



# County of San Diego

**MARK WARDLAW**  
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123  
[www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds)

**KATHLEEN FLANNERY**  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

May 29, 2020

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

1. Title; Project Numbers; Environmental Log Number:  
  
Bonsall Carefield Facility; PDS2019-REZ-19-001, PDS2019-STP-19-005, PDS2019-ER-19-02-002
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 Angelica Truong, Project Manager
  - b. Phone number: (858) 495-5421
  - c. E-mail: [angelica.truong@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:angelica.truong@sdcounty.ca.gov)
4. Project location:  
  
Thoroughbred Lane and SR-76  
Thomas Guide Page 1067, Grid J-1 and 1047
5. Project Applicant name and address:  
  
Jim Chagala  
555 West Country Club Lane, Suite #254  
Escondido, CA 92026
6. General Plan  
Community Plan: Bonsall  
Regional Category: Village  
Land Use Designation: Office Professional (C-2)  
Density: N/A  
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) N/A
7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: C30, Office Professional

Minimum Lot Size: N/A  
 Special Area Regulation: B (Community Design Review Area)

8. Description of project:

The applicant is proposing a Rezone (REZ) and Site Plan (STP) for the development of an assisted care facility on approximately 3.9 acres of land within the Bonsall Community Plan area. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Village, Land Use Designation Office Professional. Zoning for the site is Office Professional (C30). The project includes a proposed zoning reclassification to change the zoning for the site from C30 (Office Professional) to C46 (Medical Center Use Regulations). The proposed use is allowed in C46 zone with an approval of a Site Plan, which is being processed concurrently. The project site is located on the corner of Thoroughbred Lane and State Route- 76.

The project site is vacant. The proposed assisted care facility will consist of a total of 86 beds in 56 assisted living units, and 24 memory care units. The proposed facility is 74,000 square feet and will include amenities such as an outdoor swimming pool, a bocce field, and outdoor dining area, a sensory garden and a memory care garden. The proposed facility will be licensed by the California Department of Social Services under Title 22, Division 6, Chapter 8. A total of 45 parking spaces will be located on-site for guests and employees.

The site is undeveloped, and access would be provided by a proposed driveway connecting to Mission Road. Sewer and water services will be provided by the Rainbow Municipal District. Earthwork will consist of 44,275 cubic yards of cut and 3,650 cubic yards of fill (40,625 cubic yards of export).

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

The Project site is located in the community of Bonsall within unincorporated San Diego County. The Project site is bounded by Mission Road to the south and Thoroughbred Lane to the west. The north and east boundaries of the Project site are adjacent to single-family residential uses, and approximately 0.2 miles north along State Route 76 is a large strip mall with restaurants, a movie theater, and other retail and commercial uses. Approximately 250 feet south of the project site across Mission Road is another strip mall and a gas station. Lands surrounding the project site are primarily rural residential and commercial uses, with some agricultural uses and vacant land. To the southeast of the site is State Route 76, which travels parallel and east of Thoroughbred Lane. The project site is approximately 140 feet northwest of State Route 76. The topography of the project site is relatively flat.

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

<b>Permit Type/Action</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Site Plan	County of San Diego

Rezone	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
Water District Approval	Rainbow Municipal Water District
Fire District Approval	North County Fire Protection 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.

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

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

May 29, 2020  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Angelica Truong  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

Land Use/Environmental Planner  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

**INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**I. AESTHETICS. 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                               |

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 Bonsall Community Planning area (CPA), approximately 140 feet northwest of State Route 76 (SR-76) and southerly bounded by Mission Road.

The existing project site is vacant. The proposed assisted care facility will consist of a total of 86 beds in 56 assisted living units, and 24 memory care units. The proposed facility is 74,000 square feet and will include amenities such as an outdoor swimming pool, a bocce field, and outdoor dining area, a sensory garden and a memory care garden. Based on a site visit by County staff on July 2, 2019, the proposed project would 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, as the Project is similar in scale to strip malls and commercial uses located north and south of the Project site along SR-76 and Thoroughbred Lane. The County has designated several RCAs in the Bonsall CPA. The proposed project is within a RCA and within the project viewshed is Mission Road, southerly adjacent to the project. However, due to the project consistency with surrounding development and conformance with the Bonsall Design Guidelines, the proposed project would not pose a substantial adverse effect to this scenic vista. Additionally, the project design follows the policies and guidelines set forth in the Bonsall Community Plan. 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?

