



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR

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

September 7, 2017

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

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

Sringeri Vidya Bhatari Foundation (SVBF) Temple Major Use Permit;
PDS2015-MUP-15-011; PDS2015-ER-15-08-012

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

3. a. Contact: Ashley Smith, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 495-5375
c. E-mail: ashley.smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project site is located north of and adjacent to Old San Pasqual Road and south of State Route 78 (San Pasqual Road) in the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan area, within unincorporated San Diego County (APN 241-080-47).

Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1130, Grid F/6, G/6

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Dr. S.S. Iyer, 5 Yates Drive, East Brunswick, NJ 08816

6. General Plan
Community Plan: North County Metro Subregional Plan
Land Use Designation: Semi-Rural 2 (SR-2)
Density: 1 du/2, 4, 8 acres
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) N/A

7. Zoning
Use Regulation: A70
Minimum Lot Size: 2 acres
Special Area Regulation: A (Agriculture Preserve)

8. Description of project:

The project is a Major Use Permit (MUP) for a Hindu Temple on approximately 10 acres of a 19 acre parcel. The project site is located north of and adjacent to Old San Pasqual Road and south of State Route 78 (San Pasqual Road) in the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan area, within unincorporated San Diego County. The site is subject to the General Plan Semi-Rural Regional Category, Semi-Rural 2 (SR-2) Land Use Designation. Zoning for the site is A70 (Limited Agriculture).

The project consists of a one story 17,475 square feet main temple building that will have an 8,928 square feet main temple, 2,413 square feet kitchen and dining area and 6,134 square feet for the multipurpose hall. The main temple building would be 20-feet in height with the exception of a 42-foot steeple. The project also includes a one story 7,764 square feet five unit priest housing, each with three bedrooms. The Priest housing building would have a maximum height of 25 feet. There is also a 400 square feet barn to house two bovines and would have a maximum height of 14 feet.

The Temple is primarily used for private worship conducted by a priest for an individual or small groups on an as needed basis. The Temple would operate on weekdays (Monday-Friday) from 8:30 AM to 11:30 AM and 4:30 PM to 8:30 PM. On weekends and special holidays, the temple would operate from 8:30 AM to 8:30 PM. The temple would host up to 12 special events per year and has a total capacity of 400 people.

Access would be provided by a 24-foot wide paved driveway connecting to Old San Pasqual Rd. The project includes a total of 116 parking spaces, including 6 accessible spaces. The project would be served by on-site septic system (supplemental treatment system) and would be annexed into the Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District for water service. Earthwork will consist of 24,460 cubic yards of cut and 30,260 cubic yards of fill with 5,800 cubic yards of import.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Lands surrounding the project site are used for residential and agricultural uses. The Inland Valley Materials mine is located directly north of the site. The topography of the project site and adjacent land is gently to moderately sloping. The site is located adjacent to State Route 78 (San Pasqual Road).

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

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego
Annexation to a City or Special District	Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
General Industrial Storm water Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Rincon Del Diablo Water District
Fire District Approval	Escondido Fire District

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

YES

NO

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

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

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

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

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

Signature	September 7, 2017
Ashley Smith	Land Use/Environmental 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 on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

Based on a site visit completed by County staff, the proposed project is located near or within the viewshed of a scenic vista. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying land cover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The visual environment of the subject scenic vista extends along Highway 78 from Cloverdale Road to the east to Old San Pasqual Road to the west and within the surrounding rural residential neighborhood to the south. The visual composition consists of relatively flat to gently sloping land on the project site and increasing elevations to the west and south. Primary viewers of the project would be motorists traveling along Highway 78.

The proposed project is a Hindu temple. Based on photo simulations provided by Domus Studio, the project has been determined to be compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality as the project has been designed to fit into the landscape topographically as it sits lower in elevation than Highway 78 and Old San Pasqual Road, thus reducing its visual prominence. In addition, the proposed structures are set back approximately 250 feet from Highway 78 and the buildings have been designed to use earth tone colors which in turn visually blend the buildings into the surroundings. Finally, the project includes a robust landscape plan which will assist with shielding the building, thus reducing its prominence in the viewshed. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because the project would be visually integrated into the surroundings in an unobtrusive

manner. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic ([Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program](#)). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist’s line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway. As detailed in the County’s General Plan Update FEIR (2011), the County Scenic Highway System was originally intended to serve as a master plan for official State Scenic Highway designations. The County’s Scenic Highway System Priority List serves as the basis for initiating specific corridor studies. Only a handful of corridor studies have been initiated due to lack of funding and no routes have been officially designated as a County Scenic Highway. Currently, the list serves more as a source for identifying resources than as a way to implement the scenic highways program.

Based on a site visit completed by County staff, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway, but is located within the viewshed of a County scenic highway (Highway 78).

The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within the composite viewshed of the scenic highway, including the underlying landform and overlaying landcover, establish the visual environment. The visual environment of the subject scenic highway and resources extends along Highway 78 from Cloverdale Road to the east to Old San Pasqual Road to the west; and the visual composition consists of rural residential and agricultural uses as well as a mining facility. The undulating topography of this corridor along with scattered built environment features contribute to the overall high visual quality. There are also scattered non-native trees throughout this portion of the area surrounding along Highway 78, such as eucalyptus trees, that somewhat contribute to the diversity of the visual composition. There are no rock outcroppings or similar features within this portion of the subject scenic highway, or within the project site.

