reduce GHG emissions were also evaluated and incorporated as design features.

Based on the above findings, the proposed project would generate 914.172 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e annually from construction and operational emissions, with the incorporation of design features such as solar and high efficiency lighting. The 44,470 SF of onsite commercial uses generate roughly 1,480.84 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e. Based on this, the proposed project would result in a net decrease of (1,480.84 - 914.172) 566.67 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e from the existing environmental setting. Because the project would result in a reduction of GHG emissions levels as compared to the existing commercial use, impacts would be less than significant (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)(1)). Similarly, because the project would result in a reduction of GHG emissions level as compared to the existing environmental setting, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to global GHG emissions. Therefore, the project would not result in a project-specific or cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative GHG emissions that result in a significant impact to global climate change.

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:

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

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

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

Consistency with Relevant General Plan Policies:

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 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.

In addition, the proposed project would implement all applicable measures identified in the CAP Checklist. Proposed incorporated measures from the CAP Checklist include the following: electric or alternatively-fueled water heating systems, water efficient appliances and plumbing fixtures, rain barrel installations, a landscape documentation package which is required to demonstrate a 40 percent reduction in outdoor water use, and tree installation of a minimum of 184 trees. The proposed project would also incorporate additional design features and measures to reduce emissions: installation of weather-based irrigation systems with rain sensing timers, 1.8 kWh solar/photovoltaic system on each dwelling unit, high-efficiency LED street and area lighting, electric vehicle charging stations, "cool parking" consistent with CARB, Tier IV California Resources Board certified construction equipment, architectural coatings compliant with SDAPCD Rule 67, storage and collection areas for recyclables with informational materials available to residents, informational materials on ride share programs, bicycle parking rack at the recreational area, and building efficiency measures such as high efficiency HVAC systems and sealed air ducts to reduce heating and cooling losses.

Although the project is not consistent with the land use designation in the General Plan and therefore with the established GHG reduction targets in the CAP, the proposed project would reduce GHG emissions compared to the existing use (please refer to the discussion in VIII(a) above). (It should be noted that the Project is, however, consistent with the Village Regional Category of the General Plan.)

Consistency with SANDAG's San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan:

Regarding consistency with SANDAG's RTP/SCS, the project would include site design elements and project design features developed to support the policy objectives of the RTP and SB 375. The Project would implement land use and design measures that would create an environment that promotes alternative mode choice (e.g., pedestrian/bicycle networks and proximity to bus routes). The design of the project is based on a compact neighborhood design, where pedestrian and bicycle path provide access to the community facilities such as parks and clubhouse as well as the proposed bike lane and pathway.

As a design feature, the developer will provide to all homeowners an informative brochure to educate homeowners regarding water conservation measures, recycling, location of outdoor

electric outlets to promote using electrical lawn and garden equipment, and location of nearby resources such as dining and entertainment venues, small commercial centers, and civic uses to reduce vehicle miles traveled. The project will include sidewalks/pathways throughout the site.

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed residential project would remove 566 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent from baseline conditions. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change and 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 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 analysis within this section is based on a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report, submitted by EEI (September 2017), and a Phase II ESA report, submitted by Geosyntec, (September 2017).

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

However, the project proposes to demolish a structure on site that was constructed prior to 1980 and that may contain Lead Based Paint (LBP) and Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs). Lead is a highly toxic metal that was used up until 1978 in paint used on walls, woodwork, siding, windows and doors. Lead containing materials shall be managed by applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 CCR Division 4.5, the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 CCR Section 1532.1) and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8). Asbestos was used extensively from the 1940's until the late 1970's in the construction industry for fireproofing, thermal and acoustic insulation, condensation control, and decoration. The USEPA has determined that there is no "safe" exposure level to asbestos. It is therefore highly regulated by the USEPA, CalEPA, and the CalOSHA. Demolition or renovation operations that involve asbestos-containing materials must conform to San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rules 361.140-361.156. In accordance with existing regulations, the project will be required to complete asbestos and lead surveys to determine the presence or absence

of ACMs or LBP prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of onsite structures and prior to commencement of demolition.

