County of San Diego

VINCE NICOLETTI
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 210, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
(858) 505-6445 General ▪ (858) 694-2705 Codes
(858) 565-5920 Building Services
www.SDCPDS.org

TYLER FARMER
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NAME: Chabad Rancho Santa Fe Major Use Permit

RECORD ID: PDS2023-MUP-23-013

ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: PDS2020-ER-20-08-006

This Document is Considered Draft Until it is Adopted by the Appropriate County of San Diego Decision-Making Body.

This Mitigated Negative Declaration is comprised of this form along with the Environmental Initial Study that includes the following:

a. Initial Study and Environmental Analysis Form
b. Attached extended studies prepared for the Project

1. California Environmental Quality Act Negative Declaration Findings:

   Find, that this Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the decision-making body's independent judgment and analysis, and; that the decision-making body has reviewed and considered the information contained in this Mitigated Negative Declaration and the comments received during the public review period; and that revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the project applicant would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur; and, on the basis of the whole record before the decision-making body (including this Mitigated Negative Declaration) that there is no substantial evidence that the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment.

2. Required Mitigation Measures:

   Please refer to the attached Environmental Initial Study for the rational for requiring of the following measures:

GRADING PERMIT: *(Prior to approval of any grading and/or improvement plans and issuance of any Grading or Construction Permits).*

1. **NOISE#1–NOISE REQUIREMENT [PDS, FEE X]**
   INTENT: In order to reduce the impacts of the exterior sound levels from the project site on the adjacent parcels and to comply with the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance 36.404 as evaluated in the County of San Diego Noise Guidelines for Determining Significance, the following design measures shall be implemented on the building plans and in the site design. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The following design elements and noise attenuation measures shall be implemented and indicated on the building plans and made conditions of its issuance: All HVAC units shall be screened with parapet walls at least as tall as the unit to reduce noise level from on-site operational noise sources associated with the project to 45 dBA LEQ (1-hour) or less, when measured at the property line. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall place the design elements, or notes on the building plans and submit the plans to [PDS, BPPR] for review and approval. TIMING: Prior to issuance of any building permit, the design elements and noise attenuation measures shall be incorporated into the building plans. **MONITORING:**
   The [PDS, BPPR] shall verify that the specific note(s), and design elements, and noise attenuation measures have been placed on all sets of the building plans and made conditions of its issuance.

2. **CULT#1 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL & TRIBAL MONITORING**
   INTENT: In order to mitigate for potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources and human remains, an Archaeological Monitoring Program and potential Data Recovery Program shall be implemented pursuant to the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Cultural Resources and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** A County Approved Principal Investigator (PI) known as the "Project Archaeologist," shall be contracted to perform archaeological monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all grading, clearing, grubbing, trenching, and construction activities. The archaeological monitoring program shall include the following:

   a. The Project Archaeologist and Native American monitor from an affiliated tribe shall perform the archaeological and tribal monitoring duties before, during and after construction pursuant to the most current version of the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Requirements for Cultural Resources. The Project Archaeologist and Native American monitor of an affiliated tribe shall also evaluate fill soils to determine that they are clean of cultural resources. The contract or letter of acceptance provided to the County shall include an agreement that the archaeological and tribal monitoring will be completed, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Project Archaeologist and the County of San Diego shall be executed. The contract or letter of acceptance shall include a cost estimate for the monitoring work and reporting.

   b. The Project Archeologist shall provide evidence that a Native American monitor of an affiliated tribe has been contracted by the property owner or their representative to perform Native American Monitoring for the project.

c. The cost of the monitoring shall be added to the grading bonds or bonded separately.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall provide a copy of the Archaeological Monitoring Contract or letter of acceptance, copy of the Tribal monitoring contract, cost estimate, and MOU to *[PDS, PPD]*. Additionally, the cost amount of the monitoring work shall be added to the grading bond cost estimate. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of any grading and or improvement plans and issuance of any Grading or Construction Permits. **MONITORING:** *[PDS, PPD]* shall review the contract or letter of acceptance, MOU and cost estimate or separate bonds for compliance with this condition. The cost estimate should be forwarded to *[PDS, PPD]* for inclusion in the grading bond cost estimate, and grading bonds and the grading monitoring requirement shall be made a condition of the issuance of the grading or construction permit.

3. CULT#2 - CULTURAL RESOURCES TREATMENT AGREEMENT AND PRESERVATION PLAN

INTENT: In order to mitigate for potential impacts to Traditional Cultural Properties, develop and enter into a Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan with culturally-affiliated Tribes. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** A Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall be developed between the applicant or their representative, and consulting culturally-affiliated Tribes. The Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall be reviewed and agreed to by the County prior to final signature and authorization. The Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall include but is not limited to the following:

a. Parties entering into the agreement and contact information.

b. Responsibilities of the Property Owner or their representative, Principal Investigator, archaeological monitors, Native American monitors of affiliated tribes, and consulting tribes.

c. Requirements of the Archaeological Monitoring Program including unanticipated discoveries. The requirements shall address grading and grubbing requirements including controlled grading and controlled vegetation removal in areas of cultural sensitivity, and analysis of identified cultural materials.

d. Excavated soils. No soils are proposed for export. Consultation with the culturally-affiliated tribes shall occur should excavated soils need to exported offsite.

e. Treatment of identified Native American cultural materials. Any identified Native American cultural materials with the exception of Native American human remains and associated grave goods (described in item g below) are to be reburied onsite. The Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall identify a suitable location for reburial of cultural materials should they be encountered and recovered during construction monitoring. Should the reburial area be required, the location shall be recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms, and an open space easement shall be dedicated for the protection of the resources in perpetuity. If the proposed reburial location is not required, then neither recordation on DPR forms, nor dedication of an open space easement over the proposed location is required.

f. Deed restriction. Details of the requirement for a deed restriction for reburial of identified Native American cultural materials. The requirements shall address protection of Native American cultural materials, access, and responsibilities for management and maintenance of the open space.

g. Treatment of Native American human remains and associated grave goods. Consultation with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) pursuant to 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. The Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall identify a suitable location for reburial of human remains, sacred items, and funerary items, should they be encountered and recovered during construction monitoring. Should the reburial area be required, the location shall be recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms, and an open space easement shall be dedicated for the protection of the resources in perpetuity. If the proposed reburial location is not required, then neither recordation on DPR forms, nor dedication of an open space easement over the proposed location is required.

h. Confidentiality of cultural information including location and data.

i. Regulations that apply to cultural resources that have been identified or may be identified during project construction.

DOCUMENTATION: A copy of the implemented agreement shall be submitted to the [PDS, PPD] for approval. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of any grading and/or improvement plans and issuance of any Grading or Construction Permits. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PPD] shall review the implemented agreement for compliance this condition.

4. **PALEO#1 - PALEONTOLOGICAL GRADING MONITORING**
INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources, a monitoring program during grading, trenching or other excavation into undisturbed rock layers beneath the soil horizons and a fossil recovery program, if significant paleontological resources are encountered, shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** A Qualified Paleontologist shall be contracted to perform paleontological resource monitoring and a fossil recovery program if significant paleontological resources are encountered during all grading, trenching, or other excavation into undisturbed rock layers beneath the soil horizons. The monitoring program shall include the following:

a. A Qualified Paleontologist ("Project Paleontologist") shall perform the monitoring duties pursuant to the most current version of the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources, and this permit. The contract or letter of acceptance provided to the County shall include an agreement that the grading/ trenching/excavation monitoring will be completed, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Project Paleontologist and the County of San Diego shall be executed. The contract or letter of acceptance shall include a cost estimate for the monitoring work and reporting.

b. The cost of the monitoring shall be added to the grading bonds or bonded separately.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall provide a copy of the Grading Monitoring Contract or letter of acceptance, cost estimate, and MOU to the *[PDS, PPD*]. Additionally, the cost amount of the monitoring work shall be added to the grading bond cost estimate. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of any grading and or improvement plans and issuance of any Grading or Construction Permits. **MONITORING:** The *[PDS, PPD]* shall review the contract or letter of acceptance, MOU and cost estimate or separate bonds for compliance with this condition. The cost estimate should be forwarded to *[PDS, LDR]*, for inclusion in the grading bond cost estimate and grading bonds and the grading monitoring requirement shall be made a condition of the issuance of the grading or construction permit.

BUILDING PERMIT: *(Prior to approval of any building plan and the issuance of any building permit).*

5. **CULT#3 - CULTURAL RESOURCES MONITORING REPORT**
INTENT: In order to ensure that the Archaeological Monitoring occurred during the earth-disturbing activities, a final report shall be prepared. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** A final Archaeological Monitoring and Data Recovery Report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program shall be prepared. The report shall include the following items:

a. DPR Primary and Archaeological Site forms.

b. Daily Monitoring Logs

c. Evidence that all Native American cultural materials in order of preference have been conveyed as follows:

(1) Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the archaeological monitoring program have been reburied.

or

Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the archaeological and tribal monitoring program have been repatriated to a Native American group of appropriate tribal affinity. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the Native American tribe to whom the cultural resources have been repatriated identifying that the archaeological materials have been received.

(2) Evidence that all historic cultural materials have been conveyed as follows:

Historic materials shall be curated at a San Diego curation facility and shall not be curated at a Tribal curation facility or repatriated. The collections and associated records, including title, shall be transferred to the San Diego curation facility and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.

Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that the historic materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.

d. If no cultural resources are discovered, a Negative Monitoring Report must be submitted stating that the grading monitoring activities have been completed. Grading Monitoring Logs must be submitted with the negative monitoring report.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant's archaeologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to the *[PDS, PPD]* for approval. Once approved, a final copy of the report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) and any culturally-affiliated Tribe who requests a copy. **TIMING:** Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final report shall be prepared. **MONITORING:** The *[PDS, PPD]* shall review the final report for compliance this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon acceptance of the report, *[PDS, PPD]* shall inform *[PDS, LDR]* and *[DPW, PDCI]*, that the requirement is complete and the bond amount can be relinquished. If the monitoring was bonded separately, then *[PDS, PPD]* shall inform *[PDS or DPW FISCAL]* to release the bond back to the applicant.

6. PALEO#1 - PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES REPORT

INTENT: In order to ensure that the Grading Monitoring occurred during the grading, trenching or other excavation phase of the project, a final report shall be prepared. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** A final Paleontological Resources Mitigation Report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Paleontological Monitoring Program shall be prepared. The report shall include the following:

a. If no paleontological resources were discovered, submit a Negative letter report, which states that the monitoring has been completed and that no paleontological resources were discovered.

b. If resources were discovered and recovered during grading, a detailed report shall be prepared by the Project Paleontologist. The report shall comply with the County of San Diego's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources. The report shall identify which accredited institution has agreed to accept the curated fossils and include proof of the Transfer of Paleontological Resources, in the form of a letter, from the director of the paleontology department of the accredited institution to the Director of PDS verifying that the curated fossils from the project site have been received by the institution.

DOCUMENTATION: The Project Paleontologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to the *[PDS, PPD]* for approval. If resources were discovered, then the following shall be completed:

1. Transfer the cataloged fossil remains and copies of relevant field notes, maps, stratigraphic sections, and photographs to an accredited institution (museum or university) in California that maintains paleontological collections for archival storage and/or display; and

2. The applicant shall submit two hard copies of the final Paleontological Resources Mitigation Report to the *[PDS, PPD]* for final approval of the mitigation, and submit an electronic copy of the complete report in Microsoft Word on an USB disk. In addition, submit one copy of the report to the San Diego Natural History Museum and one copy to the institution that received the fossils.

TIMING: Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final report shall be prepared. **MONITORING:** The *[PDS, PPD]* shall review the final report for compliance with this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon acceptance of the report, *[PDS, PPD]* shall inform *[PDS, LDR]* and *[DPW, PDCI]*, that the requirement is complete and the bond amount can be relinquished. If the monitoring was bonded separately, then *[PDS, PPD]* shall inform *[PDS, FISCAL]* to release the bond back to the applicant.

7. **GHG-1: CALGREEN TIER 2 VOLUNTARY MEASURE IMPLEMENTATION: [PDS, CODES] [OG]**

- **INTENT:** In order to comply with Climate Action Plan requirements, project design shall comply with the requirements of this condition. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIRMENT:** The project shall achieve Tier 2 status as set forth in the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code, Title 24, Part 11 (CALGreen), Appendix A5 Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, Division A5.6, Voluntary Tiers, Section A5.601.3 CALGreen Tier 2 related to electric vehicle charging infrastructure, energy efficiency requirements, and renewable energy. Additionally, the project will comply with the requirements of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code, Title 24, Part 11 (CALGreen), Appendix A5 Voluntary Nonresidential Measures, Section A5.303.2.3.2 Tier 2 Water Efficiency and Conservation Requirements and three elective measures from Section A5.303, Section A5.304, and Section A5.305 Tier 2 Water Efficiency and Conservation Requirements. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall conform to the requirements of this condition. Failure to conform to this condition may result in excessive operation GHG emissions. **TIMING:** Consistency with this measure shall be demonstrated prior to issuance of a Major Use Permit. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, CODES] is responsible for enforcement of this permit.

GRADING PLAN NOTES

PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING: *(Prior to Preconstruction Conference, and prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances.)*

8. **CULT#GR-1 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING – PRECONSTRUCTION MEETING**
INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Significance – Cultural Resources, an Archaeological Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The County approved Project Archaeologist and Native American Monitor of an affiliated tribe shall attend the pre-construction meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the archaeological monitoring program. The Project Archaeologist and Native American Monitor of an affiliated tribe shall monitor the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits in all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. The Project

Archaeologist, and Native American monitor of an affiliated tribe shall also evaluate fill soils to determine that they are clean of cultural resources. The archaeological monitoring program shall comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources and as outlined in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall have the contracted Project Archeologist and Native American of an affiliated tribe attend the preconstruction meeting to explain the monitoring requirements. **TIMING:** Prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances this condition shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The *[DPW, PDCI]* shall confirm the attendance of the approved Project Archaeologist.

9. **PALEO-GR#1 - PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING**
INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Paleontological Resources, a Paleontological Resources Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Project Paleontologist shall attend the pre-construction meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the grading monitoring program. The Project Paleontologist shall monitor during the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits for the project, both on and off site, the Qualified Paleontological Resources Monitor shall be on-site to monitor as determined necessary by the Qualified Paleontologist. The grading monitoring program shall comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Paleontological Resources. **DOCUMENTATION**: The applicant shall have the contracted Project Paleontologist attend the preconstruction meeting to explain the monitoring requirements. **TIMING**: Prior to Preconstruction Conference, and prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances this condition shall be completed. **MONITORING**: The [*DPW, PDCI*] shall attend the preconstruction conference and confirm the attendance of the approved Project Paleontologist.

DURING CONTRUCTION: *(The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the grading construction).*

10. **AQ#1: CONSTRUCTION BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES: [DPW, PDCI].**
INTENT: To minimize temporary construction emissions associated with project site preparation and grading. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The project shall comply with the following temporary construction dust control measures:

1. Minimization of Disturbance. Construction contractors shall minimize the area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
2. Soil Treatment. Construction contractors shall treat all graded and excavated material, exposed soil areas and active portions of the construction site, including unpaved on-site roadways to minimize fugitive dust. Treatment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, periodic watering, application of environmentally safe soil stabilization materials, and/or roll compaction as appropriate. Watering shall be done as often as necessary, and at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day. For modeling purposes, it was assumed that watering would occur three

times daily, during the construction of this development, a requirement to which the applicant has committed.

3. Soil Stabilization. Construction contractors shall monitor all graded and/or excavated inactive areas of the construction site at least weekly for dust stabilization. Soil stabilization methods, such as water and roll compaction, and environmentally safe dust control materials shall be applied to portions of the construction site that are inactive for over four days. If no further grading or excavation operations are planned for the area, the area shall be seeded and watered until landscape growth is evident, or periodically treated with environmentally safe dust suppressants, to prevent excessive fugitive dust.
4. No Grading During High Winds. Construction contractors shall stop all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations during periods of high winds (20 mph or greater, as measured continuously over a one-hour period).
5. Street Sweeping. Construction contractors shall sweep all on-site driveways and adjacent streets and roads at least once per day, preferably at the end of the day, if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent streets and roads.
6. San Diego County Grading Ordinance. As a condition of this Project, construction contractors shall refer to the Section 87.428 of the San Diego County Grading Ordinance, amended by Ord. No. 10224, effective October 25, 2012. Section 87.428 (Dust Control Measures) requires all clearing and grading to be carried out with dust control measures adequate to prevent creation of a nuisance to persons or public or private property. Clearing, grading or improvement plans shall require that measures such as the following be undertaken to achieve this result: watering, application of surfactants, shrouding, control of vehicle speeds, paving of access areas, or other operational or technological measures to reduce dispersion of dust. These Project design measures are to be incorporated into all earth disturbing activities to minimize the amount of PM emissions from construction.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall comply with the temporary construction dust measures of this condition. **TIMING:** The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of site preparation and grading construction activities. **MONITORING:** The [*DPW, PDCI*] shall make sure that the grading contractor complies with the construction dust control measures of this condition. The [*DPW, PDCI*] shall contact the [*PDS, PCC*] if the applicant fails to comply with this condition.

