



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds
PHONE (858) 694-2962 • FAX (858) 694-2555

KATHLEEN FLANNERY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

~~December 12, 2019~~ September 18, 2020

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

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

Liberty Charter High School; PDS2015-MUP-15-027; PDS2015-ER-15-14-010
2. Lead agency name and address:
County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123-1239
3.
 - a. Contact: Denise Russell, Project Manager
 - b. Phone number: (858) 694-2019
 - c. E-mail: denise.russell@sdcounty.ca.gov.
4. Project location:

1530 Jamacha Road, El Cajon, Valle de Oro Community Planning Area, Unincorporated
San Diego County (APN# 498-330-39-00)

Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1272, Grid A/2
5. Project Applicant name and address:

Literacy First Charter Schools, Inc.
1012 East Bradley Avenue
El Cajon, CA 92020
6. General Plan
Community Plan: Valle De Oro
Land Use Designation: Semi-Rural 0.5 (SR-0.5)
Density: 1 du/0.5 gross acre(s)
Floor Area Ratio (FAR): N/A

7. Zoning
Use Regulation: Rural Residential (RR)
Minimum Lot Size: 0.5 acre(s)
Special Area Regulation: N/A

8. Project Description:

The project is a Major Use Permit for a charter high school for grades nine through twelve, operated by Literacy First Charter Schools (LFCS). LFCS operates under a charter issued by the County Department of Education, which requires that they operate within the boundaries of the Grossmont Union High School District. The existing Liberty Charter High School is located approximately eight miles west of the proposed site, at 8425 Palm Street in Lemon Grove. LFCS currently leases the former Palm Middle School campus from the Lemon Grove School District, and the high school will be relocated to the proposed location once constructed to better serve the local high school population in El Cajon and Rancho San Diego. At full capacity, the proposed school would serve 450 students and have 33 faculty and staff. The school year would take place from August through June, and school hours would be from 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. The school would include a 48,000 square-foot, two-story building that would house 22 classrooms, the administrative office, and a gymnasium. Other on-site amenities would include 161 parking spaces, an outdoor common area and patios, and a sports field located in the eastern portion of the site. Access to the site would be provided by a one-way circulation driveway (two driveways total) connecting to Chase Avenue. Approximately 700 linear feet of drop-off/pick-up area would be provided, accommodating 28 vehicles queuing on-site at any given time. A total of 161 parking spaces would be provided including three accessible parking spaces and one van accessible space. A minimum of 45 bicycle spaces would also be provided. Grading would consist of 23,500 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill.

The project site is 7.7 acres and is located at the intersection of Chase Avenue and Jamacha Road in the Valle de Oro Community Planning Area, within unincorporated San Diego County. The site is subject to the Semi-Rural General Plan Regional Category, Semi-Rural 0.5 Land Use Designation (SR-0.5), and to the Rural Residential (RR) Zoning Regulations. Schools are classified as Major Impact Services and Utilities under the Zoning Ordinance, and a Major Use Permit is required pursuant to the RR Zoning Regulations.

The site is currently undeveloped. The project would be served by sewer and imported water from the Otay Water District. Fire protection and emergency services would be provided by the San Miguel Fire Protection District. No extension of sewer or water utilities will be required by the project.

The proposed project includes construction of at least a 90-Kilowatt (KW) solar/photovoltaic system and would install low flow water fixtures throughout the development. Two level II electric vehicle charging stations would be installed within the common parking area, and dedicated parking would be included for vanpool/clean vehicle and carpool only.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(c)

As discussed in further detail under Section VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the County of San Diego's Climate Action Plan (CAP) has been under litigation since December 2018. Because the County was granted a writ ordering the approval of the CAP and its EIR to be set aside, and enjoining reliance on the County's CAP mitigation measure M-GHG-1, the CAP and its EIR were still in place during the appeal while the proposed project was circulated for public disclosure. However, given the legal instability concerning the County's CAP during review of the proposed project, the Greenhouse Gas analysis prepared for the proposed project did not rely on the CAP to streamline the Project's environmental analysis under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Rather, the proposed project's significant determination used the criteria informed by the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 and mitigation strategies informed by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(c) that are independent of the CAP. The proposed project was found to have a less than significant impact to Greenhouse Gas emissions.

Due to the change in circumstance of the County's CAP, this Initial Study checklist has been updated in red-colored tracked changes to disclose additional details of how the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to Greenhouse Gas Emissions. In addition, language has been added to clarify the road improvements from the traffic analysis that were circulated for public disclosure. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section §15073.5, if a project would meet one of the four circumstances listed below, the project would not be required to recirculate the Negative Declaration:

CEQA Guidelines Section §15073.5

(c) Recirculation is not required under the following circumstances:

(1) Mitigation measures are replaced with equal or more effective measures pursuant to Section 5074.1.

- The updates incorporated into the Initial Study Checklist include further discussion of design features, clarification of road improvements, as well as required local, state and federal regulations. No mitigation measures have been updated. Therefore, the proposed project does not meet this circumstance.

(2) New project revisions are added in response to written or verbal comments on the project's effects identified in the proposed negative declaration which are new avoidable significant effects.

- No updates made within this Initial Study Checklist were a result of written or verbal comments. Therefore, the proposed project does not meet this circumstance.

(3) Measures or conditions of project approval are added after circulation of the negative declaration which are not required by CEQA, which do not create new significant environmental effects and are not necessary to mitigate an avoidable significant effect.

- No new measures or conditions of project approval were added after circulation of the negative declaration. Therefore, the proposed project does not meet this circumstance.

(4) New information is added to the negative declaration which merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modification to the negative declaration.