Additionally, a former dry-cleaning business existed on-site. Investigations conducted by EEI and Geosyntec in 2016 identified relatively minor soil and soil vapor impacts associated with the dry-cleaning operations. However, localized soil and soil vapor impacts would be effectively addressed through mitigation of soil management procedures following demolition of the existing structures at the site. This would include targeted excavation of approximately 25 to 75 cubic yards of soil to be transported offsite to an appropriate disposal facility followed by confirmation soil samples to document that impacted soil has been adequately removed. With the incorporation of the aforementioned requirements and mitigation measures, the impacts associated with hazardous materials would be reduced to less than significant.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

**No Impact:** Although the project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing school, the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on a regulatory database search per CalAtlantis Group, Inc., the project site has been subject to a release of hazardous substances that could create a significant hazard to the public or environment. A former onsite dry cleaner, Bonded Cleaners, 2778 Sweetwater Springs Blvd., Suite F, had operated on the subject property since at least 1987 until approximately September 2016. The facility was reported under the EDR Historical Cleaners, Facility Index Database (FINDS), Facility and Manifest (HAZNET), and EPA Air Pollution Exposure Model for Individuals (EMI) databases. Previous assessments conducted by EEI and Geosyntec indicate that concentrations of PCE and TCE in soil vapor exists beneath the subject property that exceeds residential screening levels. Therefore, the project will be conditioned to test for and remediate potential contamination from subsurface VOCs through the County Department of Environmental Health (DEH), Site Assessment and Mitigation Program (SAM).

Although the project site is listed in the DEH SAM listing and/or CalSites Envirostor database, the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because all site remediation and clean-up will occur and will be required to comply with the DEH SAM and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

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?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

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

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

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

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

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

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                               |

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is located within a County identified Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) zone. A WUI is defined as an area where development is in proximity to open space or lands with native vegetation and habitat that are prone to brush fires. Most of the unincorporated County is within the WUI. In addition, CAL FIRE has mapped areas of significant fire hazards throughout the state and classifies lands different Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) based upon fuels, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors. The FHSZ are divided into three levels of fire hazard severity: Moderate, High and Very High. The majority of the County is in the High and Very High FHSZ. However, the project site is located within the Moderate FHSZ.

The project site is completely surrounded by urbanized areas and/or irrigated lands and no wildlands are directly adjacent to the project. The nearest wildland area with native vegetation

is located approximately 0.7 mile southeast of the project site and is buffered from the project site by developed land.

A Fire Service Availability Letter dated July 27, 2018 has been received from the San Miguel Fire Protection District (SMFPD). The conditions from the SMFPD include automatic fire sprinkler systems, site inspections, premises identification (street numbers), fire apparatus access requirements (including driveways), fire hydrants, vegetation clearing, and a fair share contribution, all subject to review and approval by the SMFPD. The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the site location is 0.2 miles from the SMFPD station. The expected emergency travel time to the project site would meet the maximum travel time allowed pursuant to the Safety Element of five (5) minutes.

Also, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will 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 San Diego County. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process. Therefore, based on the location of the project and review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and through compliance with the SMFPD conditions, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code.

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?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

**No Impact:** The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

**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?

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

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project proposes development of a residential condominium complex. Development projects have the potential to generate pollutants during both the construction and post-construction phases. In order for the project to avoid potential violations of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, storm water management plans are prepared for both phases of the development project.

During the construction phase, the project would prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would implement the following 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 will 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 9, 2009. During the post-construction phase, as outlined in the Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) dated July 2018, prepared by Hunsaker & Associates, 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 (2019) and SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (2013), as adopted by the RWQCB on May 8, 2013.

The project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements of both the CGP and MS4 storm water permits listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts and addresses human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

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

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

**No Impact:** The project will obtain its water supply from the Otay Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic, or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with

groundwater recharge including, but not limited to, the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- 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 will 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 will prepare and implement a SWPPP. The SWPPP will implement the following erosion control BMPs: hydraulic stabilization 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 will be prepared in accordance with Order No. 2009-009-DWQ, NPDES Order CAS000002 CGP adopted by the SWRCB on September 9, 2009. During the post-construction phase, as outlined in the Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) dated July 2018, prepared by Hunsaker & Associates, 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 (2019) and SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (2013), as adopted by the RWQCB on May 8, 2013.