11. CULT#GR-2 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND TRIBAL MONITORING – DURING CONSTRUCTION

INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources, a Cultural Resource Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Project Archaeologist and Native American Monitor of an affiliated tribe shall monitor the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits in all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. The archaeological monitoring program shall comply with the following requirements during earth-disturbing activities:

a. **Monitoring.** The Project Archaeologist and Native American Monitor of an affiliated tribe shall be onsite as determined necessary by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the tribal representative. Inspections will vary based on the rate of

excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Native American Monitor of an affiliated tribe. Monitoring of the cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Native American Monitor of an affiliated tribe.

b. **Inadvertant Discoveries of Native American Resources.** In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant Native American resources are discovered:

1. The Project Archaeologist or the Native American monitor of an affiliated tribe, shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources.
2. At the time of discovery, the Project Archaeologist shall contact the PDS Staff Archaeologist and culturally-affiliated tribes as identified in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan.
3. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the project archaeologist, tribal monitor(s), and the tribal representative(s) to discuss the significance of the find. Optionally, the County Archaeologist may attend the meeting to discuss the significance of the find.
4. After consultation with the developer, project archaeologist, tribal monitor(s), and tribal representative(s), a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of the County Archaeologist, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the identified cultural resources.
5. Construction activities shall not resume in the area of discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to appropriate mitigation. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area and shall be monitored.
6. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. The isolates and/or non-significant deposits shall be reburied onsite as identified in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan.
7. Treatment and avoidance of the newly discovered resources shall be consistent with the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan entered into with the appropriate tribes. This may include avoidance of the cultural resources through project design, in-place preservation of cultural resources located in native soils and/or re-burial on the Project property so they are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity.
8. If cultural resources are identified, one or more of the following treatments, in order of preference, shall be employed:
    a. Preservation in place of the Cultural Resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in place where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources.
    b. Reburial of the resources on the project property. The measures for reburial shall include, at least, the following:
        - Measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any impacts in perpetuity.

- Reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed, with the exception that sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains are excluded.
- Any reburial process shall be culturally appropriate.
- Listing of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the confidential appendix of the Monitoring Report.
- The Monitoring Report shall be filed with the County under a confidential cover and is not subject to Public Records requests.

c. If preservation in place or reburial is not feasible, consultation with consulting Tribes (Rincon) is required to find an alternative solution which may include repatriation.

d. If avoidance, reburial, or other alternative solution including repatriation is not feasible, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program (Program) shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Tribe, and the Native American Monitor of an affiliated tribe and approved by the County Archaeologist prior to implementation. There shall be no destructive or invasive testing on sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains. Results concerning finds of any inadvertent discoveries shall be included in the Monitoring Report.

   Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code § 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological resources and cultural resources. If the landowner and the Tribe(s) cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for the archaeological or cultural resources, these issues will be presented to the Planning & Development Services Director for decision. The Planning & Development Services Director shall make the determination based on the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act with respect to archaeological resources, recommendations of the project archeologist and shall take into account the cultural and religious principles and practices of the Tribe.

c. **Inadvertant Discoveries of Historic Resources.** In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant historic cultural resources (non-Native American) are discovered:

1. The Project Archaeologist or the Native American monitor, shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant historic cultural resources.
2. At the time of discovery, the Project Archaeologist shall contact the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
3. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered historic cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer and the project archaeologist to discuss the significance of the find. Optionally, the County Archaeologist may attend the meeting to discuss the significance of the find.
4. Construction activities shall not resume in the area of discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to appropriate mitigation. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area and shall be monitored.

5. Historic isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field.
6. If historic cultural resources are identified, the following shall be employed:
   a. A Research Design and Data Recovery Program (Program) shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist and approved by the County Archaeologist prior to implementation. Results concerning finds of any inadvertent discoveries shall be included in the Monitoring Report.

d. **Human Remains.** If any human remains are discovered:

1. The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
2. Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. If the human remains are to be taken offsite for evaluation, they shall be accompanied by the Native American monitor of an affiliated tribe.
3. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the NAHC shall immediately contact the Most Likely Descendant (MLD).
4. 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.
5. The MLD may with the permission of the landowner, or their authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American human remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site.
6. 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.

e. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** If tribal cultural resources are discovered, the Project Archaeologist shall conduct consultation with culturally-affiliated tribes to determine the most appropriate mitigation. Should the two parties not be able to reach consensus, then the County Archaeologist shall consider the concerns of the culturally-affiliated tribe and the Project Archaeologist, and the Director of Planning & Development Services shall make a final decision regarding appropriate mitigation.

f. **Fill Soils.** The Project Archaeologist and Native American monitor of an affiliated tribe shall evaluate fill soils to determine that they are clean of cultural resources.

g. **Monthly Reporting.** The Project Archaeologist shall submit monthly status reports to the Director of Planning and Development Services starting from the date of the Notice to Proceed to termination of implementation of the archaeological monitoring program. The report shall briefly summarize all activities during the period and the status of progress on overall plan implementation. Upon completion of the implementation

phase, a final report shall be submitted describing the plan compliance procedures and site conditions before and after construction.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall implement the Archaeological Monitoring Program pursuant to this condition. **TIMING:** The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the earth disturbing activities. **MONITORING:** The *[DPW, PDCI]* shall make sure that the Project Archeologist is on-site performing the monitoring duties of this condition. The *[DPW, PDCI]* shall contact the *[PDS, PPD]* if the Project Archeologist or applicant fails to comply with this condition.

12. PALEO-GR#2 - PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING

INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Paleontological Resources, a Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Project Paleontologist shall monitor during the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits for the project, both on and off site. The Qualified Paleontological Resources Monitor shall be on-site to monitor as determined necessary by the Qualified Paleontologist. The grading monitoring program shall comply with the following requirements during grading:

a. If paleontological resources are encountered during grading/excavation, the following shall be completed:

    1. The Paleontological Resources Monitor shall have the authority to direct, divert, or halt any grading/excavation activity until such time that the sensitivity of the resource can be determined, and the appropriate salvage implemented.

    2. The Monitor shall immediately contact the Project Paleontologist.

    3. The Project Paleontologist shall contact the Planning & Development Services immediately.

    4. The Project Paleontologist shall determine if the discovered resource is significant. If it is not significant, grading and/or excavation may resume.

b. If the paleontological resource is significant or potentially significant, the Project Paleontologist or Paleontological Resources Monitor, under the supervision of the Project Paleontologist, shall complete the following tasks in the field:

    1. Salvage unearthed fossil remains, including simple excavation of exposed specimens or, if necessary, plaster-jacketing of large and/or fragile specimens or more elaborate quarry excavations of richly fossiliferous deposits.

    2. Record stratigraphic and geologic data to provide a context for the recovered fossil remains, typically including a detailed description of all paleontological localities within the project site, as well as the lithology of fossil-bearing strata within the measured stratigraphic section, if feasible, and photographic documentation of the geologic setting.

3. Transport the collected specimens to a laboratory for processing (cleaning, curation, cataloging, etc.).

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall implement the grading monitoring program pursuant to this condition. **TIMING**: The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the grading construction. **MONITORING:** The [*DPW, PDCI*] shall make sure that the Project Paleontologist is on-site performing the monitoring duties of this condition. The [*DPW, PDCI*] shall contact the [*PDS, PPD*] if the Project Paleontologist or applicant fails to comply with this condition.

ROUGH GRADING: *(Prior to rough grading approval and issuance of any building permit).*

13. CULT#GR-3 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING – ROUGH GRADING

INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources, an Archaeological Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Project Archaeologist shall prepare one of the following reports upon completion of the earth-disturbing activities that require monitoring:

a. **No Archaeological Resources Encountered.** If no archaeological resources are encountered during earth-disturbing activities, then submit a final Negative Monitoring Report substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed, and no cultural resources were encountered. Archaeological monitoring logs showing the date and time that the monitor was on site and any comments from the Native American Monitor of an affiliated tribe must be included in the Negative Monitoring Report.

b. **Archaeological Resources Encountered.** If archaeological resources were encountered during the earth disturbing activities, the Project Archaeologist shall provide an Archaeological Monitoring Report stating that the field monitoring activities have been completed, and that resources have been encountered. The report shall detail all cultural artifacts and deposits discovered during monitoring and the anticipated time schedule for completion of the reburial and/or repatriation phase of the monitoring.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall submit the Archaeological Monitoring Report to *[PDS, PPD]* for review and approval. Once approved, a final copy of the report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center and any culturally-affiliated Tribe who requests a copy. **TIMING:** Upon completion of all earth-disturbing activities, and prior to Rough Grading Final Inspection (Grading Ordinance SEC 87.421.a.2), the report shall be completed. **MONITORING:** *[PDS, PPD]* shall review the report or field monitoring memo for compliance with the project MMRP, and inform *[DPW, PDCI]* that the requirement is completed.

14. PALEO-GR#3 - PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING

INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Paleontological

Resources, a Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Project Paleontologist shall prepare one of the following letters upon completion of the grading activities that require monitoring:

a. If no paleontological resources were discovered, submit a "No Fossils Found" letter from the grading contractor to the [*PDS, PPD*] stating that the monitoring has been completed and that no fossils were discovered, and including the names and signatures from the fossil monitors. The letter shall be in the format of Attachment E of the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources.

b. If Paleontological Resources were encountered during grading, a letter shall be prepared stating that the field grading monitoring activities have been completed, and that resources have been encountered. The letter shall detail the anticipated time schedule for completion of the curation phase of the monitoring.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall submit the letter report to the [*PDS, PPD*] for review and approval. **TIMING:** Upon completion of all grading activities, and prior to Rough Grading Final Inspection (Grading Ordinance SEC 87.421.a.2), the letter report shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [*PDS, PPD*] shall review the final negative letter report or field monitoring memo for compliance with the project MMRP, and inform *[DPW, PDCI*] that the requirement is completed.

FINAL GRADING RELEASE: *(Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit).*

15. CULT#GR-4 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING – FINAL GRADING

INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources, an Archaeological Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Project Archaeologist shall prepare a final report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program if cultural resources were encountered during earth-disturbing activities. The report shall include the following, if applicable:

a. Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms.

b. Daily Monitoring Logs

c. Evidence that all Native American cultural materials in order of preference have been conveyed as follows:

(1) Evidence that all prehistoric materials have been avoided.

(2) Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the archaeological monitoring program have been reburied.

or

(3) Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the grading monitoring program have been repatriated to a Native American group of appropriate tribal affinity. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the Native American tribe to whom the cultural resources have been repatriated identifying that the archaeological materials have been received.

d. Evidence that all historic cultural materials have been conveyed as follows:

Historic materials shall be curated at a San Diego curation facility and shall not be curated at a Tribal curation facility or repatriated. The collections and associated records, including title, shall be transferred to the San Diego curation facility and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that the historic materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.

e. If no cultural resources are discovered, a Negative Monitoring Report must be submitted stating that the archaeological monitoring activities have been completed. Grading Monitoring Logs must be submitted with the negative monitoring report.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant's archaeologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to *[PDS, PPD]* for approval. Once approved, a final copy of the report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) and any culturally-affiliated Tribe who requests a copy. **TIMING:** Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final report shall be prepared. **MONITORING:** *[PDS, PPD]* shall review the final report for compliance with this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon acceptance of the report, *[PDS, PPD]* shall inform *[PDS, LDR]* and *[DPW, PDCI]*, that the requirement is complete, and the bond amount can be relinquished. If the monitoring was bonded separately, then *[PDS, PPD]* shall inform *[PDS or DPW FISCAL]* to release the bond back to the applicant.

16. PALEO-GR#4 - PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING

INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Paleontological Resources, a Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Project Paleontologist shall prepare a final report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Paleontological Monitoring Program if resources were encountered during grading. The report shall include the following:

a. If paleontological resources were discovered, the following tasks shall be completed by or under the supervision of the Project Paleontologist:

1. Prepare collected fossil remains for curation, to include cleaning the fossils by removing the enclosing rock material, stabilizing fragile specimens using glues and other hardeners, if necessary, and repairing broken specimens.

2. Curate, catalog and identify all fossil remains to the lowest taxon possible, inventory specimens, assigning catalog numbers, and enter the appropriate specimen and locality data into a collection database.

3. Submit a detailed report prepared by the Project Paleontologist in the format provided in Appendix D of the County of San Diego's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources. The report shall identify which accredited institution has agreed to accept the curated fossils. Submit two hard copies of the final Paleontological Resources Mitigation Report to the Director of PDS for final approval of the mitigation and submit an electronic copy of the complete report in Microsoft Word on an USB drive. In addition, submit one copy of the report to the San Diego Natural History Museum and one copy to the institution that received the fossils.

4. Transfer the cataloged fossil remains and copies of relevant field notes, maps, stratigraphic sections, and photographs to an accredited institution (museum or university) in California that maintains paleontological collections for archival storage and/or display, and submit Proof of Transfer of Paleontological Resources, in the form of a letter, from the director of the paleontology department of the accredited institution to the Director of PDS verifying that the curated fossils from the project site have been received by the institution.

b. If no resources were discovered, a brief letter to that effect and stating that the grading monitoring activities have been completed, shall be sent to the Director of Planning and Land Use by the Project Paleontologist.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall submit the letter report to the [*PDS, PPD*] for review and approval. **TIMING:** Prior to the occupancy of any structure or use of the premises, and prior to Final Grading Release (Grading Ordinance Sec. 87.421.a.3), the final report shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [*PDS, PPD*] shall review the final report for compliance with the project MMRP, and inform [DPW, PDCI] that the requirement is completed.

ADOPTION STATEMENT: This Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted and above California Environmental Quality Act findings made by the:

_____

on _____

Angelica Truong, Land Use/Environmental Planning Manager
Project Planning Division

County of San Diego

VINCE NICOLETTI
DIRECTOR

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

December 18, 2025

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

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

   Chabad Rancho Santa Fe Major Use Permit; PDS2023-MUP-23-013; PDS2020-ER-20-08-006

2. Lead agency name and address:
   County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services (PDS)
   5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
   San Diego, CA 92123-1239

3. a. Contact: Layla Bajelan, Land Use/Environmental Planner
   b. Phone number: (619) 952-3223
   c. E-mail: Layla.bajelan@sdcounty.ca.gov

4. Project location:

   The project site is located on 2.43 gross acres at 14906 Via De La Valle, directly north of Villa De La Valle, approximately 1.9 miles east of Interstate 15 in the San Dieguito Community Planning Area within unincorporated County of San Diego, California (Figure 1). The project site comprises two parcels (Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APNs] 302-110-29-00 and 302-110-30-00). The project location's regional location and vicinity are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2.

5. Project Applicant name and address:

   Chabad Rancho Santa Fe
   Levi Raskin
   14906 Via De La Valle
   Del Mar, CA 92014
   chabadrsf@gmail.com
   858-756-7571

6. General Plan
   Community Plan: San Dieguito
   Regional Category: Semi-Rural

Land Use Designation:	Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2)
Density:	-
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	-

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	Single-Family Residential (RS)
Minimum Lot Size:	-
Special Area Regulation:	-

8. Description of project:

The project proposes a Major Use Permit (MUP) for Chabad of Rancho Santa Fe (as defined by Zoning Ordinance Section 1348 – Civic, Fraternal or Religious Assembly and 1332 – Child Care Center) on two (2) lots totaling approximately 2.43 gross acres (2.39 net acres) in the San Dieguito Community Planning Area of unincorporated County of San Diego. The proposed project would redevelop the property to include the construction of one (1) new building, three (3) existing-to-remain buildings, the retention of existing covered areas and construction of new covered areas, all totaling approximately 19,898.66 square feet (sf) of lot coverage (19.11% lot coverage). The proposed new building is a Chabad religious assembly center and communal space proposed to be approximately 13,845 gross sf with 11,550 sf of ground floor lot coverage. Uses associated within the proposed new building would include administration offices, mikvah, religious education classes, a kitchen, childcare, and meeting spaces. Outdoor spaces would include landscaped garden areas, a courtyard, a playground, and perimeter screening/fencing. The project offers 60 parking spaces where 47 are required by the proposed uses. The project would consist of a single phase of construction which will consist of the Shul, parking, drive aisles, signage, right-of-way improvements, and landscaping.