The proposed project is a Hindu temple. As previously detailed in the response to I(a) above, the project is generally compatible with the existing visual environment’s in terms of visual character and quality. The proposed project would not significantly damage scenic resources within this scenic highway. It would not significantly alter the topography of the project site, nor would it remove a significant amount of trees. As provided in the project’s landscaping plan,

the project will install a number of tree species, such as Indian laurel fig, date palm, coast live oak, and numerous species of fruit-bearing trees. Finally, there are no rock outcroppings or similar natural features on the project site. Therefore, with the implementation of the landscaping plan prepared for the project (and the aforementioned setbacks and earth-tone building colors), the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a scenic highway and impacts would be less than significant.

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

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer’s perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as varying degrees of development, from vacant land and agricultural uses to single family residential and mining uses on relatively flat to sloping grades.

As previously detailed in the response to I(a) above , the proposed project is a Hindu temple. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment’s visual character and quality for the following reasons: the project has been designed to fit into the landscape topographically as it sits lower in elevation than Highway 78 and Old San Pasqual Road reducing its visual prominence. In addition, the proposed structures are set back over 250 feet from Highway 78 and the buildings have been designed to use earth tone colors which assist the facility to visually blend into its surroundings. Finally, the project include a robust landscape plan which will assist with shielding the building and reducing its prominence in the viewshed.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons:

the project would be visually integrated into the surroundings in an unobtrusive manner. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209), including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: An Agricultural Analysis was prepared for the project (James Chagala and Associates, 2017). There is currently no agricultural activity taking place on this property. The County of San Diego has approved a local methodology that is used to determine the importance of agricultural resources in the unincorporated area of San Diego County known as the Local Agricultural Resource Assessment (LARA) Model. The LARA Model takes into account six factors including the required factors of water, climate, soil quality, and the complementary factors of surrounding land uses, land use consistency, and slope in determining the importance of agricultural resources. The LARA model determined that the project, for the required factors, has a rating of low for water, high for climate, moderate for soil quality. The water rating for this project is low as the site is located within the County Water Authority (CWA) boundary but is not located within a Water District and there is no water meter or other infrastructure serving the property. In addition, the property is located on fractured crystalline rock. For the complementary factors, the project has a high rating for surrounding land uses, low rating for land use consistency, and high rating for topography. As the project has a low rating for one of the required factors, the project site does not have important agricultural resources as defined by the LARA Model and the direct conversion of agricultural resources would not occur. Therefore, direct impacts would be less than significant.

The guideline for determining the significances of the indirect impacts to agricultural operations are as follow:

1. The project proposed a non-agricultural land use within one-quarter mile of an active agricultural operation or land under a Williamson Act Contract (Contract) and as a result of the project, land use conflicts between the agricultural operation or Contract land and the proposed project would likely occur and could result in conversion of agricultural resources to a non-agricultural use.
2. The project proposes a school, church, day care or other use that involves a concentration of people at certain times within one mile of an agricultural operation or land under Contract and as a result of the project, land use conflicts between the agricultural operation or

Contract land and the proposed project would likely occur and could result in conversion of agricultural resources to a non-agricultural use.

- 3. The project would involve other changes to the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of offsite agricultural resource to a non-agricultural use or could adversely impact the viability of agriculture on land under a Contract.

There is land under a contract within 1/4 miles of this property and 98 acres under contract within the ZOI. However, the proposed religious facility will not result in conflicts with any agricultural operations that will result in conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural use for the following reasons. The project would have large concentrations of people and would be within 1 mile of agricultural land and land under a Williamson Act contract. However, the concentrations of people will not occur when the agricultural activity is taking place. In addition, all temple activities will take place inside of the Temple. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in land use conflicts between the agricultural operation or Contract land and the proposed project and which could result in conversion of agricultural resources to a non-agricultural use.

The project would not involve other changes to the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of offsite agricultural resource. This property is currently vacant and the area to be developed has never been used for agriculture.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is zoned A70, Limited Agricultural, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because Religious Assembly is a permitted use in the A70 zone upon approval of a Major Use Permit and will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There has been no historical agricultural use on property dating back to 1964, except for the 2.86 acres in the northwest corner of the property. This area appears to be have been tilled between the years 1995 and 2005 and possibly 2009. The 2.86 acres is not proposed for any development and therefore will not be impacted by this project. Thus any impact on this property by the proposed development will be on land which has never been in agriculture.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes development that was anticipated in San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. As such, the project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below the screening-level thresholds (SLTs), and subsequently will not violate ambient air quality standards.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the San Diego Air Pollution Control District’s (SDAPCD’s) established SLTs for all new source review (NSR) projects in SDAPCD Rule 20.2. These SLTs can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate a project’s total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since SDAPCD does not have an SLT for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC), the SLT for VOC from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which is appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) is used.