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

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic ([Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program](#)). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist’s line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

**No Impact:** Based on a site visit completed on July 2, 2019, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway or County Designated Scenic Corridor and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway or County Designated Scenic Corridor. The project site is located approximately 140 feet northwest of SR-76 and is southerly bounded by Mission Road. Due to distance, topography and vegetation, the project site would not be visible. Additionally, the project site is located approximately five miles west of what is designated as a State Scenic Highway. Due to distance, 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is in a non-urbanized area of the Bonsall community, located at the intersection of Thoroughbred Lane and Mission Road. The project site is currently vacant. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as single-family residential with commercial and retail uses north and south of the Project site along Thoroughbred Lane and SR-76. Much of the land directly east of the project site is developed as commercial and office use. Directly west and north are primarily single-family residences, but less than one quarter mile north of the Project site is a large strip mall with a movie theater and other retail and commercial uses. Mission Road bounds the southern portion of the Project site, and less than 250 feet beyond Mission Road is another strip mall and gas station. SR-76 runs parallel and east of Thoroughbred Lane. Viewer groups of the project site include those traveling along Mission Road to access either the commercial area east and south of the project site or the residential area to the north of the project site. Viewer exposure is limited due to travel speed past the property on Mission Road.

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 design of the proposed assisted living facility is consistent with the character of the existing community; the proposed development is subject to design review by the County through a discretionary Site Plan Permit for conformance with the Bonsall Design Guidelines; and landscaping has been incorporated along Mission Road and Thoroughbred Lane for screening purposes. The location, size, and design of the proposed use would be compatible with adjacent uses due to the following reasons: the proposed care facility is similar to surrounding commercial parcels along SR-76, Thoroughbred Lane and Mission Road, and the Project will conform to the Bonsall Design Guidelines. Viewer exposure to the project would not be significant since the project has been designed to be compatible with 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?



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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 40 miles from the Mount Laguna Observatory and approximately 22 miles from Palomar Observatory. 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 is consistent with the Light Pollution Code. Therefore, 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?

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

**No Impact:** The projects site is underlain with Placentia sandy loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes, which have been mapped “Prime Farmland Soils” by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency. However, the project site is vacant and does not operate agricultural activities on the parcel and is surrounded by developed residential lots. Due to fire clearing, disturbed areas such as clearing and driveways, setback requirements and potential land use conflicts, the subject lot would not be considered a significant agricultural

resource. 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?

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

**No Impact:** The project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract, nor is not surrounded by any such land. The closest preserve or Williamson Act Contract is approximately one mile 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))?

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

- Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site and surrounding area within a radius of one-quarter mile includes lands designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance. However, the majority of the lots are developed with single-family residences and do not contain any active agricultural operations. Additionally, per response II(b), the site is not a significant agricultural resource. 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)?
  - Potentially Significant Impact
  - Less than Significant Impact
  - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
  - No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** The regional air quality standards (RAQS) and State Implementation Plan (SIP) rely on the San Diego Association of Government’s (SANDAG) growth projections, which are developed based on proposed buildout of land uses identified in the County’s General Plan. Because the RAQS and SIP project future air quality conditions based on growth projections assuming buildout of the County’s General Plan, it is assumed that a project that generates fewer emissions than what is allowable under its existing General Plan designation would also comply with the RAQS and SIP. According to the 2016 RAQS, mobile sources are the largest contributor to air quality emissions, specifically emissions generated from operations of typical residential and commercial developments, and therefore can be used to define project intensity (i.e. less mobile emissions results in less land use intensity).

The project proposes to rezone the site from an Office Professional (C30) land use to a Medical Center (C46) land use. The proposed project includes the development of a 74,000 square foot (SF), 80-bed assisted living and memory care facility with outdoor recreation space.

The most intensive use that would be permitted under the existing General Plan land use designation (i.e. the use that would generate the greatest number of vehicle trips) would be a general office building. Based on the allowable 0.25 floor-area (FAR) of the site, up to 50,000 SF of general office building would be permitted. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.2 estimated that the existing General Plan land use would generate 551.5 ADT. According to the project traffic study, the project would generate 238 ADT (Darnell and Associates, 2019). The comparison between the existing and proposed land use shows that the project generates fewer trips than the existing zoning designation allows and would be a less intense development than what is currently allowed on-site. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to generate fewer operational emissions than would otherwise have been accounted for within the General Plan.

Because mobile emissions, representing a significant majority of emissions generated during project operations, would be less than what was estimated in the RAQS, the project would be consistent with the RAQS and SIP. In addition, the construction and operational emissions from the project are anticipated to be below established screening-level thresholds (SLTs), as addressed under Question 3(b), and would not violate any ambient air quality standards.

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 National and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively) for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) and Particulate Matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) under the CAAQS. O<sub>3</sub> is formed when VOCs and oxides of nitrogen (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> and PM<sub>2.5</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:** The project would contribute PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and VOC emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established SLTs (see Appendix X). Additionally, grading activities associated with construction of the project would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance and the SDAPCD Rule 55, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. The project would generate PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions during project operations primarily from mobile sources (i.e., vehicle trips), and VOCs from area (i.e. landscape maintenance equipment, cleaning products, and architectural coating) and mobile sources. The project would include project design features (PDFs) that would reduce operational air emissions such as high efficiency lighting and low VOC architectural coatings. The proposed project would not exceed the County's SLTs during operations.