Existing as-built structures include a candle shop/commercial space (approximately 3,395 gross sf), a single-family residence (approximately 1,701 gross sf), an office (approximately 582 gross sf), a stone shop, and various out-structures. Of these structures, the project proposes to retain the candle shop/commercial space, single-family residence, and office. The stone shop and various out-structures will be demolished/removed.

The design of the project focuses activities internally to the property in a modified courtyard layout thus reducing light and noise affecting the neighboring properties. The project would preserve existing landscaping where feasible and supplement with additional plant material to screen the project.

Construction

The project would consist of a single phase of construction. The project would include construction of an approximately 13,845-sf Shul (Jewish community religious facility) and renovations/maintenance of the existing single-family home, the existing-to-remain Office, and the existing-to-remain commercial candle shop building. The project would demolish and remove a stone shop and outbuildings. The project is anticipated to demolish approximately 5,375 sf of building and approximately 50,489 sf of concrete and

asphalt. The project would also install parking areas, landscaping, signage, and public road improvements along Via De La Valle. The parking areas and driveways would be constructed with permeable pavers. Additionally, an underground stormwater storage and treatment system would be installed.

The proposed Shul would be constructed in an area currently free of structures. The Shul would be approximately 13,845 sf and cover a building area of approximately 11,550 sf. Additionally, approximately 1,870 sf of shade areas are included for religious activities outside of the Shul. Total site coverage would be approximately 19,898 sf, which is less than the 20,821-sf allowed by the 0.20 lot coverage of the RS zone. Construction is assumed to occur over approximately 17 months. Grading would require approximately 2,688 cubic yards (cy) of cut, 3,225 cy of fill, and 537 cy of imported material.

Operation

The Child Care Center use is requested for all buildings on site, with specific development details to be determined during the building permit phase. The residence and accessory structures are occasionally inhabited by the Rabbi, his family and guests of the organization. These structures are excluded from the in the Religious Assembly. The candle shop/commercial space would remain as a commercial use for the sale of religious and Chabad-related items. Childcare services are proposed for up to 50 children, aged six months to six years old, operating Monday through Friday, from 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM. The main hours of operation for the Child Care Center would be 8:00 AM to 3:00 PM but the supplemental hours are requested to allow flexibility for caregiver pick up and drop off. If the childcare program grows to serve 50 children, staffing requirements are estimated to include approximately 12 employees, depending on the ages of the children in compliance with state-mandated staffing ratios for early learning and care programs.

The Religious Assembly use would include typical Shabat weekly services held Friday evenings (typically from 6:00 PM to 9:00 PM) and Saturday mornings (typically 10:30 AM to 12:30 PM). The Shabbats typically include a meal (dinner or lunch) within the timeframe provided. The Religious Assembly use would also include other holiday services, events, weddings, and gatherings, such as but not limited to Rosh Hashanah, Passover, Yom Kippur, and Selichot. Selichot is held at midnight, twice a year. There are anticipated to be 5 to 10 events per year at the Chabad Center with live music, which would be played in accordance with the County's Noise Ordinance. Holiday services may be attended by approximately 100 adults plus children. The project is designed to accommodate the growth of the congregation from approximately 20 to 30 adults (plus children) to approximately 100 adults (plus children) for an average Friday and Saturday Shabbat. The Religious Assembly currently employs three (3) staff and would be anticipated to grow in accordance with the growth of the Chabad.

Administrative offices will operate from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. Monday through Friday, the Rabbi and his wife would host meetings, field calls, and provide private classes on- and off-site with the community. Evening classes and gatherings will operate from Monday through Thursday with varying class times in the day. Daily classes and group gatherings would generally occur between 3:00 PM and 7:00 PM and would include the following:

- Teen Classes (5 students): typically Mondays 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM

- Children's Hebrew Lessons (6 students): typically Tuesdays 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM
- Private Hebrew Lessons: typically Wednesdays 2:30 PM to 3:30 PM
- Bat Mitzvah Classes (5-6 students): typically Wednesdays 4:00 PM and 5:00 PM
- Women's Classes (4-5 students): typically Thursdays 12:00 PM and 2:00 PM
- Private Bat Mitzvah Lessons: typically Thursdays 3:30 PM to 5:00 PM
- Mother and Child gatherings (5-6 families): days vary 10:00 AM to 11:00 AM

Security and Access
Gates are proposed at both entrances of the parking lot with low-scale signs at both driveways, in compliance with the County's Dark Skies requirements. A security fence would encircle the entire Chabad Center. During Saturday services, a security guard would be employed to secure the property. Members would have access to the gates, and the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District would have Knox box access.

For childcare pick up and drop off, drivers would enter the existing driveway from Via de la Valle on the east side of the project site, drop off the children, and exit through the open west gates onto the private driveway. Drop off would be coordinated by staff. Gates would be opened at drop off and a gate code would be provided for those dropping off and picking up.

Public Services
Water service is provided by the Santa Fe Irrigation District. The project is currently not connected to a sewer district and would rely upon a septic system. Fire protection would be served by the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District. School service is provided by Solana Beach School District (elementary school) and San Dieguito Union (middle and high school).

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

The project is located directly north of Villa De La Valle, approximately 1.9-miles east of Interstate 15, in the San Dieguito Community Planning Area, within unincorporated San Diego County (APNs 302-110-29 and 30). The project site was previously used as a stone yard and candle manufacturer and is currently developed with an existing candle shop, single-family home, accessory office, stone shop, and outbuildings.

The project site is bounded by Via de la Valle to the south and is primarily surrounded by residential uses. Outside the immediate vicinity of the project site are sports/recreational uses (e.g., Del Mar Polo Fields, Del Mar Horsepark, Surf Sports Park, Play FNA, La Valle Coastal Club) and commercial uses (e.g., Rancho Real Group Retreat, Scott & Co. Skin). Planned zoning designations in the vicinity include Single-Family Residential, Rural Residential, Open Space, and Agriculture.

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

Permit Type/Action	**Agency**
Air Quality Permit to Construct	San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD)
Certificate of Compliance	County of San Diego
Clean Water Act Section 401 Permits	San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
Fire District Approval	Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Building Permit	County of San Diego
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
Public Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Site Plan	County of San Diego
Vacation of Public Road	County of San Diego
Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) Permit	County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health & Quality (DEHQ)
Water District Approval	Santa Fe Irrigation 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 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process allows tribal governments, public lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and to reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code §21083.3.2). Information is also available from the Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code §5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code §21082.3(e) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

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

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources ☐ Air Quality

☐ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☒ Geology & Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology & Water Quality	☐ Land Use & Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population & Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☒ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities & Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, PDS 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, PDS 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, PDS finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

	December 18, 2025
Signature	Date
Angelica Truong	Planning Manager
Printed Name	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 onsite, 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 §21099.

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

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

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

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

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

The project includes redevelopment of a 2.43-acre site with one new building, a 13,845-square-foot Shul, Jewish community religious facility, and three existing structures, retaining a candle shop, residence, and accessory office while removing a stone shop and outbuildings. Surrounding land uses consist of single-family residences immediately surrounding the project site as well as sports park and recreation fields a little further (i.e., over 800 feet away) from the project site. According to the San Dieguito Community Plan, the nearest RCA to the project site is Escondido Creek. Due to distance and intervening highways, structures, and topography, no impacts would occur to this RCA. Additionally, given the existing vegetation screening and proposed landscape screening and fencing (see Section I[c] below), the proposed project would not substantially degrade a scenic vista. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant effect on a scenic vista.

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

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

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

A Visual Memorandum was prepared for the proposed project by Dudek, dated October 24, 2024 (Appendix A). The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less than Significant Impact: The project site is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The nearest designated State scenic highway is a portion of SR-52 located over 12 miles south of the project site. The project is located approximately 1.9 miles east of Interstate 5, which is identified as eligible for designation as a State Scenic Highway. Both I-8 and Via de la Valle are also listed as Scenic Highways in the County's Conservation and Open Space Element of the General Plan. Due to distance, topography, and intervening structures, the project site is not visible from the highways. Additionally, the Visual Memorandum prepared for the proposed project (Appendix A) determined that the overall site visibility is limited by the presence of existing vegetation, the characteristics of local topography, and by the relatively short project site frontage of Via de la Valle. For example, views of existing site structures for motorists traveling towards the project site from westbound Via de la Valle are fully obstructed due to the existing curved alignment of the road, dense private yard landscaping, and landscaping on the project site. On the approach to the Project site from eastbound Via de la Valle, the road passes between mounded terrain that occurs to the north and south. Upon exiting this narrowed corridor (approximately 475 feet long) and near the project site's western driveway, the southwesternmost corner of the project site is partially visible but obscured from view by intervening vegetation. This partial view is available over an approximately 125-foot segment of eastbound Via de la Valle and thus, the view exposure to passing motorist is brief (lasting for less than 3 seconds assuming a travel speed of 35 miles per hour).

Lastly, existing local topography aids in the screening of structures on the project site from motorists on the adjacent segment of Via de la Valle. For instance, existing structures on the project site nearest to Via de la Valle are lower in elevation than the road's surface and setback from the road; therefore, the local topography works in combination with existing vegetation and aids in the screening and obscuring of existing site structures from view of passing motorists. As such, the project site is substantially not visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway or County Scenic Corridor, and the proposed project would not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway or County Scenic Corridor. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) In non-urbanized areas, would the project 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?

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located in an urbanized area and is surrounded by single-family residences. The project includes redevelopment of a 2.43-acre site with one new building, a 13,845-square-foot Shul, Jewish community religious facility, and three existing structures, retaining a candle shop, residence, and accessory office while removing a stone shop and outbuildings, which is allowed on the Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2) land use and Single-Family Residential (RS) zone with a MUP. As proposed, the project would comply with all zoning and regulations applicable to development within the underlying RS zone. Specifically, the proposed Shul building would comply with permitted height, setback, and lot coverage requirements. In addition, site architecture incorporates modern building materials and exteriors that are common in contemporary construction. As such, development of the project as proposed would not result in a negative site aesthetics associated with exceedances of regulations and would not introduce features that detract from or contrast from existing visual character of the site or surrounding area. Further and as documented above, the site has limited public visibility due to the characteristics of local topography (i.e., the southern portion of the site sits at elevations lower than that of adjacent Via de la Valle) and the presence of dense vegetation along the project site frontage of Via de la Valle (and on adjacent properties). Despite the depiction of new landscaping in the proposed renderings, the Project proposes to retain existing mature trees along the site frontage (Appendix A).

As shown in the figures in the Visual Memorandum, from eastbound Via de la Valle, the proposed Shul building would be partially screened from view by landscaping, and view exposure to the western façade of the building would be extremely brief (i.e., less than 3 seconds) due to intervening topography that occurs to the west of the site's western driveway. From westbound Via de la Valle, views to the proposed Shul building and other interior project features including proposed surface parking, signage, and landscaping would be partially to fully blocked from view by site landscaping. Therefore, changes to existing visual character and views from Via de la Valle would be less than significant based on project compliance with applicable development regulations, limited/brief view exposure of the site and project components from adjacent Via de la Valle, and maintenance of existing mature trees that would screen proposed development from public view. Therefore, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. Zone B is any area of the unincorporated County that is not within 15 miles from the Mount Palomar or Mount Laguna observatory. The project would not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations because the project would conform to the County's Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209). Therefore, 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.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ 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. The project site as well as surrounding areas are currently developed with an existing single family dwelling unit. The project site consists of an existing single-family dwelling unit that will remain. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

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

No Impact: The project site is not zoned for agricultural use, nor is the 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) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

No Impact: The project site 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 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) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

No Impact: The project site does not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code § 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 off-site forest resources.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Refer to Section II(a) and Section II(c). No impacts would occur to agricultural or forest uses.

III. AIR QUALITY.

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: An Air Quality Technical Study was prepared for the project by BlueScape Environmental, dated April 3, 2025 (see Appendix B). The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less Than Significant Impact: The regional air quality standards (RAQS) and State Implementation Plan (SIP) rely on the San Diego Association of Government's (SANDAG's) growth projections, which are developed based on proposed buildout of land uses identified in the County's General Plan. Because the RAQS and SIP project future air quality conditions based on growth projections assuming buildout of the County's General Plan, it is assumed that a project involving development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by the County's General Plan are consistent with the RAQS and SIP.

The project is subject to General Plan Regional Category Semi-Rural, the General Plan Land Use of Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2) and Single-Family Residential (RS) zoning. The project is not subject to Special Area Regulations. As such, the Project is consistent with the General Plan, zoning requirements, and the San Dieguito Community Plan, and therefore does not conflict with the RAQS. The project site is located in an urbanized area and is surrounded by single-family residences. The project includes redevelopment of a 2.43-acre site with one new building, a 13,845-square-foot Shul, Jewish community religious facility, and three existing structures, retaining a candle shop, residence, and accessory office while removing a stone shop and outbuildings, which is allowed on the Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2) land use and Single-Family Residential (RS) zone with a MUP, pursuant to Zoning Code Section 2105.a. As proposed, the project would comply with all zoning and regulations applicable to development within the underlying RS zone. The proposed Chabad Center would not result in an increase in population growth projections used to develop the RAQS. The project would not conflict with the region's future employment and housing needs. Additionally, as described in Section XVII, Transportation, the project is a locally serving use and therefore, is considered to have a less than significant impact related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT; average daily trips [ADT] value for the project is 241 and daily VMT is estimated to by 892). As detailed in the Air Quality Technical Study (see Appendix B), the project would not result in construction or operational emissions in excess of the applicable significance thresholds for all criteria pollutants (see also Tables 2 and 3). The project would, therefore, not result in an increase in emissions that are not already accounted for in the RAQS. This project is not a transportation project that would affect the region's transportation systems and should not increase transportation demands within the local area. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the RAQS and SIP. In addition, the construction and operational emissions from the project are anticipated to be below established screening-level thresholds (SLTs), as addressed under Section III(b), and would not violate any ambient air quality standards.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

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

Discussion/Explanation: The San Diego APCD does not provide quantitative thresholds for determining the significance of construction or mobile source-related impacts. However, the San Diego APCD does specify Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA) trigger levels for new or modified stationary sources (APCD Rules 20.2 and 20.3). If these incremental levels for stationary

sources are exceeded, an AQIA must be performed for the proposed new or modified source. Although these trigger levels do not generally apply to mobile sources or general land development projects, for comparative purposes these levels may be used to evaluate the increased emissions which would be discharged to the San Diego Air Basin from proposed land development projects. For projects whose stationary-source emissions are below these criteria, no AQIA is typically required, and project level emissions are presumed to be less than significant.

For CEQA purposes, these SLTs can be used to demonstrate that a project's total emissions would not result in a significant impact to air quality. The daily SLTs are most appropriately used for the standard construction and operational emissions. When project emissions have the potential to approach or exceed the SLTs listed below in Table 1, additional air quality modeling may need to be prepared to demonstrate that ground level concentrations resulting from project emissions (with background levels) will be below National and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively).

APCD Rules 20.2 and 20.3 do not have AQIA thresholds for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and $PM_{2.5}$. The use of the screening level for VOCs specified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which generally has stricter emissions thresholds than San Diego's APCD, is recommended for evaluating projects in San Diego County. For $PM_{2.5}$, the EPA "Proposed Rule to Implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards" published September 8, 2005, which quantifies significant emissions as 10 tons per year, will be used as the screening-level criteria as shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1. San Diego County Screening-Level Thresholds for Air Quality Impact Analysis

Pollutant	Total Emissions		
	Lbs. per Hour	Lbs. per Day	Tons per Year
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	---	100	15
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	--- *	55	10*
Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)	25	250	40
Sulfur Oxides (SO_x)	25	250	40
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	100	550	100
Lead	---	3.2	0.6
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	---	75**	13.7***

Notes: * EPA "Proposed Rule to Implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards" published September 8, 2005. Also used by the SCAQMD.
** Threshold for VOCs based on the threshold of significance for VOCs from the SCAQMD for the Coachella Valley.
*** 13.7 Tons Per Year threshold based on 75 lbs/day multiplied by 365 days/year and divided by 2,000 lbs/ton.