The SWPPP and SWQMP specify and describe the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream receiving waters. The Department of Public Works will ensure that these Plans are implemented as proposed. Therefore, it has been determined that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

- (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:** The Drainage Study prepared by Hunsaker & Associates, July 2018 in accordance with the County of San Diego Hydrology Manual (2003) and Hydraulic Design Manual (2014), determined that the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The project proposes

minor changes to the topography. However, the general drainage pattern relative to the existing condition will be maintained. All runoff will be directed towards the proposed water quality basin located at the southeast corner of the site. The water quality basin will treat on-site runoff and aid in addressing flow-control hydromodification. The infrastructure will include streets and associated utilities including a storm drain system (pipes, inlets, cleanouts) necessary to collect and convey site runoff through the project area. Additionally, the site will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- (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:** The SWQMP as well as the Drainage Study both prepared by Hunsaker & Associates, July 2018, determined that runoff water would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Inlets will be placed throughout the site and will be sized to collect peak flow runoff conveyed towards the water quality basin located at the southeast corner of the site. Runoff from an offsite slope at the southwest corner of the site will be collected by a proposed brow ditch and directed to the site's discharge point at the southeast project boundary corner. The basin provides the added benefit of water quality treatment, flow control measures, and peak flow attenuation. These benefits will provide improvements over the existing condition relative to erosion potential at the existing downstream discharge point. Additionally, see response C(i) for a list of site design measures, source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs proposed to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.

- (iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

**Less Than Significant Impact:** As described in response C(ii), the Drainage Study determined that the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. All runoff will be directed towards the proposed water quality basin located at the southeast corner of the site. Inlets will be placed throughout the site and will be sized to collect peak flow runoff conveyed towards the aforementioned water quality basin.

- 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 will 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:

As described in response a, the project would implement a combination of site design, source control and structural BMPs to prevent potential pollutants from entering storm water runoff. This includes water quality basin located at the southeast corner of the site which would treat on-site runoff. In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. Moreover, the project will obtain its water supply from the Otay Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source and would therefore not impact a sustainable groundwater management plan. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to obstruction to implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

**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. The project will add 92 residential units to a site that was previously intended for commercial primary use type and residential as a secondary use type. The proposed Project of residential units is consistent with the surrounding residential areas to the northeast, south, west and northwest and the project would provide for a seamless residential addition within the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide an established community.

- b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation 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: The Project site is an existing commercial center within the Spring Valley Community Plan Area of the County of San Diego General Plan. The project site has a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial (C-1) with the regional category Village. Within the C-1 land use designation, residential development is permitted as a secondary use.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project requires a General Plan Amendment (GPA), a Spring Valley Community Plan Amendment, a Rezone, and a Specific Plan Amendment (SPA). A Land Use Analysis prepared by Michael Baker International, dated November 2018, and a Market Study prepared by Meyers Research, dated November 2018, have been accepted for the project. The analysis found that the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable goals, policies, and objectives of the General Plan, Specific Plan or Spring Valley Community Plan. Additionally, the analysis concluded that the project is consistent with other applicable plans and regulations, such as the County Wildland Urban Interface Ordinance, County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, and the County Dark Skies Ordinance.

A GPA is required to change the current General Plan Designation from General Commercial to a Village Residential (VR-10.9) designator. An Amendment to the Spring Valley Community Plan and a zone change from General Commercial (C-36) to Multi-Family Residential (RM) is also required for consistency with the General Plan. The Regional Category of Village applies to the property: no change to the Regional Category is proposed with the project. The Project differs slightly with respect to the existing allowed land use types and allowed density, but is generally considered to be consistent, if not complimentary, with applicable goals, policies, and objectives contained within the General Plan, including but not limited to, the following elements pertaining to land use and/or density:

- Land Use Element LU-1.3: "...designate land use patterns to enhance communities and preserve surrounding rural lands".
  - The surrounding area includes many large residential subdivisions and high-density residential development. The proposed project is an infill development and is consistent with the existing residential community. Additionally, the proposed Project is located within the "Village" regional category which is not proposed to change.
- Land Use Element LU-1.7 Maximum Residential Densities. Determine the maximum number of dwelling units permitted within the boundaries of any subdivision or single lot based on the applicable land use designation(s). When the total number of dwelling units is less than one, this shall be interpreted as permitting one dwelling unit. When more than one dwelling unit is permitted, fractional dwelling units are rounded down to the nearest whole number of dwelling units. 0020
  - The Project proposes a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designation from GC (General Commercial) to VR-10.9 (Village Residential), which allows for a residential density of 10.9 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). The Project proposes a maximum of 92 dwelling units on the 10.6-acre property, for an overall density of 8.7 du/ac, consistent with the proposed VR-10.9 land use designation. This is also consistent with the Spring Valley

Community Plan Land Use Goal LU 2.1 which encourages residential development that is not higher than 15 du/ac.

- Land Use Element LU 2.3 is about development densities and lot sizes: “Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community”.
  - Surrounding the Project site to the north east, south, west, and northwest are high density residential units of Village Residential 7.3 (7.3 units per gross acre) with Village Residential 24 (24 units per gross acre) directly adjacent to the project site to the south and north. The proposed density for the Project site of Village Residential 10.9 (10.9 units per gross acre) is compatible with the surrounding residential character.
  