- The updates that have been made to the Initial Study Checklist are further clarification on the proposed project design features, road improvements, as well as required local, state and federal regulations for which the proposed project must comply. Therefore, the proposed project meets this circumstance.

The updates of this Initial Study checklist are mere clarifications and have been found to meet CEQA Guidelines Section §15073.5, circumstance (4). Therefore, no recirculation of the Initial Study Checklist is required.

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

Land uses surrounding the project site include residential and commercial uses. The topography of the project site and adjacent land is relatively flat with gentle slopes. The site is bound by Chase Avenue to the north and a private driveway to the south. A commercial shopping center is directly east of the site. Interstate 8 is approximately three miles north of the site, and State Route 54/Jamacha Road is directly east on the other side of the commercial shopping center.

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

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Annexation to a City or Special District	Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm Water Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Otay Water District
Sewer District Approval	Otay Water District
Fire District Approval	San Miguel 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.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

~~December 12, 2019~~ September 18, 2020

Signature

Date

Denise Russell
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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" 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 to individual visual resources.

No Impact

The project site is located near the intersection of Jamacha Road and Chase Avenue in the Valle de Oro planning area. Based on a site visit by County staff on December 4, 2015 the proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and will not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The project would 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. Section XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance includes a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XXI would not contribute to a cumulative impact because they do not have impacts related to aesthetics, include landscaping, or are not located within the proposed project’s scenic vista. Therefore, the project would not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 by staff on December 4, 2015, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and would not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The project site is currently undeveloped. Vegetation includes Non-native grassland and non-native vegetation, as well as developed and disturbed lands. The project site is infill development and is adjacent to Chase Avenue and Jamacha Road and is surrounded by residential and commercial development. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

The project would 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. Section XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance includes a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and would not contribute to a cumulative impact because they are not located within a state scenic highway. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

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

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

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

Less than Significant Impact

The project site is within an urbanized area of the Valle de Oro community (El Cajon), and is located at the intersection of Chase Avenue and Jamacha Road. The existing visual character and quality of the project site is undeveloped, and the surrounding area can be characterized as highly developed with land use types such as single-family residential and commercial uses. The project site is relatively flat, and the surrounding area is relatively flat with gentle sloping topography. Viewer groups of the Project site include those traveling along Chase Avenue and Jamacha Road. The viewer exposure is either limited due to travel speed or is extended for vehicles stopped at the traffic light of Chase Avenue and Jamacha Road.

The proposed Project would not detract from or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of the surrounding area for the following reasons: the height, setbacks, and design of the proposed school are consistent with the height designator, setbacks and design of the surrounding area; and landscaping has been incorporated within the project along Chase Avenue and Jamacha Road for screening purposes from public roads. The location, size, and design of the proposed use would be compatible with adjacent uses due to the following reasons: the proposed school is similar to surrounding commercial development (east, northeast) and is smaller in scale than Valhalla High School (approximately 0.5 mile southeast). Homes in the area include single-family and estate residential. Viewer exposure to the Project would not be a significant effect since the Project is proposed in a highly developed area and has been designed in a way to be compatible with the surrounding use types. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial effect on the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Section XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance includes a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XXI are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and would not contribute to a cumulative impact because the project would be visually integrated into the surroundings in an unobtrusive manner. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project would use outdoor lighting and is not located within Zone A as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. It would not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project would conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209), including the lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights, as detailed in a Photometric Study prepared for the project, dated August 2017, and accepted by the County.

In addition, the proposed project would control outdoor lighting and sources of glare in the following ways:

1. The project would not install outdoor lighting that directly illuminates neighboring properties.
2. The project would not install outdoor lighting that would cast a direct beam angle towards a potential observer, such as a motorists, cyclist or pedestrian.

- 3. The project would not install outdoor lighting for vertical surfaces such as buildings, landscaping, or signs in a manner that would result in useful light or spill light being cast beyond the boundaries of intended area to be lit.
- 4. The project would not install any highly reflective surfaces such as glare-producing glass or high-gloss surface color that would be visible along roadways, pedestrian walkways, or in the line of sight of adjacent properties.

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

In addition, the project’s outdoor lighting would be controlled through the Major Use Permit, which further limits outdoor lighting through strict controls. Therefore, compliance with the Code, in combination with the outdoor lighting and glare controls listed above ensures that the project would not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare.

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

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

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

No Impact

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

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

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

No Impact

The project site is zoned Rural Residential (RR), which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. In addition, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

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

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

No Impact

The project site, including offsite improvements, does not contain forest lands or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project is consistent with existing zoning and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones.

- d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

No Impact

The project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of offsite forest resources.

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

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

No Impact

The project site and surrounding area within a radius of 1 mile does not contain any active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations would be converted to a non-agricultural use. In addition, and as stated above, the proposed project does not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact

An Air Quality Assessment was prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc in November 2019. The General Plan designates the Project site as semi-rural residential (SR-0.5) with a regional category "semi-rural." The site is zoned RR, Rural Residential. The Project, which would develop a new high school serving 450 students and 33 staff, would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation with a major use permit. Because the project is allowed under the General Plan land use designation, which used San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth projections, it is consistent with the regional air quality standards (RAQS) and State Implementation Plan (SIP). Thus, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. Further, as analyzed and discussed in the Air Quality Assessment, the construction and operational emissions from the project are anticipated to be below established County screening level thresholds (SLTs) and would not violate any ambient air quality standards. This impact would be less than significant.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ 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 proposes the construction of a new high school in a two-story, 48,000 square foot building with balanced grading onsite. For the purposes of the Air Quality Assessment, project construction was assumed to start in January 2020 and is project to end December 2020. Additional discussion of assumptions made for the project construction analysis within the Air Quality Assessment. Emissions from project construction activities would be temporary and localized and would be required to comply with San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rules 55 and 67, and the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance. Based on the analysis provided in the Air Quality Analysis, project construction activities would not result in emissions in excess of the County's SLTs.