The Air Quality Assessment identified potential cumulative projects in the vicinity that could be constructed at the same time, located approximate two miles away from the project site. Cumulative impacts could occur if the most intensive phases of construction for these projects occur simultaneous to similar phases for the Project. The most intensive construction phase for the project and for typical developments occurs during earthwork and grading activities. To mitigate any potential cumulative impacts from construction activities, the project would coordinate with County Staff to ensure earthwork activities would not occur simultaneously at project sites in close proximity, to the extent feasible.

The project is proposing development that is of less intensity than the County’s General Plan, thus operational air emissions are considered to have been accounted for in the General Plan environmental review. The General Plan was prepared consistent with the RAQS and SIP.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Sensitive receptors include schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, day-care centers, residences, and other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The closest sensitive receptors to the project site include single-family residential units adjacent to the north and south of the project site and the Bonsall Elementary School and Community Center located approximately 2,000 feet northeast of the project site. Emissions of potentially harmful pollutants, including diesel particulate matter and fugitive dust, would be generated on-site during construction activities. The project would be required to comply with the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55 which would reduce potential emissions of fugitive dust. Further, the project would ensure that all construction equipment is equipped with Tier 4 engines with diesel particulate filters (DPF), which would reduce emissions of DPM. Construction emissions would be temporary and would not expose sensitive receptors to harmful concentrations of air pollutants.

County guidelines call for a CO hotspot analysis if the project would cause an intersection to operate at a level of service (LOS) E or F with peak-hour trips to exceed 3,000. The Project would generate approximately 238 ADT during operation (Darnell and Associates, 2019). The project generated trips would not degrade the operations of any intersections in the project vicinity from an acceptable LOS to LOS E or F. The project’s traffic generation would not warrant a CO-hotspot analysis, and therefore is not anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial CO concentrations from vehicles.

As indicated in Question 3(b), NAAQS and CAAQS would not be exceeded for both operations and construction and would not expose sensitive receptors to an incremental health risk. In addition, the implementation of Tier 4 construction equipment with DPF would reduce onsite PM<sub>10</sub> from construction exhaust emissions (i.e. DPM), reducing inhalation cancer risk to a less than significant level.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project could produce objectionable odors during construction from paving, painting, and equipment operation; however, these substances, if present at all, would be minimal and temporary.

For operations, the *County Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Air Quality* (2007) includes a list of odor-producing uses that are typically recognized (e.g. wastewater treatment facilities, animal facilities, or restaurants). An assisted living and memory care facility is 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, and a Biological Resources Report dated July 2019 prepared by Everett and Associates, it has been 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         |

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of the County’s Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resources Report dated July 2019 prepared by Everett and Associates, it has been 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 an analysis of the County’s Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resources Report dated July 2019 prepared by Everett and Associates, it has been 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?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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:** Based on an analysis of the County’s Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resources Report dated July 2019 prepared by Everett and Associates, it has been determined that the site has limited biological value and impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the proposed project due to the project site being completely surrounded by development.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated May 29, 2020 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources

including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

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

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

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

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, historic records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow, 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 with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:**

Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, historic records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to archaeological resources. However, the project site is sensitive for resources, therefore Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1, an archaeological monitoring program outlined below, will be required. Impacts will be reduced to Less than Significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Archaeological Monitoring**

- Pre-Construction
  - Contract with a County approved archaeologist to perform archaeological monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all earth-disturbing activities. The Project Archaeologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, during and after construction.
  - Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.
- Construction
  - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor are to be onsite during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in



consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor will evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources

- If cultural resources are identified:
  - Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
  - The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of discovery.
  - The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
  - Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation.
  - Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Luiseno Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.
  - If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).
- Human Remains.
  - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
  - Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. If the human remains are to be taken offsite for evaluation, they shall be accompanied by the Luiseno Native American monitor.
  - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
  - The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
  - Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.
- Rough Grading
  - Monitoring Report. Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered. A copy of the monitoring

report shall be provided to the South Coastal Information Center and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.

- Final Grading
  - Final. Report. A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center, the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians, the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
  - Cultural Material Conveyance
    - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe.
    - The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

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

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

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a 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?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would result in the use of electricity, 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.