- Land Use Element LU-2.4 Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character. Ensure that the land uses and densities within any Regional Category or Land Use Designation depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a community Plan area, in addition to the General Plan Guiding Principles.
  - The proposed residential use of the Project site does not conflict with such existing uses. A variety of residential development is present in the surrounding area including multi-family residential use (apartments) to the northwest and single-family residential use to the northeast across Austin Drive. Adjacent to the south is an apartment complex, with single-family residential uses located further to the south and southwest. To the west, Avenida Bosques borders the site. The Sweetwater Springs Community School and multi-family residential uses are located directly to the west of the site across Avenida Bosques. The Project is distanced and buffered from commercial/office and light industrial uses located to the east, across from Sweetwater Springs Boulevard and Via Orange Way. Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, as well as proposed perimeter landscaping, slopes and the on-site detention basin buffer act as buffers to the project from such uses. In addition, operational aspects of the Project would be compatible with the surrounding community character. Operation of the Project would not result in activities that would disrupt adjacent land uses. Operation of the proposed residential uses would be typical of similar residential uses found within the surrounding and adjacent areas. No significant increases in traffic along community roadways (e.g. Austin Drive or Sweetwater Springs Boulevard) are anticipated to occur with development of the proposed residential uses, and substantial new sources of noise that may affect offsite land uses would not result.
  
- Land Use Element LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design. Incorporate into new development sustainable planning and design.
  - Sustainable design features have been incorporated into the project to reduce emissions associated with construction, energy use, area sources, and water demand. These design features include policies and performance measures which have been incorporated into the Specific Plan Amendment, and include installation of solar/photovoltaic systems on all dwelling units, cool roof design

with special roof tiles and radiant barrier insulation, plumbing for electric vehicle charging stations, recycling and yard waste collection, high efficiency street and area lighting, and high efficiency HVAC systems. As a condition of approval for the project, a Landscape Documentation Package will be submitted that ensures compliance with the County of San Diego Water Conservation Landscaping Ordinance and demonstrates a 40 percent reduction in outdoor water use.

- Land Use Element LU-6.2 Reducing Development Pressures. Assign lowest-density or lowest-intensity land use designations to areas with sensitive natural resources.
  - To meet the high housing demand in the County of San Diego, higher-density infill development, such as the proposed project, can curb the pressure placed on developing more rural or natural areas within the County and reduce the impact of edge effects. The proposed Project is an infill project with minimal natural resources on site and has a “Village” Regional Category designation.
- Land Use Element LU-9.8 Village Connectivity and Compatibility with Adjoining Areas. Require new development within villages to include road networks, pedestrian routes, and amenities that create or maintain connectivity; and site, building and landscape design that is compatible with surrounding areas.”
  - The project proposes the development of a recreation area, an internal walkway system, landscaping, parking areas, and infrastructure improvements. With development of the project, this would allow for a contribution of new recreational amenities with adequate parking and improved pedestrian mobility and connectivity within the community.

An Amendment to the Rancho San Diego Specific Plan (Sweetwater-Avocado) is also required to change the designation of the property from General Commercial to Village Residential (VR-10.9) and to provide specific design guidelines and development regulations for the proposed project. The Specific Plan was adopted based upon the following principles: effect improvements in the socio-economic mix of the future population, lessen environmental impact, improve circulation and the land use pattern for a greater degree of balance and efficiency in the overall plan, and effect land use changes which reflect the everchanging market conditions. Subsequently, the Rancho San Diego Specific Plan has been amended nine (9) times to reflect current market demands.

The Market Study prepared by Meyers Research (2018) concluded that a commercial center is no longer suitable for the project site due to a number of factors: geographically constrained location, poor market window for visibility, topography, low traffic counts for retail, higher count of commercial use types within the vicinity compared to employees, and the site is not suitable for mixed-use where both residential and retail components are self-sustainable. Further, the existing retail center has a long history of underperforming. The Market Study did however find that a residential use type for the location would be suitable: compatible to surrounding residential development, strong consumer demand, lack of new construction for-sale inventory in East County San Diego, proposed attractive development to enhance the value of the surrounding area, and infeasibility of continued operation of the site as a retail development with low neighborhood commercial lease rates and high vacancy rates.