During project operations, the proposed project would generate approximately 854 average daily trips. Daily emissions of criteria pollutants associated with these motor vehicles, as well as emissions from operational area and energy sources, were estimated in the Air Quality Assessment. The project would generate daily emissions at levels below the County SLTs during operations.

The project would contribute PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, NO_x, and VOC emissions from construction activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed the established SLTs, and would be subject to SDAPCD Rules 55 and 67, and the County Grading Ordinance. These regulations require the implementation of fugitive dust control measures and VOC limits for all architectural coatings. The project would generate emissions of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and NO_x during operations, primarily from mobile sources, and VOCs from area and mobile sources. Operational emissions would not be anticipated to exceed the County's SLTs. Further, as discussed in (a), project operations would be consistent with the RAQs and SIP.

Emissions generated during project construction activities and operations would be less than significant and would not result in a cumulative considerable net increase in criteria pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

As discussed in the project's Air Quality Assessment, without the application of best available control technology for toxics (T-BACT), the project would exceed the health risk threshold of one in one million exposed during the most intense period of construction activities (grading). The project would require all construction equipment have California Air Resources Board (CARB) certified Tier 4 engines with diesel particulate filters (DPFs). The application of Tier 4 engines and DPF would meet the requirements of T-BACT and would reduce the project's health risk to below 10 in one million, which would be below the County's impact threshold. The project would have a less than significant impact to sensitive receptors during construction activities with mitigation (Tier 4 engines and DPF) incorporated.

The project includes the development of a high school which would be considered a sensitive receptor and is located adjacent to existing commercial and residential uses. None of the existing surrounding uses would generate operational emissions that would expose new sensitive receptors to potential air quality impacts. As discussed in the Air Quality Assessment and the project Traffic Study, the existing average daily traffic along adjacent roadways is below the CARB recommended advisory screening level for school siting and would not generate any potential impacts to the proposed project. Additionally, during operations, the project would not add traffic to intersections that would result in CO-hotspots. Impacts to sensitive receptors during operations would be less than significant.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact

Potential onsite odor generators would include short term construction odors from activities such as paving and possibly painting. Odors created during short term construction activities would most likely be from placing asphalt which has a slight odor from the bitumen and solvents used

within hot asphalt. Since odors generated during construction are short-term, they would not be considered a significant impact.

For operations, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality (County of San Diego, 2007) includes a list of odor producing uses that are typically recognized. School uses are not listed and would therefore not be a significant odor causing source. Based on this, the proposed 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 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, site photos, and a Biological Resources Report prepared by Elyssa Robertson (February 25, 2016), County staff biologist, Ashley Smith, has determined that the site supports native vegetation, namely, Non-native grassland. It has been determined that removal of this habitat would not result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, to any candidate, sensitive, or special status species for the following reasons: the proposed project site does not contain or marginally contains habitat and/or soils suitable for candidate, sensitive, or special status species (see Attachment C and D of the Biological Technical Report). Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Based on a site visit conducted by County staff on December 4, 2015, and as supported by the Biological Resources Report prepared by Elyssa Robertson (February 25, 2016), County staff biologist, Ashley Smith, has determined that the proposed project site contains Non-native grassland within the project boundaries; however, no riparian habitats are present. No off-site impacts have been identified within or immediately adjacent to the sensitive natural community. Impacts to 5.26 acres of Non-native grassland would be mitigated at a ratio of 0.5:1, requiring the offsite purchase of 2.62 acres of Tier III habitat or higher within the MSCP South County

Subarea. Therefore, project impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations, are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

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

No Impact

Based on a site visit conducted by County staff, on December 4, 2015, and as supported by the Biological Resources Report prepared by Elyssa Robertson (February 25, 2016), 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 would 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, site photos, a site visit by County staff on December 4, 2015, and as supported by the Biological Resources Report prepared by Elyssa Robertson (February 25, 2016), it has been determined that the site has limited biological value and impedence 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 for the following reasons: the proposed project site is small (7.7 acres) and surrounded by developed lands, and is located within the South County MSCP (outside PAMA).

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

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

No Impact

Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated December 12, 2019 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Jerry Schaefer, Ph.D., it has been determined that there is one historical resource present within the proposed project site. This resource includes concrete foundations that likely post-date World War II. They are neither associated with any significant historical persons nor with a master architect or builder. A cultural resources report entitled, *Cultural Resource Technical Report for the Liberty High School Site Project, Unincorporated Area of El Cajon, San Diego County, California*, dated March 2016, prepared by Jerry Schaefer, Ph.D. and Tony Quach evaluated the significance of the historical resources based on a review of records including maps, studies, property title and archived public records. Based on the results of this study, it has been determined that the historic resource is not significant pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5 loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. This resource (P-37-034788) would be directly impacted as a result of proposed project implementation.

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

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

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Jerry Schaefer, Ph.D. it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, *Cultural Resource Technical Report for the Liberty High School Site Project, Unincorporated Area of El Cajon, San Diego County, California*, dated March 2016, prepared by Jerry Schaefer, Ph.D. and Tony Quach. Due to the limited visibility of the site and the sensitivity of the area, archaeological monitoring would be made a condition of approval. The monitoring program would include the following requirements:

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

- Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin.
 - If the 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
 - 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
 - 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 and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
 - Disposition of Cultural Material.
 - 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 formal cemeteries?
- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Jerry Schaefer, Ph.D., it has been determined that the proposed project would not disturb any human remains because the proposed project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, *Cultural Resource Technical Report for the Liberty High School Site Project, Unincorporated Area of El Cajon, San*

Diego County, California, dated March 2016, prepared by Jerry Schaefer, Ph.D. and Tony Quach.