Less Than Significant Impact: Currently, San Diego County is in "non-attainment" status for the NAAQS and CAAQS federal and state Ozone (O_3) and state Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns and less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$). O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include the following: 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.

The project would contribute to construction and operational sources of criteria pollutant air emissions. An analysis of estimated construction and operational emissions was completed using SCAQMD's California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2022.1.1.29.

Construction is assumed to begin in March 2025, with completion by late 2026. On-site emissions are attributed to emissions occurring within the project area, such as the activity of construction equipment. Off-site emissions related to the project include vendor, hauling, and worker vehicle trips to and from the project site. Emissions of VOCs, NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed the County's SLTs during project construction, assuming adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, such as site watering during construction activities as required by the County grading permit and SDAPCD Rule 55 and the use of low-VOC paint (50 g/L for flat coatings and 100 g/L for traffic marking coating) as required by SDAPCD Rule 67.0.1. The applicant has included the following project design measures into the plan and the conditions of approval for the project:

- **Minimization of Disturbance.** Construction contractors shall minimize the area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- **Soil Treatment.** Construction contractors shall treat all graded and excavated material, exposed soil areas and active portions of the construction site, including unpaved on-site roadways to minimize fugitive dust. Treatment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, periodic watering, application of environmentally safe soil stabilization materials, and/or roll compaction as appropriate. Watering shall be done as often as necessary, and at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day. For modeling purposes, it was assumed that watering would occur three times daily, during the construction of this development, a requirement to which the applicant has committed.
- **Soil Stabilization.** Construction contractors shall monitor all graded and/or excavated inactive areas of the construction site at least weekly for dust stabilization. Soil stabilization methods, such as water and roll compaction, and environmentally safe dust control materials shall be applied to portions of the construction site that are inactive for over four days. If no further grading or excavation operations are planned for the area, the area shall be seeded and watered until landscape growth is evident, or periodically treated with environmentally safe dust suppressants, to prevent excessive fugitive dust.
- **No Grading During High Winds.** Construction contractors shall stop all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations during periods of high winds (20 mph or greater, as measured continuously over a one-hour period).
- **Street Sweeping.** Construction contractors shall sweep all on-site driveways and adjacent streets and roads at least once per day, preferably at the end of the day, if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent streets and roads.
- **San Diego County Grading Ordinance.** As a condition of this project, construction contractors shall refer to the Section 87.428 of the San Diego County Grading Ordinance, amended by Ord. No. 10224, effective October 25, 2012. Section 87.428. Dust Control Measures requires all clearing and grading to be carried out with dust control measures adequate to prevent creation of a nuisance to persons or public or private property. Clearing, grading or improvement plans shall require that measures such as the following

be undertaken to achieve this result: watering, application of surfactants, shrouding, control of vehicle speeds, paving of access areas, or other operational or technological measures to reduce dispersion of dust. These project design measures are to be incorporated into all earth disturbing activities to minimize the amount of PM emissions from construction.

Therefore, project construction would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment (O_3, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$) under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. The project's air quality emissions would not exceed the County's SLTs; therefore, as the thresholds were developed to protect the public health that align with ambient air quality standards, air quality impacts on public health would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be necessary (see Table 2 below and Appendix B).

Table 2. Estimated Project Construction-Related Air Emissions

Pollutant	Maximum Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day)	Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day)	Above Threshold?
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	2.57	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	1.50	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)	14.60	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO_x)	0.03	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	15.9	550	No
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	3.67	75	No

Note: CalEEMod does not report on lead emissions and therefore, it is not included in this analysis.

Operation of the project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions associated with area sources (e.g., architectural coatings, consumer products, and landscaping equipment), energy sources (i.e., use of natural gas for space and water heating), and mobile sources (i.e., vehicle trips to and from the project site). Criteria air pollutant emissions generated during the operation of project would not exceed San Diego County SLTs for VOCs, NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Therefore, project operation would not 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. Air quality impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be necessary (see Table 3 below and Appendix B).

Table 3. Estimated Project Operational Air Emissions

Pollutant	Maximum Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day)	Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day)	Above Threshold?
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	0.65	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	0.18	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)	0.57	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO_x)	0.008	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	4.51	550	No
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	1.26	75	No

Note: CalEEMod does not report on lead emissions and therefore, it is not included in this analysis.

Cumulative impacts could occur if the most intensive phases of construction for the proposed project occur simultaneously with intensive phases of other construction projects in close proximity. The most intensive construction phase for the project and for typical developments occurs during earthwork and grading activities. During these phases, the primary criteria air pollutant of concern would be PM_{10}. The project's estimated emissions of criteria air pollutants, specifically PM_{10}, were estimated to be a maximum of 2.57 lb/day, which is well below the County's SLTs of 100 lb/day during construction activities. In addition, due to the highly dispersive nature of PM, a cumulative impact during construction activities would only occur if a project adjacent to the proposed project undergoes simultaneous grading/earthwork activities and emits significantly greater PM_{10} emissions than the project. Because all projects developed within the County would be required to comply with the County Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55, this scenario is not anticipated to occur.

The project is proposing development that is consistent with the County's General Plan; thus, operational air emissions are considered to have been accounted for in the General Plan Update EIR. The RAQS and SIP were prepared consistent with growth forecasts in the General Plan. Thus, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants for which the region is currently in non-attainment.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool – 12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, day-care centers, residences, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality.

Less Than Significant Impact: The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are residences adjacent to the north, west, and east of the project site, located as close as 100 to 150 feet from the project boundary. The project would generate construction emissions in the vicinity of sensitive receptors.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs)
Construction-related activities would result in short-term, project-generated emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) exhaust emissions from off-road, heavy-duty diesel equipment for site preparation grading, building construction, and other construction activities. DPM was identified as a toxic air contaminant (TAC) by CARB in 1998. The potential cancer risk from the inhalation of DPM (discussed in the following paragraphs) outweighs the potential non-cancer health impacts and is therefore the focus of this discussion (CARB 2017).

Due to the short-term construction duration and the limited construction emissions, there is very low potential for fugitive dust or diesel particulate matter (DPM) to impact sensitive receptors

during construction. According to the Air Quality Technical Report prepared for the project, the total project construction DPM emissions are not of a magnitude and duration that could create significant air toxic risks to the nearest receptors during construction. Compliance with the SDAPCD rules and regulations would reduce the fugitive dust emissions during project construction and associated impacts to sensitive receptors. Thus, the proposed project's construction emissions would be negligible and would not have the potential to significantly impact the nearby residents living in the houses near the project.

Operational sources at the project location that emit TACs include mobile sources (delivery trucks; employee and worshipper vehicles). The project does not include stationary sources, such as emergency generators or boilers. Because the project is a religious institution, mobile source emissions associated with the project would be intermittent (not constant) and would have negligible health risk impacts on nearby sensitive receptors.

Therefore, the project's construction and operational air pollutant emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and would result in a less than significant impact with mitigation.

Carbon Monoxide Hotspot Analysis

Carbon monoxide is a colorless and odorless gas that may be found in high concentrations near areas of high traffic volumes. CO emissions are a function of vehicle idling time, meteorological conditions, and traffic flow. The SDAB is in attainment of state and federal CO standards. The Rancho Carmel Drive monitoring site is the closest station to the Project site that provides CO data. The maximum 8-hour CO level recorded in 2019 was 2.5 ppm (SDAPCD 2020b). Concentrations are below 9 ppm, the state and federal 8-hour standard. The maximum 1-hour CO level recorded in 2019 was 4.1 ppm. Concentrations are below 20 ppm and 35 ppm, the state and federal 1-hour standards, respectively.

Although CO is not a regional air quality concern in SDAB, elevated CO levels can occur at or near intersections that experience severe traffic congestion. A localized air quality impact is considered significant if the additional CO emissions resulting from the project create a "hotspot" where the California 1-hour standard of 20.0 ppm or the 8-hour standard of 9 ppm is exceeded. This can occur at severely congested intersections during cold winter temperatures. Screening for elevated CO levels is recommended for severely congested intersections experiencing levels of service (LOS) E or F with project traffic where a significant project traffic impact may occur.

According to the San Diego County Air Quality (AQ) Guidelines for determining air quality significance, CO "hotspots" or pockets where the CO concentration exceeds the NAAQS and/or CAAQS, have been found to occur only at signalized intersections that operate at or below LOS E with peak-hour trips for that intersection exceeding 3,000 trips. Therefore, any project that would place receptors within 500 feet of a signalized intersection operating at or below LOS E (peak-hour trips exceeding 3,000 trips) must conduct a "hotspot" analysis for CO. Likewise, projects that will cause road intersections to operate at or below a LOS E (with intersection peak-hour trips exceeding 3,000) will also have to conduct a CO "hotspot" analysis (SD County 2007). Based on the transportation analysis, prepared by Linscott Law & Greenspan, both access driveways for the proposed project are calculated to operate at LOS C or above (LLG 2024). As a result, no LOS-related significant impacts are expected for the proposed project; thus, the project is anticipated to result in a less than significant impact. Receptors would not be exposed

to substantial pollutant concentrations related to CO hotspots. No further evaluation with respect to CO hotspots is required.

As discussed in Section III(b), the proposed project would not result in construction or operational emissions that would exceed the County's SLTs for health risk. Thus, neither construction nor operation of the project would expose sensitive receptors to an incremental health risk.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: SDAPCD Rule 51, commonly referred to as the public nuisance rule, prohibits emissions from any source whatsoever in such quantities of air contaminants or other material that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to the public health or damage to property. The potential for an operation to result in odor complaints from a "considerable" number of persons in the area would be considered a significant, adverse odor impact.

The proposed project would involve the use of diesel-powered construction equipment. Some objectionable odors may be temporarily created during construction-related activities, such as from diesel exhaust and asphalt paving activities. However, these odors would dissipate quickly, would only occur proximate to the work areas for a short time, and would not affect a substantial number of people in the project vicinity.

The land use and industrial operations typically associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed operations of the buildings and parking lot are not typically associated with objectionable odors. The project does not include manufacturing or agricultural uses that are typically associated with objectionable odors or other sources of emissions. The proposed project would also be required to comply with SDCAPCD Rule 51 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, impacts associated with other emission sources adversely affecting a substantial number of people would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

a) Would the project 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 CDFW, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records and aerial imagery of the site, it has been determined that no native vegetation communities or habitats exist on or immediately adjacent to the site. The project site has been previously disturbed from construction and operation of a single-family residence and the previous commercial operations. Based on these considerations, no direct or indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities supporting candidate, sensitive, or special status species would occur. Further, properties surrounding the project site are developed with single-family residential uses. The proposed project would develop a religious center, which would be compatible with surrounding land uses. Therefore, the potential for the project to have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be less than significant.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's GIS records, aerial imagery of the site, and site photos, it has been determined that the proposed project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as defined by the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act or any other local plans, policies or regulations. The project site is surrounded by developed single-family residential uses. The proposed project would develop a religious center, which would be compatible with surrounding land uses. In addition, the project site consists primarily of developed land with some disturbed habitat (i.e., landscaping, trees). Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

Disturbed habitat and developed land are of low biological value and are not considered RPO Sensitive Habitat according to the County Guidelines and they are not considered sensitive by State or Federal agencies and have low conservation value. Construction of this project would result in permanent loss of disturbed habitat and developed land. Impacts to developed land and disturbed habitat would not result in a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

In addition, the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and associated best management practices (BMPs) would occur in accordance with the General Construction Permit for stormwater discharges to avoid indirect effects to downstream drainages (see Section X[a]). Further, project construction activities would occur in accordance with the County's Grading Ordinance to avoid erosion and sedimentation impacts to downstream drainages. Therefore, potentially significant impacts to wetlands or waters of the U.S. as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the USACE would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on a GIS analysis and aerial imagery of the site, it has been determined that the site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor as identified on MSCP maps nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The site would not assist in local wildlife movement because it is disturbed and surrounded by residential development, including roads, which restrict wildlife movement through the general area. Due to the existing developed nature of the site, the proposed project would not contribute to impeding wildlife movement or the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

No Impact: The project site is located in the Draft North County MSCP Area. This plan does not identify the project site as being subject to habitat conservation. The proposed expansion of the existing development on the project site would therefore be in compliance with this or any other future habitat conservation plan insofar as all project impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels. Impacts to urban/developed land cover and disturbed habitat vegetation

community types that occur within the project site do not have a grouping of ten or more individual plant species and do not require mitigation per the County's Biological Mitigation Ordinance. The project site does not contain any native or sensitive vegetation communities; therefore, future development at the site is not expected to conflict with the conservation goals of the MSCP, previously defined, nor any other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Impacts to jurisdictional nonwetland waters would be mitigated to below a level of significance. Therefore, no impact would occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to 15064.5?

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

Discussion/Explanation: A Historic Resources Evaluation Report was prepared for the project by Donna Beddow, County staff archaeologist, dated February 2025 (Appendix C). As part of the Historic Resources Evaluation Report prepared for the project, a records search, review of historic topographic maps, aerial photographs, and building records, and field evaluation of the property were conducted. The Historic Resources Evaluation Report evaluated the significance of the historical resources based on a review of historical records including the California Historical Resources Inventory System, National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, San Diego County Local Register, Built Environment Resources Directory, Historic Topographic Maps (1903-2021), and Historic Aerial Photographs (1953-2022). The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less Than Significant Impact: The Historic Resources Evaluation Report was conducted for the onsite structures that are greater than 50 years in age. These historic structures were documented and photographed. These include the factory structure and the candle showroom structure, both of which were determined to have been modified over time. The candle shop structure would be retained as part of the proposed project. Based on the results of records search and evaluation of the historic structures, it has been determined that the structures are not considered to be significant pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Because the resources are not considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5, the loss or modification of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: An Archaeological Resources Survey Report was prepared for the project by ASM Affiliates, Inc., dated July 2023 (Appendix D). The Archaeological Resources

Survey Report included a Sacred Lands File search and pedestrian survey of the project site. The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The Sacred Lands File search from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the project was negative. The Native American Heritage Commission also provided the contact information for tribal contacts within the local community for additional consultation. Tribal consultation was conducted with the Native American individuals and organizations provided by the NAHC (see Section XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources for further discussion of Tribal consultation). No archaeological resources were identified during the Phase I Archaeological Resources Survey. However, there is the potential for subsurface resources to be present due to the project's proximity to numerous prehistoric resources, important water sources for prehistoric and historic people, and because of the lack of ground surface visibility during the survey. As such, an Archaeological and Tribal Monitoring Program would be required with monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor for the initial ground disturbance within the project area as outlined below. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of MM CUL-1.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by ASM Affiliates, Inc. (Appendix D), it has been determined that the project is not likely disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains**.** In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered onsite during earth-disturbing activities, MM CUL-1 would ensure that state and federal laws and regulations regarding human remains (i.e., Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5) are followed. With implementation of MM CUL-1, potential impacts to disturbance of human remains would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

CUL-1 Archaeological Monitoring Program

- Pre-Construction
    - Contract with a County approved archaeologist and culturally-affiliated Native American monitor to perform archaeological monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all earth-disturbing activities. The Project Archaeologist and culturally-affiliated Native American monitor shall perform the monitoring duties before, during and after construction.

        - A Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall be prepared in coordination with a culturally-affiliated tribe.

- Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and culturally-affiliated Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.

- Construction
  - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and culturally-affiliated 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 culturally-affiliated Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and culturally-affiliated 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 culturally-affiliated Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
    - For Native American resources, the Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist and culturally-affiliated tribes as identified in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan at the time of discovery.
    - For historic resources (non-Native American), the Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of discovery.

    - Native American Resources
      - All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the project archaeologist, tribal monitor(s), and the tribal representative(s) to discuss the significance of the find. Optionally, the County Archaeologist may attend the meeting to discuss the significance of the find.
      - After consultation with the developer, project archaeologist, tribal monitor(s), and tribal representative(s), a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of the County Archaeologist, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the identified cultural resources.
      - Construction activities shall not resume in the area of discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to appropriate mitigation. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area and shall be monitored.
      - Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. The isolates and/or non-significant deposits shall be reburied onsite as identified in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan.
      - Treatment and avoidance of the newly discovered resources shall be consistent with the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan

entered into with the appropriate tribes. This may include avoidance of the cultural resources through project design, in-place preservation of cultural resources located in native soils and/or re-burial on the Project property so they are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity.