The Project will amend the Rancho San Diego Specific Plan 74-01 (Sweetwater-Avocado) consistent with its planning principles to: provide additional housing opportunities in the area near public facilities; improve pedestrian mobility and connectivity within the community; and provide densities consistent with the existing established neighborhoods in the surrounding Rancho San Diego Specific Plan 74-01 (Sweetwater-Avocado) area and surrounding community. The proposed Specific Plan Amendment provides the development regulations and design guidelines for the Project that will ensure consistency with the surrounding area and would be compatible with the Rancho San Diego Specific Plan (Sweetwater-Avocado).

For the above stated reasons, the project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The impacts would be less than significant.

**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                               |

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

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

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

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

- a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** The project is a development of 92 detached condominium units and will be occupied by residents. The surrounding area supports residential, commercial, industrial and civic use types. Based on the Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, dated December 11, 2018, the project is consistent with the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable noise standards for the following reasons:

**General Plan – Noise Element**

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of 60 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities as mentioned within Tables N-1 and N-2. The proposed project is a noise sensitive land use. Based on the Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, dated December 11, 2018, project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of the outside sound level threshold of CNEL 65 dB(A) due to the implementation of project design features. Six-foot-high sound walls are proposed to be located to the north and east of the Project site, facing and screening Sweetwater Springs Boulevard and Austin Drive.

The project is also subject to the interior habitable sound level limit of 45 dBA. Based on the noise study, traffic noise would potentially impact the site and expose the proposed exterior noise sensitive areas to noise levels over both the proposed exterior and interior sensitive area thresholds. The primary noise source would be from Sweetwater Springs Boulevard and Austin Drive. An interior noise study will be performed to ensure the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego.

**Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404**

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, dated December 11, 2018, non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The Noise Analysis and staff's review has determined that project's noise levels are not anticipated to exceed County Noise Standards.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, dated December 11, 2018, 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 75dBA standard. No blasting or rock crushing is anticipated during the grading operations.

Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas, including the proposed project site, to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc. dated December 11, 2018. The existing ambient noise levels measures were found to be roughly 55 – 65 dBA adjacent to roadways. As previously stated, the proposed condominium development is subject to the exterior outdoor area sound level limit of 65 dBA CNEL and an interior sound level limit of 45 dBA. Project design features would be required to reduce the proposed outdoor areas in the form of sound walls and an interior noise study will be performed to ensure the project would meet the interior habitable requirement of 45 dBA. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

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

b) 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                               |

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is a development of 92 detached condominium units where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the proposed development will not be exposed to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. 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. Additionally, no blasting or rock crushing is anticipated during the grading operations. Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise on a project or cumulative level.

- c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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         |

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport, public use airport or private airstrip. 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 unplanned 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 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 proposes 92 residential condominiums on 10.57 acres of land requiring a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment and Zone Reclassification. However, this physical and regulatory change will not induce substantial population growth in the area, because the existing zone (C-36) allowed for residential as a secondary use up to a maximum density of 40 units per gross acre. The proposed 92 units is well within the maximum density. Additionally, no improvement to sewer or water is proposed as part of the Project. The project is proposing infill development, not requiring further expansion into the County's natural and rural areas. Moreover, the regulatory change does not increase density or intensity of land use that is inconsistent with the General Plan.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not displace existing housing since the site is currently commercial with no existing housing. The addition of 92 dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing.

**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?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

**No Impact:** Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: San Miguel Fire Protection District, Otay Water District, San Diego County Sanitation and Grossmont Union High School District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

**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?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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 condominiums that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park

fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to pay park fees. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication and thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

Regarding regional recreational facilities, there are over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive acreage of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation, the project will not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant amount of regional recreational facilities will be available to County residents.

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

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

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

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION** -- Would the project:

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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 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, Mobility Element, and the Transportation Impact Fee Program.

**Less than Significant Impact:** A Traffic Impact Study, dated April 27, 2018 was prepared by Linscott, Law, and Greenspan Engineers. The Study prepared two trip generation tables for the proposed project; Table A compares the proposed project trip generation to the number of trips generated by a fully occupied community shopping center; and Table B compares the proposed project to the amount of traffic currently generated by the site (44,741 SF is currently occupied). The lowest retail generation rate was utilized to be conservative. As is the standard of practice in conducting traffic studies, the Sandag (SANDAG) trip rates were utilized to determine the number of trips generated by the proposed residential project. In order to provide an apples-to-apples comparison, Sandag rates were also utilized to determine the amount of trips generated by the existing shopping center. Using the Sandag trip rate for the existing center accounts for the fact that land uses can change in a shopping center based on tenant changes and also accounts for the fact that traffic generated on an existing site varies day to day, based on the specific activities occurring on that particular day.