VI. ENERGY USE -- Would the project:

a) Result in a 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 proposed project would result in the use of electricity, natural gas, petroleum, and other consumption of energy resources during both the construction and operation phases of the project; however, the consumption is not expected to be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary for the following reasons.

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

The proposed project would be designed according to the most recent 2016 Title 24 or future, more stringent versions of Title 24 that are applicable as the project is built out. Part 6 of Title 24 specifically establishes energy efficiency standards for residential buildings constructed in the State of California to reduce energy demand and consumption.

Although the state court set aside the CAP as described in further detail in response VIII Greenhouse Gas Emissions, a), the proposed project was required to incorporate more sustainable design standards and implement applicable reduction measures which are still effective measures to reduce GHG emissions and energy consumption.

According to the State CEQA Guidelines, the means to achieve the goal of conserving energy include decreasing overall energy consumption, decreasing reliance on oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with the County's Climate Action Plan (CAP) and General Plan through the implementation of the measures identified in the County's CAP Checklist. These sustainability measures that would be implemented on the project site consist of various energy efficiency and design features, water

efficient appliances and installation of rain barrels and trees per residence. Additional measures such as efficient outdoor water usage, solar panels, energy efficient outdoor lighting, electric vehicle charging stations, building efficiency standards, recycling areas, and bike parking racks would be employed by the proposed project. While the project would result in the consumption of energy, the implementation of building energy efficiency measures, on-site renewable installation, and the supporting of EV infrastructure would reduce unnecessary energy consumption and support State efforts to conserve energy. Therefore, the construction and operation of the proposed project is not expected to result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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

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

No Impact

The proposed project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault.

Therefore, there would be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone.

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 proposed 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 would not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input 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 site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 not located within a “Landslide Susceptibility Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to

western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. A slope analysis was prepared by James Roberts, RCE (March 15, 2016) and it was determined that the average existing land slope is 10.7 percent. A Geotechnical Report is required prior to any construction activities. Because the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides. Therefore, there would be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from adverse effects of landslides.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Placentia sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes, and Vista coarse sandy loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes that has a soil erodibility rating of “moderate” and/or “severe” as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The proposed project would not result in unprotected erodible soils; would not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and would not develop steep slopes.
- A Storm Water Management Plan has been prepared (Scott Harry, P.E., P.L.S. April 30, 2017). The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the proposed project site:
 - Temporary Construction BMPs
 - Silt Fence and Fiber Rolls
 - Street Sweeping/Vacuuming
 - Stockpile Management
 - Solid Waste Management
 - Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit
 - Desilting Basin
 - Gravel Bag Berm
 - Material Delivery & Storage
 - Concrete Waste Management
 - Paving and Grinding Operations
 - Operational BMPs
 - Signage
 - Non-hazardous Soil Amendments
 - Smart Irrigation Systems
 - Grease Interceptor
 - Covered & Paved Trash Enclosures
 - Downspout to Swale or Landscaping
 - Direct Drainage to Infiltration Basin and/or Trench
- The proposed project involves grading. However, the proposed project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use

Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

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

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project involves 23,500 cubic yards of grading that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. In order to assure that any proposed buildings (including those proposed on the project site) are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a listed above.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-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 Placentia sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes, and Vista coarse sandy loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes. However the project would not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils would not create substantial risks to life or property.

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

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

No Impact

The proposed project would rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. A service availability letter dated October 30, 2015 has been received from the Otay Water District indicating that the facility has adequate capacity for the proposed project’s wastewater disposal needs. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

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

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

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 (cretaceous plutonic) and has no potential for producing fossil remains. In addition, the project site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project

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

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

Overview

The proposed project would incorporate sustainability features including the installation of a 90-kilowatt (kW) solar photovoltaic (PV) system, low flow water fixtures, and electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. Further details for the project description and design features are included in the project’s Global Climate Change study, prepared by Ldn Consulting in November 2019.

The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during construction activities through the operation of construction equipment, and during operations directly through mobile sources (i.e. vehicle trips) and area sources (i.e. consumer products, landscaping equipment), and indirectly through electricity consumption and solid waste decomposition.

Background on CAP and Litigation

The County of San Diego adopted a ~~Climate Action Plan~~ CAP on February 14, 2018 which outlines actions that the County will undertake to meet its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions targets. ~~Implementation of the CAP requires that new development projects incorporate more sustainable design standards and implement applicable reduction measures consistent with the CAP.~~ In March 2018, several petitioners filed a lawsuit against the County, alleging that the CAP and, in particular, M-GHG-1 were inconsistent with General Plan Goal COS-20 and Policy COS-20.1. In December 2018, the San Diego Superior Court ruled against the County. The Court issued a writ ordering the approval of the CAP and its EIR to be set aside, and enjoining reliance on the County CAP’s mitigation measure M-GHG-1. In January 2019, the County appealed the San Diego Superior Court ruling which stayed the above described writ. Essentially, the CAP and its EIR were still in place during the appeal. However, in June 2020, the state appeals court upheld the lower court’s ruling, rejecting the County’s CAP.

Given the current legal instability concerning the County’s CAP during review of the proposed project, the analysis prepared for the proposed project did not rely on the CAP to streamline the Project’s environmental analysis under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. ~~Rather, the proposed project’s significance determination used the criteria detailed above, (informed by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4) and mitigation strategies (informed by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(c)) that are independent of the CAP.~~ As such, In the event that the CAP does not withstand judicial scrutiny, the project has undergone a separate, stand-alone analysis for determining whether the project’s GHG emissions would significantly impact the environment.