Construction of the facility is estimated to take three (3) months and requires minimal grading. No structures are proposed as part of the project for construction. Grading disturbance would result in 44,735 cubic yards of cut, 3,650 cubic yards of fill, and 40,625 cubic yards of export earthwork. Offsite improvements consist of construction of asphalt concrete driveways off of

Mission Road for main and secondary access. As a result of this minimal construction activity, the project would not be expected to result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during the construction phase of the project. Additionally, consistency with General Plan policies COS-14.10, COS-15.1, and COS-17.2 reduce the environmental impact during construction by requiring that low-emission construction vehicles, Tier 4 or higher, be utilized; that the building be designed and constructed using materials and techniques which maximize energy efficiency, incorporate recycled materials, and reduce emissions; and that construction and demolition debris be reduced, reused, and recycled. The project would also 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. These requirements are applicable to the development of the assisted care facility.

The operation of the project is expected to result in 238 average daily trips. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines. Using the above guideline as a reference, the project would not be expected to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources for vehicle trips for air quality purposes. Furthermore, 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 include tankless electric or gas water heaters and electric heat pumps, water efficient appliances and plumbing fixtures, EnergyStar appliances, and low-flow plumbing compliant with the CALGreen Code which should reduce emissions by up to 20%. Furthermore, the Project will demonstrate a 40-percent reduction in outdoor water use and install multiple trees throughout and surrounding the facility. Additional energy-efficient measures include the installation of LED lighting and 75% diversion of waste and recyclables. County staff analysis of GHG emissions determined that the proposed Project would generate 200 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e fewer GHG emissions annually than would be produce under a general plan buildout scenario. 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:** The proposed project is for the construction and operation of an assisted care facility. As stated in response VI(a), the project would be required to meet Title 24 for energy efficiency standard. Additionally, a CAP Checklist has been prepared for the project and is therefore consistent with the County’s Climate Action Plan, and County staff analysis determined that the proposed Project would generate 200 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e fewer GHG emissions annually than would be produce under a general plan buildout scenario. Furthermore, the Project is consistent with General Plan policies COS-14.3, COS-14.7, COS14.10, COS-15.1, COS-15.4, COS-17.1, and COS-17.2, which require the incorporation of alternative energy

sources, utilization of low emission construction vehicles, implementation of energy-efficient building design features, and reduction of solid waste during construction and operation. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. 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 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. According to the review of the Project site by a County Staff Hydrogeologist, in-situ soil densities are

expected to be sufficiently high to preclude liquefaction. To ensure no impacts would occur, a soils compaction report would be required prior to all ground disturbance activities. Additionally, site-specific engineering design and conformance with the Seismic Requirements as outlined in the California Building Code would cause impacts due to liquefaction to 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 within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area", Landslide Category "Low", 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. Based on the review of the Project by County Staff Hydrogeologist, in conjunction with the flat topography of the site, potential hazards associated with landslides are less than significant. In addition, a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendation would be required to be approved before the issuance of a building permit.

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 Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as sandy loams that have a soil erodibility rating ranging from slight to severe. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment. Impacts are less than significant.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves 44,735 cubic yards of cut, 3,650 cubic yards of fill, and 40,625 cubic yards of export earthwork. 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 within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are PeD2, Placentia sandy loams, which have high shrink-well behavior, and VaB, Visalia sandy loams, which have low shrink-swell behavior. However, the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply with the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. 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 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 will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. A service availability letter from the Rainbow Municipal Water District, indicating that the facility has adequate capacity for the project’s wastewater disposal needs, will be submitted as part of the building permit process. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

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

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

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

**No Impact:** A review of the County’s Paleontological Resources Maps indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains. The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

**VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project**

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project would generate GHG emissions during construction activities and on-site operational activities. The County of San Diego adopted a CAP, which outlines actions that the County will take to meet its GHG emissions reduction targets consistent with state guidance. Implementation of the CAP requires that new development projects incorporate applicable reduction measures in the project design, consistent with CAP measures. Project’s determined to be consistent with the CAP would thus be considered to have a less than significant cumulative GHG emissions impact. The project is consistent with the CAP as demonstrated through the completion of the CAP Consistency Review Checklist (Checklist) and would result in less than cumulatively considerable impact to GHG emissions.

The CAP Checklist contains two steps: (1) Land Use Consistency; and (2) CAP Measures Consistency. The proposed project would implement all applicable measures identified in the Checklist and would therefore be consistent with the County’s CAP. Though the project’s proposed use would be considered “Medical Center,” the project would accommodate assisted living facilities. To the extent feasible, measures applicable to residential uses were applied to the assisted care units to demonstrate consistency with building efficiency measures. The proposed measures to incorporate from the CAP Checklist include the following:

- Water Heating Systems: The project will install either tankless electric or gas water heaters, or electric heat pump water heaters that provide water for each assisted care unit consistent with the requirements for residential uses.
- Water-Efficient Appliances and Plumbing Fixtures: The project will install water efficient kitchen faucets and energy efficient appliances in each assisted care unit consistent with the requirements for residential uses.