- If cultural resources are identified, one or more of the following treatments, in order of preference, shall be employed:
  - Preservation in place of the Cultural Resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in place where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources.
  - Reburial of the resources on the project property. The measures for reburial shall include, at least, the following:
    - Measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any impacts in perpetuity.
    - Reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed, with the exception that sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains are excluded.
    - Any reburial process shall be culturally appropriate.
    - Listing of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the confidential appendix of the Monitoring Report.
    - The Monitoring Report shall be filed with the County under a confidential cover and is not subject to Public Records requests.
  - If preservation in place or reburial is not feasible, consultation with consulting Tribes (Pechanga, Rincon, San Pasqual, and San Luis Rey) is required to find an alternative solution which may include repatriation.
  - If avoidance, reburial, or other alternative solution including repatriation is not feasible, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program (Program) shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Tribe, and the Native American Monitor of an affiliated tribe and approved by the County Archaeologist prior to implementation. There shall be no destructive or invasive testing on sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains. Results concerning finds of any inadvertent discoveries shall be included in the Monitoring Report.

    Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code § 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological resources and cultural resources. If the landowner and the Tribe(s) cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for the archaeological or cultural resources, these issues will be presented to the Planning & Development Services Director for decision. The Planning & Development Services Director shall make the determination based on the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act with respect to archaeological resources, recommendations of the project archeologist and shall take into account the cultural and religious principles and practices of the Tribe.

- Historic Resources
  - The Project Archaeologist, in coordination with the PDS Staff Archaeologist, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources.
  - Construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area only after the PDS Staff Archaeologist has concurred with the evaluation.
  - Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field.
  - If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program (Program) shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist. The County Archaeologist shall review and approve the Program, which shall be carried out using professional archaeological methods.

- Human Remains.
  - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
  - Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. If the human remains are to be taken off-site for evaluation, they shall be accompanied by the culturally-affiliated Native American monitor.
  - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
  - The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
  - Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.

- Tribal Cultural Resources
  - If tribal cultural resources are discovered, the Project Archaeologist shall conduct consultation with culturally-affiliated tribes to determine the most appropriate mitigation. Should the two parties not be able to reach consensus, then the County Archaeologist shall consider the concerns of the culturally-affiliated tribe and the Project Archaeologist, and the Director of Planning & Development Services shall make a final decision regarding appropriate mitigation.
    - Fill Soils

- The Project Archaeologist and Native American monitor of an affiliated tribe shall evaluate fill soils to determine that they are clean of cultural resources.

- Rough Grading
  - Monitoring Report. Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to the South Coastal Information Center and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.

- Final Grading
  - Final. Report. A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center, and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.

  - Cultural Material Conveyance
    - Evidence that all Native American cultural materials in order of preference have been conveyed as follows:
      (1) Evidence that all prehistoric materials have been avoided.
      (2) Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the archaeological monitoring program have been reburied.
      or
      (3) Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the grading monitoring program have been repatriated to a Native American group of appropriate tribal affinity. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the Native American tribe to whom the cultural resources have been repatriated identifying that the archaeological materials have been received.

      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.

VI. ENERGY.

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

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

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

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

During construction, the project would require the use of heavy construction equipment that would be fueled by gas and diesel. However, the energy use would be temporary, limited, and cease upon completion of construction activities. Construction would be conducted in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations (e.g., United States Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA] and the CARB engine emission standards, which require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption, and limitations on engine idling times). Compliance with these regulations would minimize short-term energy demand during the project's grading to the extent feasible.

In addition, all new construction would be required to comply with the energy code in effect at the time of construction, which ensures efficient building construction. The project would also be required to comply with Title 24 energy standards for energy efficiency. Project design features that would result in lower energy use include efficient water usage in accordance with CALGreen Tier 2 Water Efficiency and Conservation Requirements, recycling and composting, and landscaping with climate adapted plants that require little-to-no water. Additionally, the applicant proposes to install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels to comply with the CALGreen Tier 2 renewable energy requirements, which would minimize the electricity demand from the power grid. Additionally, the project would renovate and reuse several existing structures on-site, which would limit the construction-related energy use needed to construct all new buildings. Therefore, the construction and operation of the project is not expected to result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy, and impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would use only the amount of energy necessary for the construction and operation of the proposed Chabad Center that is typical of this type of development. The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan land uses and SANDAG growth projections with the Major Use Permit. Therefore, the project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would be required to implement renewable energy and energy efficiency measures as required by state law and county sustainability measures, including but not limited to:

- Low-flow plumbing fixtures.
- Incorporation of Title 24 energy standards.

- Landscaping in compliance with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance.
- Construction and demolition recycling in compliance with County Ordinance Section 68.511 through 68.520 (Diversion of Construction and Demolition Materials from Landfill Disposal).
- Composting in compliance with the County's Strategic Plan to Reduce Waste (2017).
- High-efficiency LED street and area lighting.
- Solar PV provisions.
- EV charging spaces in compliance with EV requirements in the most recently adopted version of CALGreen.

See Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, for a detailed list of the project design features that would be incorporated into the project to reduce energy demand. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

a) Would the project 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.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not located on or in proximity to any known active or potentially active fault traces. Other active fault zones in the region that could possibly affect the project site include the Elsinore Fault Zone and Rose Canyon Fault (California Department of Conservation 2025). Due to the distance of these faults from the project site, project construction would not result in substantial adverse effects from ground surface rupture at any of these faults. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: To ensure the structural integrity of the proposed buildings, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code and the County Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. The project grading also must conform to the grading requirements outlined in the County Grading Ordinance and be verified in the field by a licensed or registered Civil Engineer and inspected by County Grading Inspectors. Therefore, compliance with the Grading Plan, Geotechnical Investigation prepared by the registered Civil Engineer, Grading Ordinance, California Building Code, and the County Code would ensure 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?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Liquefaction typically occurs when a site is located in a zone with seismic activity, onsite soils are cohesionless (such as sand or gravel), groundwater is encountered within 50 feet of the surface, and soil relative densities are less than about 70 percent. The project site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there 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?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is within a low/generally susceptible category “Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide risk areas from the County’s Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJHMP) were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25 percent); soil series data (SANDAG based on U.S. Geologic Survey [USGS] 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to the 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 percent in grade because these soils are slide prone. The project site would be graded to be relatively flat, and there would be no habitable structures on-site. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Construction of the project would include site grading, which has the potential to release sediment into downstream receiving waters. However, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project would not result in unprotected erodible soils.
- The project is not located in a floodplain.
- The project would be required to comply with the County's Grading Ordinance [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 would minimize the potential for water and wind erosion.
- The project would implement BMPs described in the Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plans (SWQMPs) and Drainage Study prepared by Chang Consultants for the project (see Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality).
- All stormwater runoff from the project site would be conveyed to one of the two biofiltration basins included in the proposed project (see Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality).

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the construction of a Jewish community religious facility and childcare center on an existing developed site. Grading associated with the project would be required to conform to the grading requirements outlined in the County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance (Grading Ordinance) and be verified in the field by a licensed or registered Civil Engineer and inspected by County Grading Inspectors. In addition, a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process to assure that the proposed buildings are adequately supported. 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. Therefore, the Grading Plan prepared by the registered Civil Engineer and compliance with the Grading Ordinance ensure the project would not result in a potentially significant impact related to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to Section VII(a)(iii) through (iv) listed above.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The areas surrounding the project site are currently developed with existing structures. Additionally, there would be no habitable structures on-site. Therefore, the project would not create a substantial risk to life or property and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The existing residence on the project site is served by an on-site septic and wastewater treatment system that was installed in 1992. This existing septic system would be retained, and a new on-site septic and wastewater treatment system is proposed for the religious and other locally serving uses on the project site. The new on-site septic and wastewater treatment system would require a permit from DEHQ. Given that the soils on the project site currently adequately support the use of septic tanks, these soils would be capable of adequately supporting the use of the proposed new on-site septic and wastewater treatment system. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

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

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

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

A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that have a high potential and sensitivity for paleontological resources. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

A monitoring program implemented by the excavation/grading contractor would be required under MM GEO-1. Equipment operators and others involved in the excavation shall watch for fossils during the normal course of their duties. In accordance with the Grading Ordinance, if a fossil or fossil assemblage of greater than twelve inches in any dimension is encountered during excavation, all excavation operations in the area where the fossil or fossil assemblage was found shall be suspended immediately, the County shall be notified, and a Qualified Paleontologist shall be retained by the applicant to inspect the find to determine if it is significant. A Qualified Paleontologist is a person who has, to the satisfaction of the PDS Director:

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

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

With the implementation of MM GEO-1 during project grading operations, potential impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant. Furthermore, the project would not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that require grading in sensitive paleontological resource areas would be required to have the appropriate level of paleontological monitoring and resource recovery. In addition, other projects that propose any amount of significant grading would be subject to the requirements for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

Mitigation Measures

MM GEO-1 The grading contractor is responsible to monitor for paleontological resources during all grading activities. If any fossils are found greater than 12 inches in any dimension, all grading activities shall be halted and PDS shall be contacted before continuing grading operations.

If any paleontological resources are discovered and salvaged, the monitoring, recovery, and subsequent work determined necessary shall be completed by or under the supervision of a Qualified Paleontologist pursuant to the *San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources*.

Upon completion of all grading activities, and prior to Rough Grading Final Inspection, one of the following letters shall be performed and submitted to PDS for review and approval:

If no paleontological resources were discovered, submit a "No Fossils Found" letter from the grading contractor to PDS stating that the monitoring has been completed and that no fossils were discovered, and including the names and signatures from the fossil monitors. The letter shall be in the format of Attachment E of the *County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources*.

If paleontological resources were encountered during grading, a letter shall be prepared stating that the field grading monitoring activities have been completed, and that resources have been encountered. The letter shall detail the anticipated time schedule for completion of the curation phase of the monitoring.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: An CAP Consistency Checklist was prepared for the project by Page Sutherland Page, Inc., dated October 26, 2023 (see Appendix E). The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels. GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons, and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption and personal vehicle use, among other sources.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter,

ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, and ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions would generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature; however, an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

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

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact can be found not cumulatively considerable if the project would comply with an approved plan or mitigation program that provides specific requirements that would avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem in the geographic area of the project. To qualify, such plans or programs must be specified in law or adopted by the public agency with jurisdiction over the affected resources through a public review process to implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced or administered by the public agency. Examples of such programs include a "water quality control plan, air quality attainment or maintenance plan, integrated waste management plan, habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plans [and] plans or regulations for the reduction of GHG emissions." Therefore, a lead agency can make a finding of "less than significant" for GHG emissions if a project complies with adopted programs, plans, policies, and/or other regulatory strategies to reduce GHG emissions.

The County of San Diego has developed a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to implement climate actions that reduce GHG emissions and establish actions to achieve a goal of net zero carbon emissions by 2045. The CAP establishes emission reduction targets of 43.6 percent emissions reductions below 2019 levels by 2030 and 85.4 percent below 2019 levels by 2045. This CAP sets GHG reduction targets and a net zero goal in alignment with the 2022 Scoping Plan. The CAP's attainment of the County's GHG reduction targets is the result of (1) several initiatives to be directly implemented by the County and (2) incorporating GHG-reduction features into the construction and operation of development projects (including County-initiated and privately-initiated projects).

The CAP Consistency Review Checklist establishes a two-step process that project proponents shall follow to determine if projects are consistent with the CAP and whether they may have a significant cumulative impact under the County's adopted GHG thresholds of significance.
Step 1 of the Checklist assesses a project's consistency with the growth projections used in the CAP to estimate future GHG emissions from activities occurring in the unincorporated area and County facilities and operations. Because the CAP uses growth projections based on implementation of the adopted General Plan, the first step in determining a project's consistency with the CAP is to demonstrate its consistency with the regional categories and land use designations of the General Plan. All projects must demonstrate consistency with existing

General Plan regional categories, land use designations, and the uses and development density and intensity allowed under the Zoning Ordinance.

If a project is consistent with the General Plan, then Step 2 of the Checklist should be completed. If a project is not consistent with the regional categories or land use designations of the General Plan, then it shall not use the CAP Consistency Checklist for CEQA streamlining.

Step 2 of the Checklist sets forth CAP measures and actions in the form of "consistency requirements" that project proponents are required to incorporate into their projects to demonstrate compliance with the CAP. Project proponents are required to demonstrate project consistency with the CAP consistency requirements or demonstrate why the requirements are not applicable to their project.

Projects that are consistent with the CAP, as determined using Steps 1 and 2 in this Checklist, may rely on the CAP for the cumulative impacts analysis of GHG emissions under CEQA. Projects that are not consistent with the CAP as determined by Steps 1 or 2 of the Checklist, shall not use the CAP Consistency Checklist for CEQA streamlining.

Less Than Significant Impact: As previously described, the proposed Jewish community religious facility and childcare center would be consistent with the Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2) land use and Single-Family Residential (RS) zoning designation for the project site upon approval of the MUP. Therefore, the project may rely on the CAP for the cumulative impacts analysis of GHG emissions under CEQA.

As described in the CAP Consistency Review Checklist and required by County laws and regulations, the project would implement the following design features (included as conditions of approval by the County):

1. Low-flow plumbing fixtures and other water efficiency measures, in compliance with CALGreen, Appendix A5 Voluntary Nonresidential Measures, Section A5.303.2.3.2 Tier 2 Water Efficiency and Conservation Requirements and three elective measures from Section A5.303, Section A5.304, and Section A5.305 Tier 2 Water Efficiency and Conservation Requirements.
2. Incorporation of Title 24 energy standards.
3. Landscaping across the project site, particularly along the project boundaries.
4. Comply with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance with automatically controlled efficient system and use of native plant species and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants in landscaping plan.
5. Comply with County Ordinance Section 68.511 through 68.520 (Diversion of Construction and Demolition Materials from Landfill Disposal), which requires recycling of 90 percent of inert and 65 percent of all other materials from construction projects.
6. Comply with the County's Strategic Plan to Reduce Waste (2017) through the support of commercial composting programs to reduce organic waste and comply with established waste diversion requirements.
7. Comply with the County's Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD's fugitive dust rules outlined in Section 87.426 of the County's Grading Ordinance.
8. Utilize architectural coatings compliant with SDAPCD Rule 67.
9. The project would not result in any wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy usage (see Section VI[a] above).

10. The project would renovate and reuse three existing buildings on-site, which would reduce the construction-related GHG emissions generated when compared to demolition and construction of new buildings.
11. The project would comply with the County's Code of Regulatory Ordinances as amended to incorporate all-electric appliances and equipment in the new construction and CALGreen (Tier 2) energy efficiency requirements for the existing buildings.
12. The proposed building structures would incorporate photovoltaic (PV) provisions consistent with CALGreen (Tier 2) requirements for nonresidential land uses.
13. Achieve compliance with electric vehicle (EV) requirements in the most recently adopted version of CALGreen (Tier 2) requirements.
14. The project would have a less-than-significant impact from VMT (see Section XVII[b] below).

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: There are numerous State plans, policies, and regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions. The principal state plan and policy is Senate Bill (SB) 32 and the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The quantitative goal of SB 32 is to reduce GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. In 2022, the State passed AB 1279, which declares the State would achieve net-zero GHG emissions by 2045 and would reduce GHG emissions by 85 percent below 1990 levels by 2045. Pursuant to the SB 32 goal and AB 1279, the 2022 Scoping Plan was created to outline goals and measures for the State to achieve the reductions. Additionally, SANDAG adopted San Diego Forward: 2021 Regional Plan in 2021, and the County of San Diego General Plan provides goals and policies to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, the analysis is based upon the project's consistency with plans and polices adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions and mitigating the effects of climate change, including the CARB 2022 Scoping Plan and SANDAG's 2021 Regional Plan.

2022 Scoping Plan
The latest iteration of the Scoping Plan is the 2022 Scoping Plan, which focuses on outcomes needed to achieve carbon neutrality by assessing paths for clean technology, energy deployment, natural and working lands, and others, and is designed to meet the state's long-term climate objectives and support a range of economic, environmental, energy security, environmental justice, and public health priorities. The 2022 Scoping Plan's strategies that apply to the proposed project include the following:

- Reducing fossil fuel use, energy demand and VMT;
- Building decarbonization; and
- Maximizing recycling and diversion from landfills.