Amendments to Section 15064.4 of the CEQA Guidelines were adopted to assist lead agencies in determining the significance of impacts of GHG emissions. Section 15064.4 specifies that a lead agency “shall make a good-faith effort, based on the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project.”

Section 15064.4 also provides lead agencies with the discretion to determine whether to assess those emissions quantitatively or to rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standard. In addition, the CEQA Guidelines specific that “[w]hen adopting or using thresholds of significance, a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies, or recommended by experts, provided the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is support by substantial evidence” (14 CCR 15064.7[c]).

In the absence of a locally adopted threshold by the County of San Diego, projects can be evaluated according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(c) by comparing the project’s GHG emissions to an efficiency threshold prepared through the County’s Local Government Partnership with San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E). This efficiency threshold is based on a countywide inventory of GHG emissions, forecasted consistent with meeting the State reduction target in 2030 and reduction goal in 2050.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact

As discussed in further detail in the project’s Global Climate Change study, the County has developed a baseline emissions inventory with emissions ~~projections~~ forecasts through 2030 and 2050, developed and funded through the County’s Local Government Partnership with SDG&E. Target emissions reductions based on these projections were set by the County, consistent with State requirements (i.e. Senate Bill 32, CARB Scoping Plan) to achieve a 40 percent reduction from baseline emissions projections in 2030.

Efficiency metrics, which describe emissions based on a per capita basis, per service population basis, or some other rate-oriented descriptor, are commonly used and recommended throughout the state to determine potential impacts related to GHGs (e.g. CARB Scoping Plan

recommendations, Bay Area Air Quality Management District [BAAQMD] efficiency thresholds). The per service population metric, which refers to the sum of the number of jobs and residents (or for the proposed project, students) generated by the project, identifies a GHG threshold which, if below, the project would be determined to generate GHG emissions that would not conflict with State requirements and would assist the County in reducing community-wide GHG emissions to meet 2030 targets.

Based on the County's baseline GHG inventory and forecasts projections, projects in the County need to demonstrate they would generate emissions below the 2.94 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) per service population. This service population threshold was determined using local data to be demonstrate consistency with the communitywide GHG reduction targets for 2030 based on State reduction targets.

Further detail for the calculations and assumptions applied to estimate project generated GHG emissions during construction and operations are provided in the project Global Climate Change study. The project would have a total service population of 488, including 450 students and 33 staff. Based on the project analysis, the project construction and operations would result in the generation of approximately 830 MTCO_{2e} annually, or 1.7 MTCO_{2e} per service population. Thus, the project's estimated GHG emissions would be below the County's service population threshold for 2030.

Although the state court set aside the CAP, the proposed project was required to incorporate sustainable design standards and implement applicable reduction measures which are still effective measures to reduce GHG emissions. These measures include carpool services and carpool/vanpool-only parking spaces, bicycle parking facilities, electric vehicle charging stations and electric vehicle-only parking spaces, and landscaping compliant with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance which requires a 40% reduction in current maximum applied water allowance for outdoor use. As stated above, the proposed project would also install a 90kW solar PV system. These measures would assist in reducing reliance on fossil fuels by providing incentives to participate in carpool/vanpools or alternative transportation methods such as biking or electric vehicles, provide a clean electricity source, and reduce water consumption, which in turn reduces the amount of energy needed to pump and treat water.

The State of California also requires additional project design requirements that would reduce GHG emissions from project operations including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Part 6 of Title 24 established Building Energy Efficiency Standards that are designed to ensure buildings achieve energy efficiency and preserve outdoor and indoor environmental quality. The California Energy Commission (CEC) adopts updated standards every 3 years to incorporate new energy efficient technologies and construction methods. As a result, these standards save energy, increase electricity supply reliability, and avoid the need to construct new power plants. Part 11 of Title 24 established the nation's first green building standards that requires minimum mandatory standards, as well as voluntary standards, pertaining to the planning and design of sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of Part 6), water conservation, material conservation, and interior air quality. The Project would be required to comply with the latest version of Part 6 and Part 11 of Title 24 standards at the building permit and construction phases.

It should also be noted that the Liberty Charter High School is the 9-12th grade program that serves the families that have enrolled their students in Literacy First Charter Schools. Most of those students live in communities near the proposed school site including the cities of El Cajon and La Mesa, and unincorporated communities of Spring Valley and Valle de Oro. The proposed school campus near the corner of Chase Avenue and Jamacha Boulevard would replace the current campus located in Lemon Grove. The relocated High School would be closer to the Elementary and Middle Schools (which represent the High School’s anticipated future student base) and would result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (which account for most of the emissions generated by the project) compared to the current location.

As previously stated, the project’s estimated GHG emissions would be below the service population threshold for 2030 utilized for this project. In addition, numerous design measures have been incorporated into the proposed project, reducing GHG emissions. Therefore, impacts related to the generation of GHG emissions would be less than significant.

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 California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has advised that “a project that falls below an efficiency threshold that is aligned with long-term goals and relevant plans has no cumulative impact distinct from the project impact.” As described in the discussion for (a), the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. The project land use and estimate emissions would be consistent with County goals and policies included in the County General Plan that address GHG reductions. Thus, the project would also be consistent with emissions reduction targets of AB 32 and the Global Warming Solutions Act. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reduction emissions of GHG emissions. Further discussion on project consistency with applicable plans and GHG reducing design features are included in the project’s Global Climate Change study.

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

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

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

No Impact

The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous

Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable 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

As stated above under response IX(a), the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, and therefore could not result in the upset and accident conditions which would release hazardous materials. 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.