- Rain Barrel Installations: If applicable incentive or rebates are available for rain barrel installation, the project will install if feasible.
- Reduce Outdoor Water Use: The project would comply with the County’s Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance by submitting a landscape documentation package which is required to demonstrate a 40 percent reduction in outdoor water use.
- Tree Planting: The project will plant a minimum of two trees on site.

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                               |

**Less than Significant Impact:** The CAP was developed based on the County’s General Plan land use and population projections. Therefore, projects that are consistent with General Plan land use designations would not inhibit the County from achieving its GHG emission reduction targets consistent with AB 32 and SB 32. The existing site is zoned Office Professional (C30) and the project proposes to rezone to Medical Center (C46). The GHG analysis (Appendix X) concludes that annual emissions generated by the proposed project would be less than emissions generated by a use consistent with the existing land use designation. Emissions projections included in the CAP were based on maximum allowable, General Plan consistent projects. Because emissions are less than those projected by an existing allowable use, the proposed project would be consistent with the County General Plan and the project would not deter the County from meeting its GHG emission reduction targets.

Furthermore, as described under 3(a) above, the project demonstrates consistency with the applicable GHG reduction measures through completion of the County’s CAP Checklist. As such, the project is consistent with the County’s General Plan and CAP, which were developed to support the goals and requirements of State legislation and recommendations. Thus, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** -- Would the project:

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

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

**No 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. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

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

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

**No Impact:** One school, the Pathways Academy Charter School, is within a quarter mile of the project site. However, 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 type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

**No Impact:** Based on a regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database (“CalSites” Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA’s Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA’s National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. The proposed project is for an assisted living facility, which would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant 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 area.

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

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

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, although Mission Road is within a dam inundation zone, the proposed project and associated activities are located outside of the dam inundation zone. In addition, the portion of the parcel where the proposed project would be located is at a higher elevation than the portion of the parcel which is within the dam inundation zone. According to the Drainage Study prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering on October 17, 2019, the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern, which flows in the direction of the lower portion of the site that is located in the dam inundation zone. Additionally, the mitigated peak flow would be less than the existing peak flow with the incorporation of biofiltration basins on site. Therefore, no development activities or changes in drainage flow on site would interfere with a Dam Evacuation Plan.

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. The project site is located within the Very High FHSZ.

The proposed Project is located within the jurisdiction of the County of San Diego Fire Authority, North County Fire Protection District. A Fire Service Availability Letter dated April 12, 2019 has been received from the North County Fire Protection District. Pursuant to the approved Fire Service Availability Letter and the Fire Protection Plan for the project submitted to the San Diego County Fire Authority on March 11, 2019, the Project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The site location is approximately 0.11 miles from the nearest fire station with an expected

emergency response travel time to the project of less than five minutes. The project site would meet the maximum travel time allowed pursuant to the Safety Element of ten (10) minutes. The project site would also be required to implement fire safety measures discussed further below.

The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project would comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 16 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Major Use Permit and/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 San Diego County Fire Authority, 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- 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. The site is required to meet specific standards for BMPs in compliance with the Grading, Stormwater and Watershed Protection Ordinances as well as comply with an approved Manure Management Plan and vector control plan. 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?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed Project is an assisted living facility. 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 and mulch, straw, wood chips, and soil application on disturbed flat areas; County Standard lot perimeter protection detail and County Standard desilting basin for erosion control on disturbed flat areas; silt fencing, gravel and sand bags for sediment control; stabilized construction entrance 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 Standard Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) dated February 2020, prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering, 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?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project will obtain all potable water from the Rainbow Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. Irrigation during project operation will also be provided by a potable water meter issued through the Rainbow Municipal Water District. 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; silt fencing, gravel and sand bags for sediment control; stabilized construction entrance 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 Standard Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) dated February 2020, prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering, 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 proposed project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns or increase the amount of runoff. The Drainage Study prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering on October 17, 2019 indicated that the mitigated peak flow would be less than the existing peak flow with the incorporation of biofiltration basins on site. Therefore, the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

- (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 Tory R. Walker Engineering in October of 2019 determined that runoff water would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. 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 prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering in October of 2019 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 would coincide with existing site drainage patterns.

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

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?

**Less than Significant Impact:** As described in response X(a), the project would implement a combination of site design and source control BMPs to prevent potential pollutants from entering storm water runoff. 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 would obtain all of its potable water supply from the Rainbow Municipal Water District, including water used for irrigation purposes. The Project would 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         |

**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 an assisted living facility to an empty parcel between lots which are zoned for residential uses to the north and

west and office professional and commercial uses to the east. The proposed project will rezone the parcel from an Office Professional Use (C30) to a Medical Center Use (C46); however, the scale of the facility is similar to other Office Professional facilities nearby and will be in harmony with the neighborhood character. 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                               |

**Less than Significant Impact:** The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Village, Land Use Designation Office Professional. Zoning for the site is Office Professional (C30). The project includes a proposed zoning reclassification to change the zoning for the site from C30 (Office Professional) to C46 (Medical Center Use Regulations). According to the Zoning Ordinance, the C46 Use Regulation is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Designation. The proposed use is allowed in C46 zone with an approval of a Site Plan, which is being processed concurrently.