The proposed project would be consistent with these goals through project design that would be consistent with latest California 2022 Energy Code. The proposed building structures would incorporate PV provisions consistent with CALGreen (Tier 2) requirements for nonresidential

land uses. In addition, the 2022 CALGreen Standards state five percent of the total number of parking spaces shall be equipped with Level 2 EV supply equipment, which is approximately three EV chargers. Therefore, the proposed project's six EV chargers would exceed and be consistent with the latest CALGreen Standards. The proposed project would be served by San Diego Gas & Electric, which is required to increase its renewable energy procurement in accordance with SB 100 targets. In addition, the project would be consistent with the County requirement of recycling 90 percent of inert and 65 percent of all other materials from construction projects, per County Ordinance Section 68.511 through 68.520 (Diversion of Construction and Demolition Materials from Landfill Disposal). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the 2022 Scoping Plan.

San Diego Forward: 2021 Regional Plan

The 2021 Regional Plan provides a framework for meeting goals with coordinated land use and transportation planning strategies. Implementation actions related to projects, policies and programs would confirm SANDAG's commitment to fully realizing the strategies in the 2021 Regional Plan. The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) envisions a transportation system that is fast, fair, and clean, as well as a region that is resilient to economic and environmental changes. The 2021 Regional Plan polices are built around three core strategies:

- Invest In a Reimagined Transportation System. Build a network and fund services that include multimodal roadways; an expanded network of fast, frequent, and low-cost transit; 21st century technology that manages the entire transportation system and connects people to on-demand services; and zero-emissions options for vehicles and micromobility.
- Incentivize Sustainable Growth and Development. Collaborate with local jurisdictions and fund programs to accelerate housing production while also addressing equity, climate resilience, and mobility.
- Implement Innovative Demand and System Management. Reduce solo driving and congestion through increased remote work, carsharing, vanpooling, pricing strategies and parking management programs that leverage partnerships and technology.

The project includes development of a 13,845-square-foot Shul, Jewish community religious facility, renovation of existing structures (retaining a candle shop, residence, and accessory office), demolition of a stone shop and outbuildings, as well as six-foot fencing around the perimeter of the site, landscaping, utility improvements, and new internal circulation improvements. The proposed project would be consistent with the SANDAG growth projections. The project would not generate population growth or and would retain one residence on-site, which would not affect housing; therefore, the project would not conflict with the region's future employment and housing needs. This project is not a transportation project that would affect the region's transportation systems and should not increase transportation demands within the local area. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2021 Regional Plan.

San Diego County General Plan

The General Plan provides a consistent framework for land use and development decisions consistent with an established community vision. As the equivalent of a local "constitution" for land use and development, the General Plan's diagrams, goals, and policies form the basis for the County's zoning, subdivision, and infrastructure decisions. The General Plan Conservation

and Open Space, and Land Use Element provide the following goals, policies and objectives pertaining to greenhouse gas emissions that are relevant to this analysis:

- COS-14.3: Sustainable Development. Require design of residential subdivisions and nonresidential development through "green" and sustainable land development practices to conserve energy, water, open space, and natural resources.
- COS-15.4: Title 24 Energy Standards. Require development to minimize energy impacts from new buildings in accordance with or exceeding Title 24 energy standards.
- LU-5.1: Reduction of Vehicle Trips within Communities. Incorporate a mixture of uses within Villages and Rural Villages and plan residential densities at a level that support multi-modal transportation, including walking, bicycling, and the use of public transit, when appropriate.

The project would comply with the latest Title 24 Energy Standards that reduces wasteful, expensive, inefficient or unnecessary use of energy. The project would be subject to CALGreen, which requires a 20 percent increase in indoor water use efficiency and use of indoor water-efficient irrigation systems. In addition, the project would be a locally serving use and therefore, is considered to have a less than significant impact related to VMT. Therefore, the project would be consistent with goals and policies in the San Diego County's General Plan to reduce GHG.

Conclusion

The proposed project would comply with the plans, policies, regulations, and GHG reduction actions/strategies outlined in the 2022 Scoping Plan, 2021 Regional Plan, and the San Diego County General Plan. The project would be consistent with the 2021 Regional Plan since the anticipated residents would be located within the region and would not increase population growth and housing needs. Consistency with the plans, policies, regulations, and GHG reduction actions/strategies would reduce the project's incremental contribution of GHG emissions. Therefore, the proposed project's GHG impacts would be less than significant.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the project by AEI Consultants, dated December 3, 2019 (see Appendix F). The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Project construction would involve the transport of gasoline and other petroleum-based products associated with construction equipment. These materials are considered hazardous as they could cause temporary localized soil and water contamination. Incidents of spills or other localized contamination could occur during refueling, operation of machinery, undetected fluid leaks, or mechanical failure. However,

all storage, handling, and disposal of these materials are regulated by California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the USEPA, and the Vista Fire Protection District. All construction activities involving the transportation, usage, and disposal of hazardous materials would be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local requirements, which would reduce impacts associated with the use and handling of hazardous materials during construction to less than significant. Operationally, the project would involve the transport, use, and storage of typical household hazardous materials, such as cleaners, pesticides, etc. However, the project will not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because all storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances will be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520.

The purpose of the Phase I ESA is to assist the client in identifying potential Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs), in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E1527-13, associated with the presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products, their use, storage, and disposal at and in the vicinity of the subject property. A REC is defined by the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment.

The Phase I ESA included 1) a desktop review of federal, state, tribal, and local databases that identify and describe underground storage tank (UST) sites, leaking UST (LUST) sites, hazardous waste generation sites, and hazardous waste storage and disposal facility sites within the ASTM approximate minimum search distance; 2) a property and surrounding site reconnaissance, and interviews with the past and present owners and current occupants and operators to identify potential environmental contamination; and 3) a review of historical sources to help ascertain previous land use at the site and in the surrounding area.

The Phase I ESA found that USTs were formerly located at the subject property and were removed under regulatory compliance with DEHQ. The project site reportedly was equipped with a 500-gallon UST installed in 1960 and a 1,000-gallon UST installed in 1981. The USTs contained gasoline and were removed in 1986. DEHQ issued a letter stating that they inspected the USTs during the removal and no holes or significant corrosion was identified. No evidence of significant soil or groundwater contamination was reportedly identified. Although a map was provided of the locations of the USTs, the map does not appear to have been to scale and thus the exact locations of the USTs are unknown. Although no report of a release has been documented, the USTs may have impacted the subsurface of the subject property. It appears that no soil samples were collected and analyzed for the presence of contamination at the time of the removal of the USTs. Based on the absence of this data, the possibility exists that contamination may remain in place at the project site. Therefore, the Phase I ESA recommends preparation of a Phase II ESA with a subsurface investigation to determine the presence of soil or groundwater contamination at the project site, which is included in MM HAZ-1.

Given the age of the existing structures on-site, it is possible that Asbestos Containing Materials

(ACM) and Lead Based Paint (LBP) are present. Lead is a highly toxic metal that was used up until 1978 in paint used on walls, woodwork, siding, windows, and doors. Lead-containing materials shall be managed by applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Division 4.5, the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 CCR §1532.1), and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8). Asbestos was used extensively from the 1940's until the late 1970's in the construction industry for fireproofing, thermal and acoustic insulation, condensation control, and decoration. The USEPA has determined that there is no "safe" exposure level to asbestos. It is, therefore, highly regulated by the USEPA, the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), and the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (CalOSHA). Although the observed suspect ACMs and painted surfaces at the property were determined by AEI to be in good condition and not expected to pose a health and safety concern to building occupants, AEI recommends the implementation of an Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan which stipulates that the repair and maintenance of damaged materials and the assessment, repair, and maintenance of damaged painted surfaces should be performed to protect the health and safety of the building occupants. Therefore, MM HAZ-2 includes preparation of an O&M Plan to repair and maintain any damaged materials that could include ACM and to assess, repair, and maintain damaged painted surfaces that could include LBP. In the event that building renovation or demolition activities are planned, a thorough asbestos survey to identify asbestos-containing building materials is required in accordance with the USEPA National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) 40 CFR Part 61 prior to demolition or renovation activities that may disturb suspect ACMs. In addition, demolition or renovation operations that involve ACMs must conform to SDAPCD Rules 361.140-361.156. To determine if LBP is present, actual material samples would need to be collected, or an X-ray fluorescence (XRF) survey performed. It should be noted that construction activities that disturb materials or paints containing any amount of lead may be subject to certain requirements of the OSHA lead standard contained in 29 CFR 1910.1025 and 1926.62.

In addition, the project site contains an existing septic system with two 1,000-gallon septic tanks below the ground service that were installed in 1992. There are no floor drains in the building or garage; nor are there any shop use sinks. Based on the use of the septic system solely for domestic waste, the Phase I ESA determined that the septic system is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern. The existing septic tanks would be retained on-site, and additional septic tanks would be installed to support the proposed Jewish community religious facility and childcare center. The Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Layout for the new on-site septic and wastewater treatment system was approved by DEHQ and would also require a permit from DEHQ. Therefore, with compliance with the applicable required permit conditions, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the removal of existing leach lines associated with the septic system.

Therefore, with implementation of MM HAZ-1, MM HAZ-2, and all applicable federal, state and local regulations and permit requirements, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

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

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

Less Than Significant: There are no schools within 0.25-mile of the project site. The nearest school to the project site is High Bluff Academy located approximately 3,534 feet (approximately 0.67 mile) east from the nearest corner of the school. Given the project site's proximity to Interstate 8, construction hauling is most likely to be transported to the project site along Via de la Valle west of the project site; therefore, the it would not pass the high school which is off of Via de la Valle to the northeast of the project site. Further, the transport and handling of minor amounts of hazardous materials during construction and operation would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations that control hazardous material handling (refer to Section IX[a]). Therefore, with implementation of all applicable federal, state and local regulations and permit requirements, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation: The Phase I ESA prepared for the project determined that there are several known cases or listings on federal, state, tribal, and local environmental databases searched. According to the HAZNET listing, in 1986, the property generated approximately 0.0208 ton of oil/water separation sludge. This listing is presumed to be associated with lubricating materials associated with on-site machinery. No clarifiers or subsurface features were identified at the subject property that would represent a conduit to the subsurface for hazardous substances or petroleum products. Therefore, the Phase I ESA determined that proper disposal of this small quantity of waste does not represent a REC at this time.

The San Diego Co. HMMD, HIST UST, SWEEPS UST listings pertain to the registration of the facility with DEHQ and the former USTs on the property. USTs were formerly located at the subject property and were removed under regulatory compliance with DEHQ. The subject property reportedly was equipped with a 500-gallon UST installed in 1960 and a 1,000-gallon UST installed in 1981. The USTs contained gasoline and were removed in 1986. DEHQ issued a letter stating that they inspected the USTs during the removal and no holes or significant corrosion was identified. No evidence of significant soil or groundwater contamination was reportedly identified. Although a map was provided of the locations of the USTs, the map does not appear to have been to scale and thus the exact locations of the USTs are unknown.

Although no report of a release has been documented, the USTs may have impacted the subsurface of the subject property. It appears that no soil samples were collected and analyzed for the presence of contamination at the time of the removal of the USTs. Based on the absence of this data, the possibility exists that contamination may remain in place at the subject property. Therefore, MM HAZ-1 would require preparation of a Phase II ESA with a subsurface investigation to determine the presence of soil or groundwater contamination at the project site in accordance with the Phase I ESA recommendations. Therefore, with implementation of HAZ-1 and all applicable federal, state and local regulations and permit requirements, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment as a result of a release of hazardous substances.

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

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

No Impact: The closest airports to the project site are McClellan-Palomar Airport, located more than 10.2 miles north of the project site, and the Wateridge/Henley Heliport, located nearly 6 miles south of the project site. As such, the project site is not within noise contours of either airport. The project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Height Notification Surface. Therefore, the project would not constitute a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

e) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard

profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located within the Wildland-Urban Interface Zone and a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) in state responsibility area (SRA). The Building Plan for the project is required to be reviewed and approved by the County Fire Authority and as such, would comply with regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code (see Section XX, Wildfire). Based on review of the project by County staff, and through compliance with the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District's comments, the County Fire Code, and Consolidated Fire Code, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures

HAZ-1 In order to determine the presence of soil or groundwater contamination at the project site, a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) with a subsurface investigation shall be prepared prior to approval of any grading and/or improvement plans.

In the event that the Phase II subsurface investigation discovers the presence of contaminated soils on-site, the contractor and/or property owner shall notify County PDS and DEHQ. The presence of contaminated soils will require soil testing and remediation in accordance with standard County procedures. This process will be determined once the County is notified of the presence of contaminated soils.

HAZ-2 Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of the grading permit, an Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan shall be prepared, submitted to the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health & Quality (DEHQ), and implemented. The O&M Plan shall stipulate that the repair and maintenance of damaged materials that could include asbestos-containing material (ACM) should be performed to protect the health and safety of the building occupants. Similarly, the O&M Plan shall stipulate that the assessment, repair, and maintenance of damaged painted surfaces that could include lead-based paint (LBP) should be performed to protect the health and safety of the building occupants.

The O&M Plan shall include a description of all federal, state, and local requirements related to the disturbance of ACM and LBP. For example, the O&M Plan shall stipulate that a thorough asbestos survey to identify asbestos-containing building materials be conducted in accordance with the USEPA National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) 40 CFR Part 61 prior to demolition or renovation activities that may disturb suspect ACMs. In addition, demolition or renovation operations that involve ACMs must conform to SDAPCD Rules 361.140-361.156.

In the event that an LBP survey is necessary to determine its presence on the project site, actual material samples would need to be collected, or an X-ray fluorescence

(XRF) survey performed. It should be noted that construction activities that disturb materials or paints containing any amount of lead may be subject to certain requirements of the OSHA lead standard contained in 29 CFR 1910.1025 and 1926.62.

DEHQ shall verify and approve the O&M Plan for compliance with this condition and the business will need to annually certify this plan as well as comply with any other requirements of the O&M Plan.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards *or* waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

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

Discussion/Explanation: The following technical studies have been prepared for the project:

- PDP SWQMP prepared by SWS Engineering Inc., dated September 10, 2025 (Appendix G).
- Drainage Study prepared by SWS Engineering Inc., dated September 9, 2025 (Appendix H).

The following responses have incorporated the analyses from these studies.

Less Than Significant Impact: Potential sources of water pollution would include construction phase disturbance of the soils through grading, materials delivery, and waste generation, and post-construction development, including impervious surfaces, landscaped areas (fertilizers/pesticides), and motor vehicles. However, as described in the PDP SWQMP for the proposed project prepared by SWS Engineering Inc., dated September 10, 2025 (Appendix G), the project is required to obtain a waste discharge identification number and a NPDES General Construction Permit for stormwater discharges from the State Water Resources Control Board (Region 9). The General Construction Permit for requires preparation and implementation of a SWPPP and associated BMPs. As noted in the PDP SWQMP for the proposed project, construction BMPs would include vegetation stabilization planting in the summer, erosion control measures on flat areas, energy dissipator outlet protection, silt fence, fiber rolls, gravel and sand bags, storm drain inlet protection, a stabilized construction entrance, materials management, and waste management.

The project would be consistent with requirements of the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual, which is a design manual for compliance with local County of San Diego Watershed Protection Ordinance (Sections 67.801 et seq.) and regional Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB], San Diego Region Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100) requirements for stormwater management.

Additionally, the PDP SWQMP prepared for the project includes several long-term operational BMPs that would prevent degradation of surface or groundwater quality, including but not limited to site design (landscaping and maintenance of common area and slopes with native or drought-tolerant species, conserving nature areas, soils, and vegetation), parking areas and driveways made constructed with permeable materials, storm drain stenciling/signage, protect trash storage areas, and others), directing runoff to pervious areas, and structural controls including biofiltration basins (see Section X(e)(i) for further discussion of the proposed treatment and storage systems).

Given that the project would incrementally increase the area of impervious surfaces onsite, and includes construction and long-term operational BMPs, the project would have less than significant impacts on water quality standards and discharge requirements, as well as degradation of surface and groundwater quality in general.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the Rancho Santa Fe Hydrologic Sub Area of the Solana Beach Hydrologic Area of the San Dieguito Hydrologic Unit (905.11). The nearest impaired waterbody as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list is the San Dieguito River approximately 1,100 feet south of the project site. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, the San Dieguito River is impaired for benthic community effects, bifenthrin, chloride, nitrogen, dissolved oxygen, phosphorus, pyrethroids, total dissolved solids, and toxicity. According to the Drainage Study prepared for the project by SWS Engineering Inc., dated September 9, 2025 (Appendix H), runoff from the project site drains into lined channel located on the southeast of the site (south of Via De Valle) and ultimately to the San Dieguito River and the Pacific Ocean.