Both tables show that the project results in fewer average daily drips (736 ADT) than the shopping center when fully operational and as currently being used, respectively. Additionally, the project will not have a significant 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 impacts related to Traffic and Transportation. Finally, the General Plan Regional Category is Village; traffic impacts have been analyzed for a commercial and residential center in this location through the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report. The proposed residential development would ultimately reduce traffic counts from the existing use and is therefore accommodated by the General Plan road network.

As identified in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation, the project trips would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and no mitigation is required. Moreover, the Project trips would not contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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:

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. As stated previously in Section VIII, the proposed project would reduce GHG emissions due to the change in use from commercial to residential. Specifically, annual GHG emissions from mobile sources will reduce from an existing 1,205.736 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> to 769.013 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>. Therefore, GHG emissions associated with mobile sources will be reduced. It should also be noted that, as a design feature, the developer will provide to all homeowners an informative brochure to educate homeowners regarding the location of nearby resources such as dining and entertainment venues, small commercial centers, and civic uses in an effort to reduce VMT.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric 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                               |

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed development is for residential condominiums and is an infill project. No new infrastructure such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections are proposed. Additionally, the Traffic Assessment identified that the proposed project would not result in any additional ADT. Moreover, the use is consistent with the surrounding development. Therefore, the project would not directly or cumulatively increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.

d) 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         |

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

**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         |

**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) Require or result in the relocation of construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which would 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                               |

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project does not include or require the construction or expansion of utility and service system facilities which would cause significant environmental effects. Prior to building permit sign-off and use of the site in relation to electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities approval from San Diego Gas and Electric and applicable telecommunication company would be required. Additionally, based on the service availability forms received, the project will not require construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage facilities. The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Because the project will be discharging wastewater to a RWQCB permitted community sewer system and will be required to satisfy the conditions listed above, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, including the Regional Basin Plan. Moreover, pipelines will have to be extended

for the purposes of this project. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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 requires water service from the Otay Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Otay Water District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

- c) 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 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 requires wastewater service from the San Diego County Sanitation District. A Service Availability Letter from the sewer district has been provided, indicating adequate wastewater service capacity is available to serve the requested demand. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or Local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

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

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction 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                               |

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

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

**No Impact:** As described in the response to IX(f) above, the project site is not located in a very high FHSZ. The project is located mostly within the “urban unzoned” and, to a lesser extent, the moderate FHSZ and is surrounded by urbanized areas and/or irrigated lands. The proposed project does not substantially impair any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and would be serviced by the San Miguel Fire Protection District. Pursuant to the fire service availability form submitted for the project, San Miguel Fire Protection District has indicated the project is eligible for service and nearest fire station is located 0.2 miles from the project. Therefore, the proposed 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 concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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         |

**No Impact:** As indicated above in response a), the proposed project is not located within a high or very high fire hazard severity zone, and thus a fire protection plan is not required. The proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risk due to slope, prevailing winds or other factors

because the project site is relatively flat and is an infill development located near existing commercial and residential use types with minimal vegetation. The project will however 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 would be required. Additionally, the San Miguel Fire Protection District has indicated the availability to serve the site in the case that a fire would occur. The nearest fire station is located 0.2 miles from the project site.

- 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?

<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

**No Impact:** The project site is not located within a high or very high fire severity zone. The proposed project is an infill development and as identified in response b), generalized fire safety measures would be required. 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d) 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?

<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

**No Impact:** The project site is not located within a high or very high fire severity zone. The proposed project is an infill development and as identified in response b), generalized fire safety measures would be required.

**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:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects.

There is no substantial evidence that there are biological or cultural resources that are affected or associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

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
Sweetwater Vistas	General Plan Amendment, Residential Development	SW of Sweetwater Springs Blvd and Jamacha Blvd	Approved 2017
Sweetwater Place	General Plan Amendment, Residential Development	NE of Sweetwater Springs Blvd and Jamacha Blvd	Approved 2017

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVIII of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** 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, XVII. Transportation, and XX. Wildfire. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to the following: IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials and XIII Noise. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes soil remediation and asbestos and lead surveys for hazards mitigation as well as an acoustical study and noise wall for noise mitigation. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

## **XXI. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to [www.leginfo.ca.gov](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 (NLRPIP), 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/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

### **AGRICULTURE RESOURCES**

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

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.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.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attach.pdf>)

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

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.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.