The Project is also consistent with the Bonsall Community Plan, and adheres to its Policies 1.2, 1.2, and 1.4 regarding Community Character, Community Growth, and Commercial, Industrial, and Accessory Uses. In particular, the Project is consistent with Policies LU-1.2.1, LU-1.2.2, LU-2.1.1, LU-4.1.2, LU-4.1.3, which encourage consistency with community character and design guidelines, advocate for new development between the intersections of Olive Hill Road and Mission Road with Highway 76, and require that new commercial development not only serve the local community needs but also incorporate landscaping and buffering which is aesthetically consistent with the community character. As such, the Project would not conflict with the General Plan, the Bonsall Community Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, or other regulation.

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is within 1,300 feet of Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) "2", as 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). However, the project site has no active mines and is surrounded by residential and office professional land use types which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result



in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

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

**No Impact:** The project site is within 1,300 feet of Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) "2", as 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). However, the project site has no active mines and is surrounded by residential and office professional land use types which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. Please refer to Section XII(a) for more detailed information. 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?

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:**

The project is a Rezone and Site Plan to allow the construction of the assisted care facility and will be occupied by workers and patients. Based the Noise Analysis prepared by Lnd Consulting, Inc. and dated January 28, 2020, the surrounding areas consist of commercial and residential zones. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

**General Plan – Noise Element**

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, 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 CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to 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. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Lnd Consulting, Inc. dated January 28, 2020, project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport,

heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL. To ensure that on-site noise sensitive receptors are not exposed to noise level that exceed the County's Noise Elements, the project will incorporate the following Project Design Features: 1) Construction of a 6-foot high solid wall along the perimeter of the recreational area as shown in Figure 2-A of the noise report. The solid wall may be vinyl that is ¾-inch or thicker consisting of solid panels on minimum 4x4-inch posts with no cracks or gaps through or below and all seams or cracks will be filled or caulked. 2) Apply the noise protection easement over the entire project site. This will require that an exterior-interior noise analysis is submitted to the County for review, prior to the approval of the building permit. The exterior-interior noise analysis will evaluate the interior noise levels for units that are within the direct line of sight of State Route 76, to ensure that it complies with the 45 dBA CNEL. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

In addition, the noise report analyzed the potential noise impacts to the existing off-site sensitive land uses (NSLU). Based on the report, the project would not result in a direct impact to the surrounding existing NSLU, as the project will not cause an increase of 3 dBA to any roadways. The project will add less than a one percent increase to the State Route 76, therefore, the project would not result in a significant cumulative noise impact to any roadway.

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Lnd Consulting, Inc. and dated January 28, 2020, 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 site as well as adjacent parcel to the east and west are commercially zoned, which has a one-hour average sound limit of 60 dBA daytime and 55 dBA nighttime. The adjacent properties to the north and south are zoned Single-Family Residential (RS) and Limited Agriculture (A70), respectively, and have one-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA daytime and 45 dBA nighttime. The Noise Analysis evaluated the project's noise levels at the adjoining properties and found that the noise levels would be 42 dBA and will not exceed County Noise Standards.

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Lnd Consulting, Inc. and dated January 28, 2020, the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). The construction activities include equipment such as dozer, grader, trucks, and compactor. Based on the report, the grading operating would occur more than 100-feet from the property lines. At that distance, the activities are not expected to exceed the noise standards. In addition, construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan 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 proposed development would 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 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 an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). However, sensitive receptors (school, day care, etc.) are not proposed as part of the project. Five to fifteen (5 – 15) employees would be on-site based on guests needs. Per the County Geographical Information System which includes various noise inputs into its data and layers, including noise generated from airports, the southern portion of the property is within noise contour lines of 60 dBA. The proposed project is within the 55-60 dBA CNEL noise impact zone within Airport Influence Area 1. The project is consistent with the commercial and/or industrial use that is listed as compatible. The outdoor activities associated with the land use would essentially have no interference from aircraft noise. This is consistent with the County’s General Plan Noise Element requirement and would therefore 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 an assisted living facility for seniors and includes a proposed zoning reclassification to change the zoning for the site from C30 (Office Professional) to C46 (Medical Center Use). The proposed use is allowed in C46 parcels with the approval of a Site Plan, which is being processed concurrently. This regulatory change will not induce substantial population growth in the area because the senior retirement facility will accommodate many residents already living in the area who move from other types of housing, and the project does not include any infrastructure extensions because it can be served with existing water, sanitary sewer, and road infrastructure. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

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

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

**No Impact:** The proposed project would not displace any existing housing because the site is currently vacant.

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

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

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

**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: North County Fire Protection District and Rainbow Municipal Water District. The proposed assisted living facility would not house children that would require schools. 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?