The PDP SWQMP prepared for the project includes design measures and source control BMPs such that potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of pollutants in receiving waters and reduce impacts on stormwater quality and hydromodification to less than significant levels during construction (e.g., vegetation stabilization planting in the summer, erosion control measures on flat areas, energy dissipator outlet protection, silt fence, fiber rolls, gravel and sand bags, storm drain inlet protection, a stabilized construction entrance, materials management, and waste management). As part of this project, associated improvements would include permeable materials for the parking areas and driveways and an underground stormwater treatment and storage system (see Section X(e)(i) for further discussion of the proposed treatment and storage systems). The BMPs are consistent with the regional surface water and stormwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and stormwater permitting regulation for County of San Diego includes the following: RWQCB, San Diego Region Order

No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100; County Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO; Sections 67.801 et seq.); County Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance; and County Stormwater Standards Manual. The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that would reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. The WPO has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

The project would implement construction and operational BMPs to protect water quality as established in the PDP SWQMP prepared for the project and described above in Section X(a). The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and stormwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d).

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The RWQCB has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit. The project lies in the Rancho Santa Fe Hydrologic Sub Area of the Solana Beach Hydrologic Area of the San Dieguito Hydrologic Unit (905.11) that has the following existing beneficial uses for groundwater: municipal and domestic supply, agricultural supply, and industrial service supply (State Water Resources Control Board 2021).

Potential sources of polluted runoff resulting from the project would be typical of general construction and demolition projects in the County and are discussed in the PDP SWQMP prepared for the project. As described in Section X(a) and (b) above, a number of construction and operational BMPs would be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the project would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and stormwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would obtain its water supply from the Santa Fe Irrigation District that obtains water from surface reservoirs (Lake Hodges) and imported water purchased from the San Diego County Water Authority. Given the developed nature of the project site, very limited water would be required during the construction phase for dust control and suppression, and the project would not use any groundwater during construction or operation phases of the project.

In addition, the project would result in an incremental increase in impervious surfaces (from 56 percent to 70 percent), which would not interfere with regional groundwater recharge. The project would include landscaping and permeable pavers bordering the paved surfaces and would direct runoff to pervious surfaces, which would allow for infiltration. The project would 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., 0.25-mile). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project 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 surface, in a manner which would:

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Under existing conditions, stormwater runoff from the project site flows over the natural ground and pavement surfaces in a southeasterly direction into an on-site natural channel located at the southern portion of the site where this channel conveys the runoff to its lowest point located on the southeast portion of the site. There is off-site run-on into the project site from north and west side of the site where it confluences with the onsite majority runoff toward the low point of the channel. All runoff from the channel ultimately discharges off-site on the east driveway via existing storm drain system. There is also a small off-site area draining into the project site from the northeast which discharges off-site into the low point of the site, conferencing with the rest of the onsite and off-site runoff from the west. All on-site and off-site discharge runoff drain into a lined channel located on the southeast of the site (south of Via De Valle) and ultimately into San Dieguito River and the Pacific Ocean.

Under proposed project conditions, the project runoff would be conveyed from nine basins (Basin 200-A through 200-I) on the project site. The runoff from Basin 200-A (along with off-site runoff from the north [basin 100.2]) would discharge via proposed brow-ditch and storm drain systems

into a proposed inlet located at the southwest corner of the site, where it would confluence with the rest of the off-site run-on from west (basin 100.1). The Basin 200-B runoff would drain into the same inlet. All these confluence runoffs would bypass the site via the proposed onsite storm drain systems into the discharge point located at the low point of the east driveway. The runoff from Basins 200-C and 200-H would sheet flow in a northerly direction into proposed inlets and then into a bypass storm drain system that would confluence with the rest of conveyed runoffs already in the system. The runoff from Basins 200-D, 200-E, 200-F, and 200-G would drain into the proposed pollutant control treatment system first and then into the proposed underground storage system for hydromodification control via proposed inlets and storm drain systems.

All of the treated and detained runoff from Basins 200-D, 200-E, 200-F, and 200-G would discharge into the bypass storm drain system, which would confluence with the rest of runoff in the system and finally discharge off-site located on the east driveway low point. The runoff from Basins 200-I (existing undisturbed area) and 200-J (west driveway) would discharge into second a second proposed treatment system via inlets and storm drain systems for treatment prior to discharging into the west driveway low point, the same as bypass runoff system does.

All on-site and off-site discharge runoffs ultimately drain into the lined channel located southeast of the site (south of Via De La Valle) and then into San Dieguito River.

Without the proposed underground storage system for hydromodification control, the proposed project would increase on-site runoff by 1.5 cubic feet per second (cfs). However, the proposed runoff would be reduced by 0.2 cfs as compared to the existing condition with installation of the underground storage system. Additionally, the parking lot and east driveway would be constructed with permeable pavers that would substantially reduce the total site runoff.

The existing drainage patterns within the project footprint would be altered, which is typical for development projects. However, the discharge point where the on-site runoff leaves the project site would not be altered by the project and total site runoff would be reduced, so there would be no off-site flooding nor erosion/siltation impacts. The on-site drainage facilities would be designed to adequately convey the design storm, so there would be no on-site flooding.

Further, the project would implement construction and operational BMPs to protect water quality as established in the PDP SWQMP prepared for the project and described above in Section X(a) and (b). Several of these BMPs are intended to reduce erosion and siltation to the maximum extent feasible. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Please refer to Section X(e)(i). The proposed project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns or increase the amount of runoff. Based on the Drainage Study prepared by SWS Engineering Inc., dated September 9, 2025 (Appendix H), the 100-year peak flow from the project site would be slightly decreased following development of the site and installation of the proposed underground storage system, and drainage patterns and basin areas would not be substantially altered. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact with respect to increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Please refer to Section X(e)(i). Since the project would not increase the off-site 100-year flow rate, the project would not create nor contribute runoff that would impact the current capacity of existing nor proposed capacity of planned stormwater drainage systems. The on-site drainage facilities would be designed to adequately convey the design storm, so there would be no on-site flooding.

The project would implement construction and operational BMPs to protect water quality as established in the PDP SWQMP prepared for the project and described above in Section X(a) and (b) and would have a less than significant impact with regard to substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. As described in Section X(e)(i) above, the project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns and would actually reduce the amount of runoff from the project site (Appendix H). Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact with respect to creating or contributing runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

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

Less Than Significant: Please see Section X(e)(i) through (iii). The Drainage Study prepared by SWS Engineering Inc., dated September 9, 2025 (Appendix H) demonstrates that the project would not impede or redirect flood flows.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

No Impact: The project would not place structures in a 100-year flood hazard area because there are no such hazard areas mapped at the site by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the County. As described in Section IX(e)(v), there are no dams nor levees that affect the site. Therefore, the project site is not located in a flood hazard zone. Additionally, the project site is located outside of a tsunami or seiche zone given its distance from a lake or the coast. Therefore, no impact would occur.

g) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site would be in compliance with the San Diego Basin Water Quality Control Plan and is not located within a County Sustainable Groundwater Management Act or Groundwater Sustainability Plan basin area. See Section X(a) through (d). The project would implement construction and operational BMPs established in the PDP SWQMP prepared for the project to protect water quality. As a result, the project would not contribute to a direct or cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. As described in Section X(d) above, the project would not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic, or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project would be required to implement the PDP SWQMP, prepare and implement a SWPPP, and be in compliance with the County's WPO. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact with regard to implementation of the Basin Plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would develop a Jewish community religious facility and childcare center, including construction of Shul, community gathering areas, children's play area, parking, a new internal circulation (road) system, an entry gate with guard building, landscaping, and utility improvements. The proposed Chabad Center would provide opportunities for religious assembly uses, administrative functions, small gathering areas, evening classes, childcare for up to 50 children, quite spaces for the community, and associated outdoor spaces, such as gardens, a courtyard, and a playground. The site is currently developed with an existing single-family home, office, and commercial candle shop building which would remain and a stone shop and outbuildings that would be removed. The project proposes the

development of additional buildings on a currently developed site and would not disrupt or divide the community further than existing conditions. The project would maintain the existing six-foot fencing around the perimeter of the site. No component of the project would introduce a new barrier or division to, or otherwise result in a conflict with, the surrounding residential, commercial, or industrial development or other established community.

b) Would the project 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 project would develop a Jewish community religious facility and childcare center in an unincorporated area of the County of San Diego, which is consistent with the Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2) land use and Single-Family Residential (RS) zoning designation for the project site upon approval of the MUP. Surrounding land uses consist of single-family residences immediately surrounding the project site with sports/recreation and commercial uses further outside the immediate project vicinity. The project does not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the County of San Diego General Plan, the project site is located within an MRZ-3 Zone (Resources Potentially Present). The project site is surrounded by developed residential land uses which would be incompatible with future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would 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 extraction would not occur at the site due to incompatible land uses.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the County of San Diego General Plan, the project site is located within an MRZ-3 Zone (Resources Potentially Present). However, a future mining operation at the project site would 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 extraction would not occur at the site due to incompatible land uses. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan would occur as a result of this project.

XIII. NOISE.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: A Noise Analysis Report was prepared for the project by dBF Associates, Inc. dated October 2024 (see Appendix I). The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less Than Significant: The project proposes a Major Use Permit for a Chabad Center on two lots, totaling approximately 2.43-acres. The project proposes constructing an 11,150 square foot Shul, maintaining the existing single-family home, office, and candle shop buildings. The project would add surface parking, signage, and landscaping. The project would consist of a single phase of construction including the Shul, parking and drive aisles, signage, and landscaping. General construction equipment for grading and preparation of the site would be required. The primary noise source from project construction would be from site preparation. Grading could require the use of heavy equipment such as bulldozers, loaders, and scrapers. No blasting would be necessary. Haul trucks could be used to import or export fill to or from the project site. Construction of the project would generate a short-term temporary increase in noise in the project area. The increase in noise level would be primarily experienced close to the noise source. The magnitude of the impact would depend on the type of construction activity, noise level generated by various pieces of construction equipment, duration of the construction phase, acoustical shielding and distance between the noise source and receiver.

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 dBA for single residences (including senior housing, convalescent homes), and 65 dBA CNEL for multi-family residences (including mixed-use commercial/residential). Moreover, if the project is located in an area in 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 Noise Analysis Report (Appendix I) calculated exterior roadway noise levels based on sound level measurements and actual simultaneous traffic counts conducted by dBF Associates, Inc. staff. Future exterior roadway noise levels at the Shul would range from below 60 dBA CNEL at the north façade to approximately 70 dBA CNEL at the south façade. Future exterior roadway noise levels at the courtyard would be below 65 dBA CNEL. Typical building design would reduce exterior noise to an interior noise level of 50 dBA Leq or less. As such, noise levels would be considered “Acceptable” under General Plan compatibility standards at all areas.

Typical construction activities would not exceed the County of San Diego temporary construction noise limit of 75 dBA at adjacent property lines during the construction activity. General good practice measures including reasonable maintenance of equipment, conservative planning of simultaneous equipment operation, and using equipment with effective mufflers would ensure that noise levels remain below the County of San Diego construction noise limits. Construction activity, equipment operation, and delivery of construction materials would be limited to the County of San Diego’s allowable hours of operation (Monday through Saturday 7 AM to 7 PM). The Noise Analysis Report (Appendix I) calculated the worst-case anticipated construction noise level, assuming that up to five pieces of equipment at any given time would operate continuously within the grading area boundary. Based on the analysis, the project is anticipated to generate noise levels ranging from approximately 65 to 74 dBA Leq at project property lines. Construction noise would not exceed the County’s standard of 75 dBA Leq (8-hour), in compliance with the County’s Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

The project is also subject to the County Noise Ordinance. Temporary construction noise is subject to Section 36.408, 409, and 410 of the Ordinance. Construction equipment operations are subject to a 75 dBA 8-hour average sound level limit at the boundary of an occupied residence. In accordance with 36.409 of the County Noise Ordinance, except for emergency work, construction equipment shall not be operated in a manner that exceeds 75 dBA for an eight-hour period between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, when measured at the boundary line of the property where the noise source is located or on any occupied property where the noise is being received.

The Noise Analysis Report (Appendix I) calculated the worst-case anticipated construction noise level, assuming that up to five pieces of equipment at any given time would operate continuously within the grading area boundary. Based on the analysis, the project is anticipated to generate noise levels ranging from approximately 65 to 74 dBA Leq at project property lines. Construction noise would not exceed the County’s standard of 75 dBA Leq (8-hour), in compliance with the County’s Noise Ordinance.

In addition, the County’s Noise Ordinance provides 1-hour average sound level limits in the RS zone of 50 dBA for the daytime (7 AM to 10 PM) and 45 dBA for the nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 AM). Operation of the project would generate noise associated with new HVAC units mounted on the Shul building roof. Based on the Noise Analysis Report (Appendix I), on-site operational noise sources from the project would range up to approximately 38 dBA Leq at project property lines. Noise would not exceed the County nighttime noise standard of 45 dBA Leq (1-hour average).

Operation assumes that the units would be screened with parapet walls at least as tall as the units.

Guidelines for Determining Significance for Noise
The County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Noise state that there would be an impact if project implementation will result in the exposure of any on- or off-site, existing or reasonably foreseeable future noise sensitive areas to exterior or interior noise (including noise generated from the project, together with noise from roads [existing and planned], railroads, airports, heliports and all other noise sources) in excess of 60 dBA CNEL or an increase of 10 dBA CNEL over pre-existing noise for exterior locations and 45 dBA CNEL for interior locations.

As described above, on-site operational noise sources from the project would range up to approximately 38 dBA Leq at project property lines. Assuming that the Shul building would be operational for 12 daytime hours, the corresponding CNEL would be approximately 36 dBA. It was assumed that the ambient noise levels at all neighboring properties are 30 dBA CNEL or higher. As such, the project would not result in the exposure of any off-site noise sensitive areas to noise levels exceeding 60 dBA CNEL or an increase of 10 dBA CNEL over pre-existing noise or 45 dBA CNEL for interior locations.

The project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element 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 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 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) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Construction of the project is not expected to include any significant vibration inducing equipment, such as a jack hammer, pile driving equipment, or heavy soil compaction. In addition, no rock crushing or blasting is proposed. Conventional construction techniques such as earth movement by trucks, have the potential to generate minimal groundbourne vibration and noise. Therefore, excessive levels of groundborne vibration and groundborne levels are not expected to be received by any persons during construction. Further, the project does not include any components that would generate operational vibration. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Potential impacts to noise would be less than significant with conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410). Once the project is constructed, project operation would result in noise levels up to approximately 38 dBA Leq at nearby property lines (Appendix I). Assuming that the Shul building would be operational for 12 daytime hours, the corresponding CNEL would be approximately 36 dBA. The Noise Analysis Report assumed that the ambient noise levels at all neighboring properties are 30 dBA CNEL or higher. As such, the project would not result in the exposure of any off-site noise sensitive areas to an increase of 10 dBA CNEL over pre-existing noise.

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

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

Less Than Significant: Temporary and periodic increases in ambient noise from grading activities and construction of the project are addressed above in Section XIII(a). Permanent increases in ambient noise from operation of the project are addressed above in Section XIII(c). As indicated in these responses, the project would not result in construction or operational noise above the Impacts would be less than significant.

e) 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?

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

No Impact: The closest airports to the project site are McClellan-Palomar Airport, located more than 10.2 miles north of the project site, and the Wateridge/Henley Heliport, located nearly 6 miles south of the project site. As such, the project site is not within noise contours of either airport. The project site is not located within an ALUCP, an Airport Influence Area, or a FAA Height Notification Surface. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.

a) Would the project 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)?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project includes redevelopment of a 2.43-acre site with one new building, a 13,845-square-foot Shul, Jewish community religious facility, and three existing structures, retaining a candle shop, residence, and accessory office while removing a stone shop and outbuildings, which is allowed on the Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2) land use and Single-Family Residential (RS) zone with a MUP, pursuant to Zoning Code Section 2105.a. Primary users of the site would be temporary in nature and are anticipated to be residents of the neighboring communities; therefore, the project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area. The proposed Chabad Center is consistent with the existing land use and zoning designations for the site. The project site is located in an urbanized area and is surrounded by single-family residences. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial unplanned population growth, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would retain one existing residence on the project site. This residence is the only habitable structure on-site and is owned by the property owner (Rabbi and his family); therefore, the project would not displace a substantial number of existing people or housing, and impacts would be less than significant.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.