The project proposes to construct a new 17,500-square foot temple, a 5-unit apartment building for priest housing, and a 116-space parking lot. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the SLTs established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance because construction activities would disturb less than 3.5 acres of ground surface material in a single day.¹ In addition, based on the traffic impact study conducted for the project², the project trip rate was estimated to be 198 average daily trips (ADT) on weekdays and 630 ADT on

¹ County of San Diego. 2007. *Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirement, Air Quality*. Available: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/ProjectPlanning/docs/AQ-Report-Format.pdf>.

² Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG). 2015. *Traffic Impact Analysis: SVBF Temple*.

weekends. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans³, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the SLTs established by the Guidelines for criteria pollutants. As such, the project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California ambient air quality standard (CAAQS) for ozone. San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) and particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}) under the CAAQS. Ozone is formed when VOC and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, NO_x and VOC from construction/grading activities, as well as VOC as the result of increase of traffic from project implementation. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and VOC emissions below the SLTs established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The vehicle trips generated from the project would result in 198 ADT on weekdays and 630 ADT on weekends. According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the SLTs established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance for VOC, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for

³ Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *California Environmental Quality Act: Air Quality Guidelines*. Available: http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en.

determining significance for VOC, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}; therefore, the construction and operation-generated emissions associated with the project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, or any ozone precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: single-family residences. However, based on review by a County staff air quality specialist, this project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and would not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project has emissions below the SLTs established by the County guidelines for determining significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the project. As such, no direct or cumulative impact from odors is anticipated.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County’s Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit and a Biological Resources Letter Report (Everett and Associates 2017), the site supports 3.73 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub, 12.62 acres of non-native grassland, 0.11 acre of southern mixed chaparral, 0.10 acre of southern willow scrub, 0.87 acre of eucalyptus woodland and 2.44 acres of developed and disturbed lands. No sensitive plant or animal species were observed on site. The Major Use Permit boundary covers only a portion of the site and will result in impacts to 8.60 acres of non-native grassland and 0.09 acre of southern mixed chaparral. The onsite drainage consisting of southern willow scrub as well as a 50-foot buffer from the drainage will be preserved in a biological open space easement and protected by a 100-foot limited building zone easement.

Mitigation for impacts to non-native grassland and southern mixed chaparral will be provided through the purchase of 4.35 acres of offsite tier III habitat. In addition, the project will be conditioned to avoid the raptor breeding season and to provide a biological open space easement and limited building zone easement protected by open space fencing and signage.

County staff reviewed the past, present, and probable future projects as listed in Section XVII(b) and has determined that the cumulative loss of coastal sage scrub may cause a significant impact on candidate, sensitive, or special status species. However, this project’s contribution to the cumulative habitat loss will be less than cumulatively considerable because the project will be conditioned to purchase offsite mitigation that would be conserved in perpetuity.

Therefore, staff has determined that although the site supports native biological habitat, implementation of the mitigation measures described above will ensure that the project will not result in substantial adverse effects, or have a cumulatively considerable impact to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and 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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Although the project site contains riparian habitat, the project will avoid this habitat and will also include a 50-foot buffer from this habitat through the dedication of a biological open space easement and 100-foot limited building zone. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse impact on any riparian habitat. The project site contains non-native grassland and southern mixed chaparral which are considered sensitive natural communities by the County, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. As detailed in response a) above, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Fish and Wildlife Code, and Endangered Species Act are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on a site visit conducted by County staff and as supported by the Biological Resources Letter Report (Everett and Associates), it has been determined that the proposed project will avoid any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers. The areas of the site containing wetlands in accordance with the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) will not be impacted by project implementation as there will be a 50' wide biological buffer in place along the wetland and a 100' limited building zone extending from the biological buffer.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Letter Report (Everett and Associates) dated March 10, 2017, it has been determined that the site has limited biological value and impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native

resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the proposed project for the following reasons: the site is located immediately adjacent to developed roads including Highway 78 to the north and Old San Pasqual Road to the south with no evidence of wildlife utilizing the site for movement, dispersal, or as a nursery. The site does contain a drainage that may serve as a local wildlife movement corridor but the drainage is avoided by the dedication of a biological open space easement over the drainage and 50-foot wetland buffer as well as the dedication of a 100-foot limited building zone easement. Therefore, the project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites because the property does not support linear, topographical and/or vegetation features and adequate protective cover that might encourage wildlife movement of large mammals to forage and use as nursery sites.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The conversion of natural habitats in the unincorporated County of San Diego is currently regulated through Subarea Planning efforts in compliance with the Natural Community Conservation Program (NCCP) process, and in accordance with County Guidelines based on the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The site is within the South County MSCP Subarea Plan, and is not designated as a Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA).