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

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any residential uses, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile-home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity. The project would be used as a full-service, senior living facility. The planned facility grounds include a pool, landscaped courtyard, bocce ball court, and social grounds. Due to the nature of the proposed facility, it is not expected that residents would utilize off-site recreational facilities; as such, no contribution to the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance will be required. Due to the extensive acreage of publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation, the project will not result in substantial physical deterioration of recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of parkland. Moreover, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of recreation facilities because even with all past, present, and future residential projects, a significant amount of 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?

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

**Less Than Significant:** The project involves new on-site recreational facilities. The new facilities include a pool, bocce ball court, landscaped courtyard and social grounds. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form, the new facilities will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment because all related impacts from the proposed project, which includes those recreation facilities, have been mitigated to a level below significance. Refer to Sections IV, Biology; V, Cultural Resources; VII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions; IX, Hydrology and Water Quality; XII, Noise; XVI, Transportation and Traffic and XVIII, Utilities and Service Systems for more information

**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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project is for an assisted living facility which would house residents and serve as a place of business for nursing staff and other employees. An Issue Specific Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), dated October 30, 2019 was prepared by Darnell & Associates, Inc., which concluded that the Project would generate 238 Average Daily Trips (ADT) with 16 AM and 22 PM peak hour trips. Intersection analysis was not required because less than 25 peak hours trips would be added to nearby intersections per County Guidelines. Furthermore, State Route (SR) 76, including the intersection of Thoroughbred Lane where the project takes access, was widened to its ultimate classification in 2017. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project is surrounded by single family residences and office professional buildings. The Project’s primary traffic would be employees and visitors. The Project includes mitigation measures MM-TRA-1, contribution to the TIF program, which will reduce impacts to less-than-significant.

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

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

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 VMT policy and is not expected to until July 2020, when the provisions of the section apply statewide. As the VMT policy does not yet apply, no impact would occur. In addition, one of the goals of SB743 is to reduce GHG emissions associated with vehicle trips. As stated previously in Section VIII, the proposed project would not pose a significant impact on GHG. Additionally, County staff specialists have determined that the project would generate 200 MT CO<sub>2e</sub> fewer GHG emissions annually than would be produced under a general plan buildout scenario, inclusive of emissions generated by vehicle trips. Furthermore, the Project is consistent with Policy COS-14.10 and would require Tier 4 construction equipment to reduce GHG emissions. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed development is for an assisted living facility. No new infrastructure such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections are proposed for the Project. The County Traffic Engineer has found the request to be consistent with the sight distance requirements outlines in A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, Exhibit 3-2 per AASHTO standards. Additionally, the TIA determined that the proposed project’s ADT would not result in significant operational impacts to adjacent road segments and/or intersections. Moreover, the use would not conflict with the surrounding development of rural residential and open agricultural land uses. 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?

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

**Less Than Significant:** The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The North County Fire Protection District, which is the Fire Authority Having Jurisdiction, has reviewed the proposed project and associated emergency access roadways and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access proposed. A Fire Protection Plan prepared by Santa Margarita Consulting and approved by the North County Fire Protection District on April 12, 2019 has been prepared for the project. 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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input 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:** All potable water for the Project will be supplied by the Rainbow Municipal Water District and irrigation for the property. The Project will also be connected to the Rainbow Municipal Water District sewer line. As such, 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 form received from the Rainbow Municipal Water District for water, the project would not require construction of new or expanded facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

- 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 Rainbow Municipal Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Ramona Municipal Water District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the project 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?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project requires wastewater service from the Rainbow Municipal Water 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?