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

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

No Impact

Although the project is a proposed school, it is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or other proposed school. The proposed project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact

Based on a site visit and regulatory database search, the proposed project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances that would create a significant hazard to the public

or environment. A Phase I Environmental Assessment was prepared for the proposed project (Marc Boogay, March 15, 2016, accepted April 2017) that did not identify any recognized environmental conditions for the subject site. The proposed 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 proposed 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 (UST) 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

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

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

No Impact

The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the proposed 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 proposed project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the proposed project area.

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

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

The following sections summarize the proposed 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 proposed project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact

The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan would not be interfered with by the proposed project due to the location of the proposed project, the 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 proposed 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 proposed project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact

The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan would not be interfered with because the proposed project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact

The Dam Evacuation Plan would not be interfered with because the proposed project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

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

No Impact

The proposed project is surrounded by urbanized areas and/or irrigated lands and no wildlands are adjacent to the proposed project. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated October 27, 2015, have been received from the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District. The conditions from the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District include the following requirements:

- Fire sprinklers required in all structures in accordance with NFPA 13 Standards and San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District Standards.
- Fire alarm system to be installed in accordance with NFPA 72 Standards.
- Gates shall have a clear width of 24 feet, and a vertical clearance of 13 feet 6 inches.
- Provide a 24-foot-wide fire lane for access to all sides of the school.
- Provide access from structures to the athletic field by means of a ramp/stairs for emergency evacuation of students.
- Fire hydrants shall be provided on the public street or on the site of the premises or both to be protected as required and approved by the Chief.

The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the proposed project site to be 4 minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the Safety Element is 5 minutes. Therefore, based on the location of the proposed project; review of the project by County staff; and through compliance with the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District's conditions, the proposed project is not expected to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project proposes the development and operation of public charter high school which requires biofiltration BMPs be implemented to address both pollutant and hydromodification management requirements. The project applicant has provided a copy of the Priority Development (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) prepared by KARN Engineering and Surveying, dated 4/30/17, which demonstrates that the project would comply with all requirements of the 2013 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit and County of San Diego BMP Design Manual 2016. The proposed project site proposes and would be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source

control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: Storm Drain Stenciling or Signage, Trash Storage Enclosure, Permeable Pavement, and Biofiltration Basins. These measures would enable the proposed project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program (JRMP) and BMP Design Manual.

Finally, the proposed project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project would not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the proposed project would conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JRMP and BMP Design Manual, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the proposed project would 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 |

No Impact

The proposed project would obtain its water supply from the Otay Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project would not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the proposed project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the proposed 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 or groundwater management 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 the development and operation of public charter high school. As outlined in the PDP SWQMP dated 4/30/2017 and prepared by KARN Engineering and Surveying, the proposed project would implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: temporary construction BMPs, stabilization planting/vegetation, self-retaining permeable pavement, and Biofiltration basins. These measures would control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program (JRMP) and BMP Design Manual. The SWQMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that would address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works would ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the proposed project would not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and would not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation would be controlled within the boundaries of the proposed project, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 would not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons, based on a Drainage Study prepared by KARN Engineering and Surveying on 4/30/2017:

- Drainage would be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- The proposed project would not increase surface runoff exiting the proposed project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

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

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?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The project proposes to connect to an existing storm water drainage system and would discharge at a flow rate equal to the pre-development flow rate based on the Drainage Study prepared by KARN Engineering and Surveying on 4/30/2017.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities, parking lots, trash storage or refuse area, food service, and a fertilized sports field. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs would be employed such that potential pollutants would be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: temporary construction BMPs, storm drain stenciling or signage, trash storage enclosure, self-retaining permeable pavement, and Biofiltration basins. Refer to IX Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

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

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

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 proposed project site; therefore, no impact would occur.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact

The proposed 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 proposed 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?

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

No Impact

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

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

No Impact

The proposed project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly disrupt or divide the 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?

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

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project is a charter high school within the Valle de Oro Community Plan Area of the County of San Diego General Plan. The proposed project is subject to the General Plan Semi-Rural Regional Category and the Semi-Rural 0.5 (SR-0.5) Land Use Designation. The proposed project is also subject to the policies of the Valle De Oro Community Plan. The property is zoned Rural Residential (RR) which permits schools with a Major Use Permit pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance Section 2185.

The proposed project does not conflict with any adopted land use plan, policy or regulation. It complies with the MSCP, RPO, and CEQA. Furthermore, it is consistent with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Significance.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3).

However, the proposed project site is surrounded by developed land uses including residential and commercial uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the proposed project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

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

No Impact

The proposed project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands or is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s).

Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan would occur as a result of the proposed project.

XIII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

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

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project is a charter high school and would be occupied by students, faculty and staff. Based on a site visit completed by County staff on December 4, 2015 and as described in the Noise Analysis prepared by Jeremy Loudon (August 3, 2017), the surrounding area supports residential and commercial uses. The proposed project would 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 areas 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 the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities as mentioned within Tables N-1 and N-2. The project is a Major Use Permit for Liberty Charter High School that is comprised of a 48,000-square foot, two-story building for classrooms, administrative offices and a gymnasium. A sports field would be located east of the proposed building, on the eastern portion of the project site. Based on the noise report prepared by Jeremy Loudon (August 3, 2017), future noise levels at the proposed exterior active sports field are anticipated to be as high as 70 dBA CNEL, which is in conformance with the Table N-1 noise exposure thresholds pursuant to the County Noise Element. The proposed project is also subject to interior sound levels for proposed schools, and noise exposure should be no greater than 50 dBA Leq pursuant to Tables N-1 and N-2, No. 3. This threshold is applicable to uses usually occupied part of the day such as a school classroom. Interior levels are subject to an interior noise level of 50 dBA Leq. The project would demonstrate conformance with the 50-dBA interior if windows were improved to a specific STC rating (e.g. STC 26 rated dual pane windows). This level of building plan detail would be addressed prior to building permits. This would ensure that building plans associated with the project demonstrate conformance with the interior sound level requirements pursuant to the County Noise Element.