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: A cultural resources report was prepared for the proposed project (Brian F. Smith, 2016). Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property, it has been determined that there are one or more historical resources within the project site. These resources include an abandoned airstrip and associated subterranean support structure. The cultural resources report evaluated the significance of the historical resources based on a review of historical records including:

- The National Register of Historic Places Index
- Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility
- OHP Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File
- San Diego County 1872 Map
- San Diego County Historic Road Map (1769 to 1885)
- The *Escondido* 7.5-minute topographic map (1948)

Based on the results of this study, it has been determined that the historic resource is not significant pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Because the resources are not considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. Therefore, no impact would occur.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Based on a site visit and review of aerial photography, the site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance

for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A review of the County’s Paleontological Resources Maps indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The cultural resources report did not identify any human remains on site. However, there is potential on any undeveloped site to contain undiscovered human remains. Any disturbance could potentially violate existing state regulations. The California HSC Section 7050.5 has specific provisions for the protection of human burial remains, Native American or otherwise, if they are discovered. HSC Section 7050.5 requires that in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site, or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent remains, until the County Coroner has examined the remains. The project would be required to adhere to the existing state laws and regulations. Therefore, compliance with existing regulations would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to 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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be there will 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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as VaC (Visalia sandy loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes) and VsE2 (Vista coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes, eroded) that have a soil erodibility rating of "moderate" and "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Storm water Management Plan dated November 9, 2016, prepared by BWE Inc. The plan includes Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

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

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land

disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project involves 30,260 cubic yards of grading that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. In order to assure that any proposed buildings (including those proposed on the project site) are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are VaC (Visalia sandy loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes) and VsE2 (Vista coarse sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes, eroded). However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the

Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact The project proposes the use of a supplemental treatment system (STS) to treat the wastewater generated by the proposed project. The design conforms to the Local Agency Management Program (LAMP), as adopted by San Diego County on July 24, 2015, under section 68.301 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. DEH has reviewed the onsite wastewater treatment system for the project pursuant to the LAMP, and approved the design on August 30, 2016. The project will comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3. The property owner will be required to obtain an Annual Operating Permit from the Department of Environmental Health for the onsite wastewater treatment system prior to occupancy. The Annual Operating Permit must be renewed each year with the Department of Environmental Health. The property owner will be required to obtain and maintain an annual service contract, from a qualified service provider, for their onsite wastewater treatment system. This contract must include biannual inspections and reporting of all inspection results to DEH by the owner or their service provider.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are said to 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, hydrofluorocarbons, and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. A regional GHG inventory prepared for the San Diego Region⁴ identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 43 percent of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (24 percent) and third (9 percent) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

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, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

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

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

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. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) states that an environmental impact report (EIR) shall analyze GHG emissions resulting from a project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

The annual 900 metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂e) screening level is used which is referenced in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) CEQA and Climate Change white paper dated January 2008 which can be found at <http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/05/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf>. Projects that meet or fall below the screening level are expected to result in 900 MTCO₂e per year or less and would not require additional analysis.

⁴ San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory: *An Analysis of Regional Emissions and Strategies to Achieve AB 32 Targets Revised and Updated to 2010*. University of San Diego and the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC), March 2013.

GHG emissions associated with the project were quantified by County Staff using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.1 computer program.⁵ Modeling was based on project-specific information (e.g., building size, area to be graded, paving area, energy information) where available; assumptions based on typical construction activities; and default values in CalEEMod that are based on the project’s location and land use type. Construction of the project was assumed to begin in Summer 2018 and take approximately 12 months to complete. Total construction emissions were amortized over a 30-year period, consistent with guidance from the South Coast Air Quality Management District.⁶ Emissions generated from project construction are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Construction-Generated Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Year	MTCO_{2e}/year
2018	368
2019	101
Total Construction GHG Emissions	469
Amortized Over 30 Years	16
Notes: GHG = greenhouse gas; MTCO _{2e} /year = metric ton of carbon dioxide equivalent per year Source: Modeled by County staff in 2017 using CalEEMod Version 2016.3.1	

As shown in Table 1, project construction is estimated to generate a total of 469 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) over the duration of the construction period. Amortized construction emissions over a 30-year period results in annualized emissions of 16 MTCO_{2e}.

Operational emissions from all sources were estimated at full project buildout. The first full year of operation was assumed to be 2020. Project-related operational emissions of GHGs were estimated to be the following sources: area sources (e.g., landscaping-related fuel combustion sources), energy use (i.e., electricity and natural gas consumption), water use, solid waste generation, and mobile sources. Mobile source emissions were estimated using daily trip rate information in the traffic impact study conducted for the project.⁷ The project trip rate was estimated to be higher on the weekend than weekdays. The project was estimated to generate 198 average daily trips on weekdays and 630 average daily trips on weekends. The trip distance for the applicable land use was modified upwards to 20 miles for a one-way trip to conservatively account for driving distance of patrons. Indirect emissions associated with electricity consumption were calculated using GHG emission factors forecasted for San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) for 2020 based on the utility’s progress toward achieving the State’s Renewable Portfolio Standard goal of attaining 33 percent of electricity from renewable sources. CalEEMod default energy intensity factor is based on 2009 Power Utility Protocol data for SDG&E, and SDG&E procured 10.2 percent of its electricity from renewable sources in 2009.⁸ Therefore, the default energy intensity factor was further reduced by 22.8 percent. The project’s level of electricity and natural gas usage were based on 2016 Title 24-adjusted

⁵ California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. 2016. *California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.1*. Available at: <http://www.caleemod.com/>.

⁶ South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2008. *Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules, and Plans*.

⁷ Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG). 2015. *Traffic Impact Analysis: SVBF Temple*.