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

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

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

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

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** As described in the response to IX(f) above, the project site is located in a very high FHSZ. The project is surrounded by residential, rural lands, and/or office professional uses which have been identified as high and very high FHSZ. However, the proposed project would not substantially impair any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project would be serviced by the North County Fire Protection District, who approved the Fire Protection Plan submitted by Santa Margarita to PDS on March 1, 2019 with the addition of 13.5-foot clearances at the entrance and appropriate placement of Fire Department Connections on the access roads. Pursuant to the fire service availability form submitted for the project, The North County Fire Protection District has indicated the project is eligible for service and nearest fire station is located 0.11 miles from the project. Response time to the project site has been estimated to be less than five (5) minutes, meeting the time allowed pursuant to the Safety Element of ten (10) minutes. 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?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** As indicated above in response a), the proposed project is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone. However, the majority of the County is in the High and Very High FHSZ. Accordingly, the County has implemented fire safety measures depending on specific factors, such as location, vegetation, etc. The proposed project has prepared a Fire Protection Plan (FPP) which has been approved by the County Fire Authority and North County Fire Protection District. The FPP states that the Project will install two commercial type fire hydrants at the corners of Mission Road and Thoroughbred Lane and at the north/east side of the main access driveway. Additionally, the main entrance will meet fire access road requirements, and setbacks, building construction, fire protection systems, defensible space, and vegetation management will be subject to local regulations and the FPP specifications approved by the North County Fire Protection District and County Fire Authority. 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 located near residences, rural lands, and office professional facilities of a similar size. Pursuant to the Fire Protection Plan for the project, the adjacent properties which surround the subject property would not pose a serious wildfire threat due to the lack of native vegetation and the ongoing commercial practices occurring. The

project would also be required to meet applicable fire measures such as fire sprinklers, site inspections, premises identification, fire apparatus access, access road requirements, fire hydrants and vegetation removal/clearance. Additionally, the North County 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 0.11 miles from the project site and would meet the maximum travel time pursuant to the Safety Element.

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

<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 for an assisted living facility. No installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, such as roads, fuel breaks, or emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities would be required for the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) Expose people or 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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project site is relatively flat and is not located near County Steep Slopes. Pursuant to the Fire Protection Plan, there are no significant terrain or geological features that would affect the site plan or fire hazard assessment on the subject property. Additionally, the surrounding area has been either developed as residential or office professional properties. As indicated within response VII(a)(iv), the project site is within a landslide susceptibility area, Landslide Category "Low", as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. However, 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. In addition, the Drainage Study prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering determined that the existing drainage pattern would be maintained after the construction of the Project, and that the peak flow would be reduced by project features. Because of this, the project site has a low probability to become unstable. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes. Impacts are less than significant.

**XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

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

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** 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.

Conditions of approval have been included that clearly reduce these effects to a level below significance. This includes archaeological monitoring during construction to ensure that no important examples of California history or prehistory are eliminated. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact                       Less than Significant Impact  
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated                       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
Verizon Cell Site – Olive Hill	Major Use Permit	5425 Olive Hill Road	Approved 2017
Golf Green Estates Tentative Map	Tentative Map	SW of Camino Del Rey and Old River Road Intersection	Approved 2013

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. This Project and the Golf Greens Estates Tentative Map each include an archaeological monitoring program which will reduce direct and cumulative impacts of the Project to less-than-significant. This Project, the Verizon Cell Site – Olive Hill, and Golf Green Estates Tentative Map all include a condition for contribution to the Transportation Impact Fee Program, which will mitigate direct and cumulative impacts of the Project to less-than-significant.

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?

- |                          |  |                                     |                              |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <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:** 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 no identified potentially significant effects to human beings related to the project. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that 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**

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

Everett and Associates (July 2019). Biological Resources Letter Report for the Bonsall Carefield Assisted Care Facility, Bonsall, CA APN: 126-230-55-00.

North County Fire Protection District, Patricia Koch (April 2019). Request for Agency Recommendations – Fire, Bonsall Carefield Facility, Thoroughbred Lane and SR-76, 126-230-55-00

Darnell & Associates, Bill E. Darnell (October 2019). Revised Traffic Analysis for the Carefield Solana Assisted Care Facility, Thoroughbred Land and SR-76, APN: 126-230-55-00

Santa Margarita Consulting, LLC, Sid Morel (February 2019). Fire Protection Plan – Letter Report, Bonsall Assisted Care Facility, APN 126-230-55-00.

Ldn Consulting, Inc., Jeremy Loudon (March 2020). Air Quality Assessment, Carefield Solana Assisted Care Facility Development, County of San Diego, CA, APN: 126-230-55-00.

Ldn Consulting, Inc., Jeremy Loudon (March 2020). Global Climate Change Analysis, Carefield Solana Assisted Care Facility Development, County of San Diego, CA, APN: 126-230-55-00.

Ldn Consulting, Inc., Jeremy Loudon (January 2020). Carefield Solana Assisted Care Facility Development Noise Assessment – County of San Diego

Tory R. Walker Engineering, Tory R. Walker (October 2019). Preliminary Drainage Study for Carefield Senior Care Facility; Bonsall, CA APN: 126-230-55-00.

Tory R. Walker Engineering, Tory R. Walker (February 2020). Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) For Carefield Senior Care Facility, Bonsall, CA, APN: 126-230-55-00.

Rainbow Municipal Water District, Steven Strapac (October 2018). Project Facility Availability – Water, Thoroughbred Lane LLC, APN: 126-230-55-00.

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

#### AESTHETICS

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

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

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), 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/legsregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

#### AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

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