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

i. Fire protection?
ii. Police protection?
iii. Schools?
iv. Parks?

v. Other public facilities?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would develop a 2.43-acre site with one new building, a 13,845-square-foot Shul, Jewish community religious facility, and three existing structures, retaining a candle shop, residence, and accessory office. The project would not result in the need for significantly altered public services or 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. The project is located 3.2 miles (driving distance) from the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District Station 3. According to the Service Availability Letter (Appendix J), Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District facilities are currently adequate to serve the project, and the expected emergency travel time to the proposed project is five minutes. The San Diego County Sheriff's Department provides police protection to the project site from either the North Coastal Station or the 4S Ranch Substation. Gates are proposed at both entrances of the parking lot and a security fence would encircle the entirety of the Chabad Center. Additionally, a security guard would be employed to secure the property during Saturday services. Members would have access to the gates and the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District would have Knox box access.

The project is located within the Solana Beach School District, although the project does not propose any residential uses that would generate demand for school services. Nevertheless, the Solana Beach School District has provided a Service Availability Letter (Appendix K) indicating adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. Further, the Chabad Center would not result in increased demand for existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, and the proposed project would be considered passive open space area. Therefore, the project would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause a significant impact on the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. RECREATION.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project includes development of a Jewish community religious facility, with renovations of the existing buildings, demolition of a few selected buildings, parking, landscaping, signage, and utility improvements. Surrounding land uses consist of single-family residences immediately surrounding the project site with sports/recreation and commercial uses further outside the immediate project vicinity. The proposed project would

include a playground, small gathering areas, and extensive landscaping and hardscaping throughout the site that would provide passive recreational opportunities to project occupants. In addition, the project site is located in proximity to several sports and recreational facilities (e.g., Del Mar Polo Fields, Del Mar Horsepark, Surf Sports Park, Play FNA, La Valle Coastal Club). The development of a Jewish community religious facility and childcare center would not 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would include a playground, small gathering areas, and extensive landscaping and hardscaping throughout the site that would provide passive recreational opportunities to project occupants. The project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur from the project.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: The County of San Diego's Transportation Study Guidelines (TSG) establish thresholds for transportation using VMT. The TSG also establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system by incorporating standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards and 2011 General Plan Mobility Element.

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would redevelop a 2.43-acre site with one new building (a 13,845-sf Shul) and three existing structures, retaining a candle shop, residence, and accessory office. The project would not have a direct impact related to a conflict with any plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system. Given that construction worker trips would be temporary and would be dispersed along different routes based on the origin of the trips, construction worker commuting is not expected to have a significant effect on the capacity of the transportation system.

Operationally, the project would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions (see Section XVII[b] and [c] below) and would not result in off-site changes to the circulation system. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing

measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including public transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and public transit. In addition, implementation of the project would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, nor would it generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian, or bicycle facilities. There is an existing bus stop for San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Line 308 along the project site frontage on Via De La Valle, which borders the site to the south. The project would not remove or otherwise inhibit access to or use of the bus stop. Therefore, the project would not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: The County of San Diego's Transportation Study Guidelines (TSG) establish thresholds and screening criteria for transportation VMT.

Less Than Significant Impact: The Transportation Analysis utilized the County of San Diego Transportation Study Guidelines (TSG) approved by the Board of Supervisors in September of 2022 (incorporated herein by reference). The TSG provides criteria on how projects should be evaluated for consistency related to the County's transportation goals, policies, and plans, and through procedures established under CEQA. The TSG establishes the contents and procedures for preparing a Transportation Impact Analysis in the County of San Diego. The TSG was updated in 2022 to address legislative changes in SB 743, which changed the basis for evaluating transportation impacts in CEQA from the Level of Service (LOS) metric to the VMT metric. As noted in the TSG, "The legislative intent of SB 743 was to 'more appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.'"

The project meets the screening criterion 4 (Locally Serving Retail Projects) of the County's Draft 2022 Transportation Study Guidelines. Pursuant to the County's adopted Transportation Study Guidelines, the project meets the CEQA VMT screening criteria for locally serving commercial projects that are less than 50,000 square feet and will not result in a significant VMT impact. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to consistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Additionally, since construction traffic is temporary, and workers are either travelling to the project jobsite or another jobsite elsewhere, the impact on VMT is considered less than significant. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact related to VMT, and no mitigation is required.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: An Access Analysis was prepared for the project by Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers dated October 15, 2024 (Appendix L). The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would not significantly alter roadway geometry on Via De La Valle. Via De La Valle is an undivided, 2-lane east-west roadway west of the west project driveway and is an undivided, 2-lane roadway with a two-way left-turn lane east of the west project driveway. The Access Analysis prepared for the project shows that both access driveways to the site are expected to function adequately with the projected trip generation and distribution (Appendix L). The project would be required to ensure that safe and adequate sight distance at the project driveways comply with applicable County road standards and to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. The driveway improvements would be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. The proposed project would not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Less Than Significant: The project would not generate traffic volumes that would impede emergency access. The proposed plans are required to comply with the County's emergency access requirements per the San Diego County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code, including turning radius and maneuverability of large emergency vehicles such as fire trucks and ambulances. Additionally, the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District has reviewed the project site plans and established conditions of project approval. Therefore, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: As previously described, a Historic Resources Evaluation Report was prepared for the project by Donna Beddow, County staff archaeologist, dated February 2025 (Appendix C). The following response has incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego adjunct cultural staff, it has been determined that the historical resources within the project site are not significant pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Therefore, the loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. See discussion in Section V(a), for further discussion on historic resources eligibility. Impacts would be less than significant.

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.

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

Discussion/Explanation: As previously described, an Archaeological Resources Survey Report was prepared for the project by ASM Affiliates, Inc., dated July 2023 (Appendix D). The Archaeological Resources Survey Report included a Sacred Lands File search and pedestrian survey of the project site. The following response has incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Although no archaeological resources were identified during the Phase I Archaeological Resources Survey, there is the potential for subsurface resources to be present due to the project's proximity to numerous prehistoric resources, important water sources for prehistoric and historic people, and because of the lack of ground surface visibility during the survey. Therefore, the Archaeological Resources Survey recommends monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor for the initial ground disturbance within the project area.

ASM Affiliates contacted the NAHC on May 24, 2023 to request a Sacred Lands File search of the project site. The NAHC response for the Sacred Lands File was negative. The NAHC also provided the contact information for tribal contacts within the local community for additional consultation. Information request letters were sent to the Native American groups and individuals provided by the NAHC on June 23, 2023.

- On July 7, 2023, Shuuluk Linton, Tribal Historic Preservation Office Coordinator, Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, responded that the project is within the Traditional Use Area of the Luiseño people. The tribe had no cultural resource information available to share at

this time, no comments, and did not request consultation. They recommended contacting local Kumeyaay tribes that are closer to the project area.

- On July 18, 2023, Daniel Tsosie, Cultural Resources Manager, Campo Band of Mission Indians, responded regarding a Kumeyaay Village within the vicinity of the project area and requested consultation and monitoring.

- On July 19, 2023, Stephen Rochester, Assistant Cultural Resources Director, La Posta Band of Mission Indians, responded that the project site is located near the San Dieguito valley and river, and the Tribe would like to be included in consultation and field work.

To date, no other responses have been received.

Given the reasons described above and the Campo Band of Mission Indians' request for monitoring, an Archaeological and Tribal Monitoring Program would be required with monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor for the initial ground disturbance within the project area as outlined in Section V, Cultural Resources. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of MM CUL-1.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project would develop a Jewish community religious facility and childcare center, including construction of Shul, community gathering areas, children's play area, parking, a new internal circulation (road) system, an entry gate with guard building, landscaping, and utility improvements. The proposed utility improvements and installation of a new on-site septic and wastewater treatment system could cause a significant environmental effect. For example, excavation required for installation of the on-site septic and wastewater treatment system could result in disturbance of potential archaeological, Tribal cultural, and/or paleontological resources buried beneath the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and GEO-1 would reduce these impacts to less than significant. Refer to Section V. Cultural Resources, Section VI. Geology and Soils, and Section XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources for further discussion. Therefore, the project would not result in any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects regarding the construction or relocation of utilities.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is served by Santa Fe Irrigation District. Minimal water would be required during project construction for dust control and suppression. Operation of the project would require water for landscaping and to serve the proposed Shul, Children's Center, administrative office, and residence. The Santa Fe Irrigation District provided a Water Service Availability Form (Appendix M) indicating it has sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Wastewater from the existing residence on the project site is currently collected in an on-site septic system and treated via an on-site wastewater treatment system. The project proposes the installation of a second on-site septic and wastewater treatment system. DEHQ has reviewed the proposed project and has no objection to the approval of the project provided that the project implement the following conditions of approval:

1. The applicant shall obtain all required permits from DEHQ for the installation of the proposed onsite wastewater treatment system(s) to serve the proposed use. This shall be required prior to the issuance of any building permits for the proposed structures.
2. The applicant shall provide a capacity test for each vertical seepage pit to be installed as part of this project. This shall be required prior to issuance of the Septic Permit for the installation of the proposed onsite wastewater treatment system(s).
3. Any existing septic tanks, proposed for continued use, must be inspected by a C42 or a licensed contractor and deemed to meet all current standards. Any such report must be submitted to DEHQ prior to building permit issuance.
4. Any existing onsite wastewater treatment system (septic tank, leach lines, or vertical seepage pits) found to not meet current setbacks to the proposed structures or those that are no longer in use must be properly abandoned and/or destroyed by the applicant. The applicant shall provide detailed documentation of such activity to DEHQ.

The proposed project would implement all conditions of approval and obtain the required permits from DEHQ for the installation of the proposed onsite wastewater treatment system. Given that the proposed project would not require off-site wastewater treatment, the project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers service capacity. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would develop a Jewish community religious facility and childcare center, including a Shul, Children's Center, office, small gathering spaces, and single-family home, which would result in long-term operational solid waste generation. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity, including Borrego Landfill (111,504 cubic yards [cy] remaining capacity), Otay Landfill (21,194,008 cy remaining capacity), West Miramar Sanitary Landfill (11,080,871 cy remaining capacity), Sycamore Landfill (113,972,637 cy remaining capacity), San Onofre Landfill (1,057,605 cy remaining capacity), and Las Pulgas Landfill (9,503,985 cy remaining capacity). Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and the project would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

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

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project would develop a Jewish community religious facility and childcare center, including a Shul, Children's Center, office, small gathering spaces, and single-family home. 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 CalRecycle under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The County requires recycling of 90 percent of inerts and 70 percent of all other materials from construction projects, per County Ordinance Section 68.508 through 68.518 (Diversion of Construction and Demolition Materials from Landfill Disposal). The project would be in compliance with County ordinances upon submission of a Construction and Demolition Debris Management Plan prior to the issuance of a building permit. Project operations and waste management methods would be consistent with the County's Strategic Plan to Reduce Waste (2017) through the support of commercial composting programs to reduce organic waste and comply with established waste diversion requirements (refer to Section VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions). The project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility, and therefore, would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE.

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

a) Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would be served by the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District Station 3, approximately 3.2 miles (driving distance) east of the project site. According to the Service Availability Letter (Appendix XX), the expected emergency travel time to the proposed project is five minutes, which is well below the County's goal of 10 minutes. As described in Section IX(e), the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The proposed project would develop a Jewish community religious facility and childcare center on an existing developed site. The project does not include any growth-inducing project components since the anticipated visitors would be located within the region and would not increase population growth. Therefore, no substantial demand beyond current conditions is required for emergency response. Access to the project site would be at from Via de la Valle and Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District would have Knox box access to the entry gates. Project access would comply with County road standards (e.g., road and street grade below 20 percent, paved streets with capacity to support up to 75,000 pounds, etc.). Therefore, the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located within a very high FHSZ in SRA and is within the WUI. Given that the majority of the County is in the high and very high FHSZ, the County has implemented fire safety measures depending on specific factors, such as location, vegetation, etc. Homes near the project site and their compliance with fuel modification requirements lower the fire threat and risk to the proposed project. The project would redevelop an existing developed site and therefore, would not exacerbate fire risk more than existing conditions at the project site. The project proposes installing maintained landscaping that can provide fire buffers. Additionally, the project would be required to meet applicable fire measures in the County's Consolidated Fire Code, Uniform Building Code, and California Fire Code, such as fire apparatus access and access road requirements. To ensure the project does not exacerbate wildfire risks, the project grading and building plans would require review and approval by the Vista Fire Protection District requirements. Therefore, the project would not expose project occupants, such as employees or attendees, to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Additionally, Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District Station 3 is located approximately 3.2 miles east of the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project includes development of a Jewish community religious facility and childcare center with associated infrastructure, such as road and parking improvements and utility improvements; however, the project site is currently developed with residential and commercial uses, and the project does not propose any structures or additional infrastructure that would Development and operation of the proposed project would be required to comply with the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code, and compliance with the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District's requirements. Therefore, based on project coordination with County staff and compliance with the County's and Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District's requirements, impacts associated with fire risk would be less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project includes development of a Jewish community religious facility and childcare center, including construction of Shul, community gathering areas, children's play area, parking, a new internal circulation (road) system, an entry gate with guard building, landscaping, and utility improvements. As described in Section X, Hydrology, the project site is not located in a floodplain or prone to flooding. All stormwater runoff from the project site would be conveyed to the proposed stormwater storage and treatment system. Therefore, the project site would not be prone to onsite flooding following construction of the project. In addition, project grading also must conform to the grading requirements outlined in the County Grading Ordinance and be verified in the field by a licensed or registered Civil Engineer and inspected by County Grading Inspectors. Due to the aforementioned factors, the project site would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Impacts are less than significant.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The potential of the project 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 Section IV and Section V of this Initial Study. In addition to project-specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. Please see Section V, Section VII, Section IX, and Section XVIII above. This an archaeological monitoring program, monitoring for paleontological resources, a Phase II subsurface investigation, and an Operations and Maintenance Plan**.** As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: 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	DETAILS
TIEFENBRUN ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT	PDS2007-3000-07-061	Administrative Permit for an oversized fence

BARNETT ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT	PDS2011-3000-11-044	Administrative Permit for a second dwelling unit

The potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in Sections I through XX of Initial Study. In addition to project-specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, and in consideration of all mitigation required by the project, there were determined to be no potentially significant cumulative effects the project would have a considerable contribution to. Mitigation has been included for project impacts that clearly reduces any potential for a considerable contribution to any cumulative effects to a level below significance. Please refer to Section V. *Cultural Resources*, Section VII. Geology and Soils, Section IX. *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, and Section XVIII. *Tribal Cultural Resources* above. This mitigation includes but is not limited to archaeological monitoring program, monitoring for paleontological resources, a Phase II subsurface investigation, and an Operations and Maintenance Plan. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, the project would have any considerable contribution to a cumulative impact. 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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in Section I. *Aesthetics*, Section III. *Air Quality*, Section VII. *Geology and Soils*, Section IX. *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, Section X. *Hydrology and Water Quality*, Section XIII. *Noise*, Section XIV. *Population and Housing*, and Section XVII. *Transportation*. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to potential hazardous materials. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes soil remediation and temporary sound barriers during construction. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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.

Appendix A – Visual Impact Report

Appendix B – Air Quality Analysis Report

Appendix C – Historic Resources Evaluation Report

Appendix D – Archaeological Resources Survey Report

Appendix E – CAP Consistency Checklist

Appendix F – Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

Appendix G – Priority Development Plan Storm Water Quality Management Plan

Appendix H – Drainage Study

Appendix I – Noise Analysis Report

Appendix J – Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District Service Availability Letter

Appendix K – Solana Beach School District Service Availability Letter

Appendix L – Access Analysis

Appendix M – Santa Fe Irrigation District Water Service Availability Form

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. December 14, 2017. https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf.

California Department of Conservation. 2022. CGS Seismic Hazards Program: Fault Traces. https://maps-cnra-cadoc.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/cadoc::cgs-seismic-hazards-program-fault-traces/explore?location=32.869270%2C-116.877257%2C10.77.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2020. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. (CT-HWANP-RT-13-069.25.3) April. Available at: https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tcvgm-apr2020-a11y.pdf.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. Available at:

https://oehha.ca.gov/air/crnr/notice-adoption-air-toxics-hot-spots-program-guidance-manual-preparation-health-risk-0.

State Water Resources Control Board. 2021. Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin, Chapter 2: Beneficial Uses. https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/docs/chapter_2.pdf.