⁸ San Diego Gas & Electric. 2012. *Provisional Closing Report for California Renewables Portfolio Standard 20% Program*.

consumption rates provided by CalEEMod for place of worship and apartment land use types. Adjustments were based on the California Energy Commission (CEC) estimate that residential and nonresidential buildings are 28 and 5 percent, respectively, more efficient than 2013 Title 24 standards.⁹ CalEEMod default rates were used for water consumption and solid waste generation. The loss of sequestered carbon associated with the removal of vegetation was estimated using the vegetation module in CalEEMod and the type and amount of vegetation that would be permanently removed. The project was conservatively assumed to remove 1.75 acres of vegetation based on site acreage. Project-generated GHG emissions are shown below in Table 2.

Table 2 Project-Generated Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Source	MTCO ₂ e/year
Area	<1
Energy	67
Mobile	653
Waste	51
Water	7
Amortized Construction Emissions	16
Vegetation Removal Emissions	8
Total Project GHG Emissions	801
Screening Level	900
Exceed Screening Level?	No
Notes: GHG = greenhouse gas; MTCO ₂ e/year = metric ton of carbon dioxide equivalent per year	
Source: Modeled by County staff in 2017 using CalEEMod Version 2016.3.1	

As shown above, total GHG emissions associated with the project would generate a total of 801 MTCO₂e per year. The project emissions would not exceed the 900 MTCO₂e screening level. Therefore, it is determined that the project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

b) 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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: In 2006, the State of California passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the GHG emissions reduction goal for the State into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to

⁹ California Energy Commission. 2015 (June). *2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards*. Adoption Hearing.

1990 levels by reducing GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

SB 375, passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the CARB to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing, and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under the CEQA. SANDAG has prepared the region’s SCS and the 2050 RTP which are elements of the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. The strategy identifies how regional GHG reduction targets, as established by the CARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

To implement State mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The County of San Diego’s General Plan incorporates policies related to climate change. These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets.

As discussed in VII(a) above, the project’s GHG emissions would be below the 900 MTCO_{2e} screening level. The project’s emissions would occur only during the duration of grading activities and would cease at completion of such activities. Therefore, the project would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 16 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County.

This project is in an area of the County that is currently unserved by any fire agency. The project will be conditioned to annex into the Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District, which provides fire & emergency services via contract with the Escondido Fire District.

Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Major Use Permit or building permit process. A Fire Service Availability Letter dated April 9, 2015 from Fire Station # 4 has been received which indicate a response time of five minutes. In addition, a Fire Protection Plan Letter report dated January 15, 2016, has been accepted. The conditions from the Fire Protection Plan Letter Report include: 100 foot setback from the centerline of Old San Pasqual Road, all structures built with ignition-resistive construction requirements, all habitable structures and attached garages shall have fire sprinklers, a minimum 100-foot Fuel Management Zone will be established and maintained around all structures over 250 square feet in size, the fuel management zone shall be maintained by property owner annually or as often as needed. The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be 5.9 minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the Safety Element is 10 minutes. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and through compliance with the San Diego County’s Fire Authorities’ conditions, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project will require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a SWQMP which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

The Priority Development Project Storm Water Quality Management Plan (PDP SWQMP) prepared by BWE Inc. dated November 6, 2016 proposes bioretention basins to provide pollutant and hydromodification management control in order to avoid potential water quality and water quantity impacts from the proposed development.

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 Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the San Pasqual (905.32) hydrologic subarea, within the San Dieguito hydrologic unit. As discussed in the Storm Water Quality Management Plan, according to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, this watershed is impaired for:

303(d) Impaired Water	Body Pollutant(s)/Stressor(s)	TMDLs / WQIP Highest Priority Pollutant
Cloverdale Creek	Phosphorus, Total Dissolved Solids	Phosphorus, Total Dissolved Solids
San Dieguito River	Enterococcus, Fecal Coliform, Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Total Dissolved Solids, Toxicity	Enterococcus, Fecal Coliform, Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Total Dissolved Solids, Toxicity
Hodges Lake	Color, Manganese, Mercury, Nitrogen, pH, Phosphorus, Turbidity	Color, Manganese, Mercury, Nitrogen, pH, Phosphorus, Turbidity

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: Sediment, nutrients, heavy metals, organic compounds, trash & debris, oxygen demanding substances, oil & grease, bacteria & viruses, pesticides due to erosion, fertilizer application,

vehicle parking and use, cleaning supplies, waste disposal, food preparation, sanitary waste disposal and pesticide application. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or permanent post construction pollutant and hydromodification control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: prevention of illicit discharges, storm drain stenciling, preservation of existing hydrologic features, conservation of natural areas, minimization of impervious areas, minimization of soil compaction, impervious area dispersion, landscaping with native plant species, and biofiltration BMPs. As discussed in the PDP SWQMP identification of project site pollutants is only required if flow-thru BMPs are implemented in lieu of biofiltration BMPs.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will 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 storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego includes the following: San Diego Region, Order No. R9-2013-0001; County Watershed Protection Ordinance; Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO); County BMP Design 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 will 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 Watershed Protection Ordinance 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 Storm Water Quality Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures that will ensure that the project will not discharge to impaired water bodies. Therefore, preparation and implementation of the SWQMP would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board 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 San Pasqual (905.32) hydrologic subarea, within the San Dieguito hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; estuarine habitat; marine habitat;