Project implementation would 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. Therefore, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Direct and cumulative noise impacts to existing nearby residences were also evaluated. Project related traffic on nearby roadways would not have a substantial noise contribution to these roads and would not result in an off-site direct/cumulative noise impact at existing residences. Therefore, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Jeremy Loudon (August 3, 2017), 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 is zoned Rural Residential (RR) that has a one-hour average sound daytime limit of 50 dBA and nighttime limit of 45 dBA. The adjacent properties are zoned Rural Residential (RR) and General Commercial (C36) and have one-hour average daytime sound limit of 50 dBA and 60 dBA and nighttime sound limit of 45 dBA and 55 dBA, respectively. The Noise Analysis states the project's noise levels to the nearest property lines are not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) with noise measures incorporated. With the noise measures, the cumulative noise levels from the non-transportation sources would not exceed 45 dBA, and therefore complies with the County Noise Standards.

The proposed project is zoned residential and is subject to the one-hour average daytime sound level limit of 50 dBA and nighttime 45 dBA at the project property lines. Noise sources associated with the project involve HVAC systems and an outdoor school bell system. The proposed rooftop HVAC units would be visually screened by a parapet barrier which would also function as a noise control feature. This parapet barrier design would reduce levels from the HVAC unit. The proposed HVAC units would comply with County noise standards with the implementation of the parapet noise measure design. The school bell system is anticipated to operate for 4-5 seconds in duration, with a maximum of two occurrences in any given hour during daytime hours from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. The one-hour average sound level limit from both the bell system and mechanical HVAC unit would be as high as 48.3 dBA, in compliance with the daytime sound level requirement pursuant to the County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.404. With the incorporation of noise measures, the proposed project's noise levels at the adjoining properties would not exceed County Noise Standards.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Jeremy Loudon (August 3, 2017), the proposed project would not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction noise was assessed and is subject to the County's eight-hour average sound level limit of 75 dBA at any occupied boundaries. Based on the noise report and the noise model, a dozer, tractor/backhoe, loader, grader, and water truck were used to calculate a conservative noise source at one single location of 50 feet. Although not physically possible, this would introduce a conservative combined highest construction noise levels of 80.6 dBA at a reference distance of 50 feet. Based on noise attenuation by distance, at a distance of 100 feet would reduce levels to 74.6 dBA. Grading equipment operations would be spread out over the entire site as far as 400 feet away from the applicable property lines. Grading activities within 100 feet of the western and southern property lines occur intermittently and is limited to the slope preparation for the parking lot with a single piece of equipment in operation at one location. The majority of the grading operation would occur more than 100 feet

from the property lines. Based on the Noise Report’s quantitative assessment, it is not anticipated that temporary construction noise would exceed the 75 dBA eight-hour average requirement. In addition, construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the proposed 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 would not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project would not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the proposed project would 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 proposed project would 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

A charter high school is proposed where low ambient vibration and quiet during daytime use is important. The facilities include a setback of more than 50 feet from County Circulation Element (CE) roadways that use rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 43 VdB or less. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities would insure that these proposed uses or operations would not be impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 2006, Carl E. Hanson, David A. Towers, & Lance D. Meiser). This setback ensures that this proposed project site would not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways. In addition, the project site is not located near or adjacent to any property line for parcels that are zoned industrial or extractive uses or located near any permitted extractive uses.

Also, the proposed 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 and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

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

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

No Impact

The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip and is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

In addition, based on the list of past, present and future projects there are no new or expanded public airports projects in the vicinity that may extend the boundaries of the CNEL 60 dB noise contour. Refer to XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise on a project or cumulative level.

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

No Impact

The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area because the proposed project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

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

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

No Impact

The proposed project would not displace any people or existing housing since 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?

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

No Impact

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

XVI. RECREATION

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

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

No Impact

The proposed project does not propose any residential use, including but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

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

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

No Impact

The proposed project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

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

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

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 with Mitigation Incorporated: A Focused Traffic Impact Study, dated November 2018, was prepared by Kimley Horn that evaluated the potential traffic-related impacts associated with the construction of the new charter school.

The proposed project would generate a total of 585 new daily trips, including 117 (82 in, 35 out) morning peak-hour trips, 99 (33 in, 66 out) afternoon (school traffic) peak-hour trips, and 59 (23 in, 36 out) afternoon (commuter traffic) peak-hour trips.

Based on the County of San Diego criteria for determining traffic related impact, the proposed project would have a direct traffic related impact along Chase Avenue between the westernmost driveway and Jamacha Road. To mitigate this traffic direct impact, the proposed project would widen Chase Avenue to provide a second eastbound lane and would provide sufficient space to accommodate a westbound left-turn lane onto the site. In addition, a raised median will be added. The roadway widening is consistent with Chase Avenue ultimate classification per the Valle de Oro Mobility Element, which states that Chase Avenue is classified as a 4.1B Major Road with Bike Lanes.

The proposed project does not have a traffic related impact at intersections within the study area.