preservation of biological habitats of special significance; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: parking lots, landscaped areas, septic system, driveways, waste disposal and food preparation. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or permanent post construction pollutant and hydromodification control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: prevention of illicit discharges, storm drain stenciling, preservation of existing hydrologic features, conservation of natural areas, minimization of impervious areas, minimization of soil compaction, impervious area dispersion, landscaping with native plant species, and biofiltration BMPs.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will obtain its water supply from the Rincon Del Diablo Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. Existing drainage patterns and discharge locations will be maintained to the maximum extent technically feasible and the proposed development will not increase post development runoff. The existing natural hydrologic feature will be preserved on site and will not be impacted by the proposed development. The potential for erosion will be mitigated by proposed landscape plantings of native drought tolerant species in accordance with the Landscape Ordinance. Please refer to the CEQA Drainage Study dated November 2016 and PDP SWQMP dated November 2016 prepared by BWE, Inc.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The onsite drainage pattern will change minimally due to the proposed development, but the runoff will continue to flow in the same general direction towards existing unnamed natural creek located northeast side of the site. The peak flow rate in the proposed condition is reduced from the peak flow rate in the existing condition. Therefore, an adverse drainage impact is not anticipated due to this development. Refer to the CEQA Drainage Study dated November 2016 prepared by BWE, Inc.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Storm water runoff from the site is collected and conveyed by a system of downspouts, inlets, planters, and storm drain pipes. The proposed development avoids storm water quantity impacts to the maximum extent practicable through the use of the best management practices. The existing drainage pattern will change slightly to accommodate the proposed development. The mitigated peak flow rate due to the 100 year storm is anticipated to be reduced from the existing condition peak flow rate by 3.12 cfs. This

does not represent a substantial increase in runoff water and would be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Storm water runoff from the site is collected and conveyed by a system of downspouts, inlets, planters, and storm drain pipes. The proposed development mitigates the storm water quantity impacts to the maximum extent practicable through the use of the best management practices.

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact will occur.

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact will occur.

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. It has been determined that the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, though the project does propose land disturbance that will expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to introduce either new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. However, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community for the following reasons: the project will introduce potable water service to the site (through a LAFCO annexation) and will require the extension of water service by approximately 800 feet. Because the surrounding area is already served by potable water service, the project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the General Plan Semi-Rural Regional Category and contains lands within the Semi-Rural 2 (SR-2) Land Use Designation. The project is also subject to the policies of the North County Metro Subregional Plan. The property is zoned Limited Agricultural (A70) which permits a religious assembly facility with a Major Use Permit pursuant to the Section 2705 of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations and impacts would be less than significant.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is currently surrounded by developed land uses including residential uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. The placement of the proposed use on the project site would not result in a loss of mineral resources because the feasibility of future mining at the site is already impacted by existing land use incompatibilities. Based on current land use conditions, a future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and other impacts, thereby reducing the feasibility of future mining operations occurring, regardless of the proposed project.

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

XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: A Noise Analysis was prepared for the proposed project (Louden and Associates 2016). Incorporation of noise measures and conditions would ensure the project would not exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan,

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The project is subject to the County Noise Element interior noise level requirement of 50 dBA CNEL. Based on the location of adjacent roadways, an interior noise assessment would be required prior to building permit issuance. Interior noise measures may include upgrades to window STC ratings. The Major Use Permit would be conditioned to require this interior assessment at the time building plans are available for review. Therefore, implementation of an interior noise assessment would ensure that the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the Noise Element within the County of San Diego General Plan.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

The project is zoned for agricultural use (A70) and subject to the most restrictive nighttime one-hour average sound level limit of 45 dBA and daytime 50 dBA pursuant to Section 36.404. Primary noise sources associated with the project are composed of building related mechanical equipment. There will be no use of generator units, no outdoor events, and no uses of amplified equipment that would exceed County noise standards. Additionally, the Major Use Permit would be condition to require all noise generating equipment and operations to conform to the County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.404. Therefore, the project would comply with this section of the County Noise Ordinance.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

The project is also subject to construction noise limits related to project grading activities. Temporary construction equipment activities are subject to a 75 dBA eight-hour average limit at an occupied boundary line. Based on the project description, typical construction equipment to prepare and grade the site would involve excavation equipment, haul trucks, scrapers and dozers. No drilling or blasting is proposed. No use of impulsive type of heavy equipment is anticipated. The applicant does not propose any materials processing on site and grading is estimated to be complete within 3 months. North of the site, across the roadway is an existing industrial use, Escondido Materials. Neighboring properties to the south east and west have existing residences. A majority of the combined grading operations would be more than 100 feet away from the adjacent boundary lines. No off-site construction is proposed. Grading activities are anticipated not to be located at a single location in close to an existing residence for a long duration of time. General grading operations are spread out over the entire project site. Project construction equipment operations are not anticipated to exceed the 75 dBA requirement eight hour average sound level required and best management practices for construction equipment would be a condition of approval requirement. Therefore, the project demonstrates Noise Ordinance compliance for grading operations.

Finally, 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 36.409) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in

excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. The proposed facilities are typically setback more than 50 feet from any County Circulation Element (CE) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 38 VdB or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities would insure that these proposed uses or operations do not have any chance of being impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 1995, Rudy Hendriks, *Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations* 2002). This setback insures that this project site will not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: temple activities and vehicle traffic on nearby roadways. As indicated in the response listed under Section XII Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise

sensitive areas to direct noise impacts over existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff and the Noise Analysis prepared by LDN Consulting dated March 2016. Additionally, the project will not result in cumulative noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. Refer to XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

d) 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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is subject to construction equipment operations related to project grading activities. Temporary construction equipment activities are subject to a 75 dBA eight hour average limit at an occupied boundary line. Based on the project description, typical construction equipment to prep and grade the site would involve excavation equipment, haul trucks, scrapers and dozers. No proposed drilling and no blasting is proposed. No use of impulsive type of heavy equipment is anticipated. The applicant does not propose any materials processing on site and grading is estimated to be complete within 3 months. North of the site, across the roadway is an existing industrial use, Escondido Materials. Neighboring properties to the south east and west have existing residences. A majority of the combined grading operations would be more than 100 feet away from the adjacent boundary lines. No off-site construction is proposed. Blasting and material processing on site are not proposed. Grading activities are anticipated not to be located at a single location in close to an existing residence for a long duration of time. General grading operations are spread out over the entire project site. Project construction equipment operations are not anticipated to exceed the 75 dBA requirement eight hour average sound level required and best management practices for construction equipment would be a condition of approval requirement. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes annexation into the Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District for water service. However, this regulatory change will not induce substantial population growth in an area, because the extension of infrastructure and public facilities such as water, sewer or roadways into previously unserved areas is consistent with the County General Plan and project will be consistent County planning goals.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace any existing housing since the site is currently vacant.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
 - i. Fire protection?
 - ii. Police protection?
 - iii. Schools?
 - iv. Parks?
 - v. Other public facilities?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Escondido Fire Department and the San Pasqual School District/Escondido Union High School District. The project is located entirely within the district and is eligible for service. In addition, the project will be required to annex into the Rincon Del Diablo Water District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XV. RECREATION

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

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

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to construct a five-unit priest housing, each with three bedrooms. Four of the residences will be occupied by full time resident priests. One unit will be reserved for visiting guests. The small amount of people residing on-site are not expected to increase the use of existing parks such that substantial physical deterioration would occur. 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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?

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

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A Traffic Impact Study, dated November 17, 2015, prepared by LLG Engineers was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study identified that the proposed project will result in 198 ADT. The project trips will be distributed to the street system based on the project's proximity to state highways and arterials. However, it was found that the project will not have a direct impact related to a conflict with any performance measures establishing measures of effectiveness of the circulation system because the project trips do not exceed any of the County's Guidelines for

Determining Significance for determining significant direct impacts. As identified in the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation, the project trips would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not have a direct impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

Concerning cumulative impacts, the 198 ADT will be distributed on Mobility Element roadways in the County, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. The TIF program creates a mechanism to proportionally fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. These new projects were based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing Mobility Element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region’s freeways have been addressed in SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, State, and Federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. By ensuring TIF funds are spend for the specific roadway improvements identified in the TIF Program, the CEQA mitigation requirement is satisfied and the Mitigation Fee nexus is met. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

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

Discussion/Explanation: California State Proposition 111, passed by voters in 1990, established a requirement that urbanized areas prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP). The requirements within the State CMP were developed to monitor the performance of the transportation system, develop programs to address near-term

and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. SANDAG provided regular updates for the state CMP from 1991 through 2008. In October 2009, the San Diego region elected to be exempt from the State CMP and, since this decision, SANDAG has been abiding by 23 CFR 450.320 to ensure the region’s continued compliance with the federal congestion management process. SANDAG has been designated as the TMA for the San Diego region. San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, the region's long-range transportation plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy, meets the requirements of 23 CFR 450.320 by incorporating the following federal congestion management process: performance monitoring and measurement of the regional transportation system, multimodal alternatives and non-SOV analysis, land use impact analysis, the provision of congestion management tools, and integration with the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process

Less Than Significant Impact: A Traffic Impact Study, dated November 17, 2015, prepared by LLG Engineers was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study identified that the proposed project would result in an additional 198 ADT. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. By ensuring TIF funds are spend for the specific roadway improvements identified in the TIF Program, the CEQA mitigation requirement is satisfied and the Mitigation Fee nexus is met. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impedes adequate site distance on a road.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A Traffic Impact Study, dated November 15, 2017, prepared by LLG Engineers was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study identified that the proposed project would result in an additional 198 ADT. The project will dedicate additional ROW to the fronting public road. Therefore, with mitigation, the project will not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. As a result of tribal outreach, four tribes responded (Pechanga, Rincon, San Luis Rey, and Soboba). Pechanga declined consultation and Soboba deferred to more southerly tribes. Formal consultation meetings were held with San Luis Rey and Rincon. Consultation was concluded with San Luis Rey. Consultation conclusion has been requested of Rincon. To date, a response has not been received. No tribal cultural resources were identified during consultation. As such, there are no impacts to tribal cultural resources.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to discharge wastewater to a supplemental treatment system (STS). Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board’s (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for STS “to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained.” The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain STS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the STS and approved the project’s STS on August 30, 2016. Therefore, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency. Impacts would therefore be less than significant.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project involves a new onsite wastewater treatment facility. The new facility includes a supplemental treatment system. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form, the new facility will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. The new facilities include biofiltration basins. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form, the new facilities will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment, because all related impacts from the proposed storm water facilities have been mitigated to a level below significance. Refer to the PDP SWQMP prepared on November 2016 by BWE, Inc. for more information.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires water service from the Rincon Del Diablo Water District. The Rincon Del Diablo Water District has indicated that adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources upon annexation into the district. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