The County's Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Program/Ordinance provides a mechanism for projects to mitigate cumulative impacts with a "fair share" fee payment. The TIF Program

identifies transportation facilities needed to address cumulative impacts caused by future growth. TIF payments are divided into funds for the local Area, Regional, State Highway and Ramps and, if applicable, the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) to account for future transportation improvement projects. The Liberty Charter High School project is located within the Valle de Oro local fee area within the South region. Payment of TIF mitigates cumulative impacts to less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

No Impact: The County of San Diego has not adopted a threshold for VMT and is not expected to until July 2020, when the provisions of the section apply statewide. Since the VMT threshold is yet to be adopted by the County, no impact 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)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 includes widening Chase Avenue; however, the segment of roadway does not include any curves or dangerous intersections that would directly or cumulatively increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

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

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

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

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

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

No Impact

Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. No tribal cultural resources were identified during consultation. As such, would be no impacts to tribal cultural resources.

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

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which would cause significant environmental effects?

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

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities or the construction of such facilities. The service availability forms received do not require the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate adequate water and wastewater treatment facilities are available to serve the project from the following agencies/districts: Otay Water District.

The proposed project would construct new stormwater facilities (infiltration basin and trench). Impacts for the construction of these facilities were evaluated. See Section IV - Biological Resources for a discussion of required mitigation measures. Electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications would be provided by existing facilities near the proposed project site. Therefore, with the inclusion of mitigation (biological resources) the proposed project would have a less than significant impact associated with the construction of new or expanded facilities.

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project requires wastewater service from the Otay Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Otay Water District has been provided, indicating adequate wastewater service capacity is available to serve the requested demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider’s service capacity.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the proposed 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 21440 et 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 proposed project's solid waste disposal needs.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact

Implementation of the proposed 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 21440 et seq.). The proposed project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

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

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

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve any uses that would discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

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

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

The proposed project involves new and/or expanded storm water drainage facilities. The new and/or expanded facilities include an infiltration basin and trench. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form, the new and/or expanded facilities would not result in adverse physical effect on the environment, because all related impacts from the proposed storm water facilities have been mitigated to a level below significance. Refer to Section IV - Biological Resources for more information.

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

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

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

Less than Significant Impact

The proposed project is not located in a moderate, high or very high fire hazard severity zone. The project is located entirely within the "urban unzoned" fire hazard severity zone. Lands east and southeast of the proposed project site are within the moderate, high and very high fire hazard severity zones; however, these lands are over one mile from the project site. However, the proposed project does not substantially impair any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and would be serviced by the San Miguel Fire Protection District. Pursuant to the fire service availability form submitted for the project, San Miguel Fire Protection District has indicated the proposed project is eligible for service and nearest fire station is located 0.2 miles from the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

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

No Impact

As indicated above in response a), the proposed project is not located within a high or very high fire hazard severity zone, and thus a fire protection plan is not required. The proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risk due to slope, prevailing winds or other factors because the project site is relatively flat and is an infill development located near existing commercial and residential use types with minimal vegetation. The project will however be required to meet applicable fire measures such as fire sprinklers, fire hydrants, fire alarm system, fire apparatus access, access road requirements, emergency access, and fire clearing around all structures. Additionally, the San Miguel Fire Protection District has indicated the availability to serve the site

in the case that a fire would occur. The nearest fire station is located 4 minutes from the project site.

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

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

No Impact

The proposed project site is not located within a high or very high fire severity zone. The proposed project is an infill development and as identified in response b), generalized fire safety measures would be required. No installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, such as roads, fuel breaks, or emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities would be required for the project. As such, 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 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 would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides because the project is located on land which is relatively flat and is an infill development. Additionally, the proposed project site is not located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. A slope analysis for the project was prepared by James Roberts, RCE (March 15, 2016) and it was determined that the average existing land slope is 10.7 percent indicating that the project site is generally flat. As such, the potential for landslides is considered low.

The proposed project site is also not located within a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature. In order to assure that any proposed buildings are adequately supported, 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. Lastly, the Drainage Study by Scott Harry, P.E., P.L.S. (KARN Engineering and Surveying, Inc. [April 30, 2017]), determined that the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, due to the above stated reasons, the proposed 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 would be less than significant.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly biological resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes the offsite purchase of Non-native grassland habitat. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this proposed project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact

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

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
St. Gregory of Nyssa Major Use Permit	PDS2005-3300-05-010
Winchester Ranch Tentative Map	PDS2010-3100-4416
Brayton Way Tentative Parcel Map	PDS2005-3200-20918
Law Tentative Parcel Map	PDS2006-3200-20991
Drysdale’s Boulder and Landscape	PDS2003-3300-03-060

Avocado Ranch Road Tentative Parcel Map	PDS2017-TPM-21253
Fuerte Tentative Parcel Map	PDS2018-TPM-21261
Dawson Subdivision Tentative Map	PDS2000-3100-5157
Lynn Lot Split Tentative Parcel Map	PDS2016-TPM-21236

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

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

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

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, IX Hydrology and Water Quality XII. Noise, XIII. Population and Housing, and XVI. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request or on the County CEQA Public Review website at https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/ceqa_public_review.html.

AESTHETICS

- California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)
- California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)
- County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)
- Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).
- Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)
- Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)
- International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)
- US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)
- US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)
- US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

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

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

- California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)
- County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

- CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)
- County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFW and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No.

8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.
- County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.
- Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento, California, 1986.
- Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.
- Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)
- CULTURAL RESOURCES**
- California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.
- County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.
- Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.
- U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- GEOLOGY & SOILS**
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)
- HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**
- American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.
- California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

- California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov>, www.oes.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)
- Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)
- HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**
- American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government
- California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)
- California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.
- California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com>.)
- County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)
- County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.
- Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.
- National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)
- National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)
- San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- LAND USE & PLANNING**
- California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted August 3, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.
- Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

NOISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POPULATION & HOUSING

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

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

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

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

RECREATION

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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