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

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

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will rely completely on an on-site wastewater system (supplemental treatment system); therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider’s service capacity.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

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

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal

community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly biological resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes dedication of a biological open space easement and limited building zone, open space fencing and signage, offsite mitigation and breeding season avoidance. 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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

PDS2007-3800-07-007	EMBLY, GPA 07-007; REZ 07-004; TPM 21062
PDS2003-3300-03-002	THE HOWARD HOUSE
PDS2004-3300-04-026	VILLAGE NURSERY MONOPALM CELL SITE
PDS2006-3300-06-009	WHELAN MONOPOLE
PDS2006-3300-06-029	NS-341-01 LYDICK RESIDENCE
PDS2006-3300-06-029	NS-341-01 LYDICK RESIDENCE

PDS2006-3300-06-070	SAN-217-D ROHNAN RESIDENCE
PDS2008-3300-08-004	CINGULAR,WIRELESS FACILITY, P08-004
PDS2010-3300-10-036	AT&T MOBILITY VILLAGE NURSERY WIRELESS T
PDS2011-3300-81-044	OFTEDAL LOT AVERAGING
PDS2011-3300-90-046	RINCON RADIO TOWER
PDS2011-3300-90-047	US WEST CELLULAR
PDS2011-3399-08-004	AT&T MOBILITY, CONDITION OF SATISFACTION
PDS2013-MUP-13-016	AT&T Rohan Residence NS0338
PDS2006-3301-90-047-01	WHELAN MONOPOLE W1
PDS2011-3301-08-004-01	LYDICK, MUP MOD P 08-004W1
PDS2014-MUP-90-047W2	SD06591 Mary Lane
PDS2000-3400-00-036	COX/SPRINT PCS
PDS2000-3400-00-088	NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS
PDS2000-3400-00-147	PACIFIC BELL WIRELESS
PDS2010-3400-95-024	AIR TOUCH CELLULAR
PDS2006-3401-95-024-01	WILD ANIMAL PARK
PDS1995-3600-95-011	CLOVERDALE HEIGHTS
PDS1999-3600-99-013	FRANKS
PDS2010-3500-10-026	DEL BIANCO STP 10-026
PDS2010-3500-10-026	DEL BIANCO STP 10-026
PDS2011-3500-88-111	SAN PASQUAL/MADRIGAL PRD STP
PDS2000-3100-4776	Mary Lane
PDS2001-3100-4781	KONYN
PDS2002-3100-5159	CROWE SUBDIVISION TM
PDS2003-3100-5178	DOOLEY SUBDIVISION TM5178
PDS2010-3100-3691	HOLLIDAY HILL TM
PDS2011-3100-4555	MORRISON HOMES TM4555
PDS2011-3100-4567	WOHLFORD PRD TM
PDS2011-3100-4890	RANCHO DEL VERDE ESTATES
PDS2011-3100-4987	CROWE TM4987
PDS2014-TM-5583	Oro Verde 10 lot Subdivision
PDS1999-3200-20455	PURDUM & FRANKS TPM
PDS2001-3200-20517	SCHELLING TPM
PDS2002-3200-20705	ZUNGUI TPM
PDS2003-3200-20492	SMATHERS TPM
PDS2007-3200-21062	EMBLY, GPA 07-007; REZ 07-004; TPM 21062
PDS2007-3200-21111	PETERSEN, TPM, 2 LOTS
PDS2008-3200-19665	RANCHO DEL VERDE ESTATES
PDS2008-3200-19713	TPM - OFF VISTA DEL SEMBRADO, ESCONDIDO
PDS2009-3200-20146	HENRY TPM
PDS2011-3200-21188	MALL RESIDENCE, TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP, 21

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVIII of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF). As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, IX Hydrology and Water Quality XII. Noise, XIII. Population and Housing, and XVI. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF. 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.

XX. 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.

Agricultural Analysis, James Chagala and Associates, March 16, 2017

Biological Resources Letter Report, Everett and Associates, March 10, 2017

Cultural Resources Study, Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc., August 9, 2017

Drainage Study, BWE, June 2017

Fire Protection Plan Letter Report, DomusStudio Architecture, January 15, 2016

Photosimulations, DomusStudio Architecture

Priority Development Project (PDP) SWQMP, BWE, March 22, 2017

Traffic Impact Analysis, Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers, August 8, 2017

AESTHETICS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)

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

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

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

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

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

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

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

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

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

AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFW and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

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

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

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

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

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

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

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

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

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

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

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

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

1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

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

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

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

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

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

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

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

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

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association

Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition.
(www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

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

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

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

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

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

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002.
(www.projectcleanwater.org)

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

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

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

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

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

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

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

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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

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

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989.
(www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted August 3, 2011.
(ceres.ca.gov)

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

NOISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POPULATION & HOUSING

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

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

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

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

RECREATION

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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