



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

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

DARREN GRETLER
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

September 4, 2015

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

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

SWEETWATER PLACE; PDS2014-GPA-14-003, PDS2014-REZ-14-003, PDS2014-TM-5588, PDS2014-STP-14-015; PDS2014-ER-14-19-005

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: David Sibbet, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3091
c. E-mail: David.Sibbet@sdcounty.ca.gov

4. Project location:

2657 Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, Spring Valley, CA 91977 (APN: 505-231-36)

Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1291, Grid F/1

5. Project Applicant name and address:

SAM Sweetwater LLC
20201 SW Birch Street, Suite 100
Newport Beach, CA 92660

6. General Plan

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Community Plan: | Spring Valley |
| Land Use Designation: | Public/Semi-Public Facilities (P/SP) |
| Density: | NA |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR) | N/A |

7. Zoning
- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| Use Regulation: | S90 |
| Minimum Lot Size: | 6000 square feet |
| Building Type | W |
| Height | G |
| Setback | E |
| Special Area Regulation: | B |

8. Description of project :

The project proposes 122-unit residential condominium units on a 20 acre project area located at the north and east of the intersection of Jamacha Boulevard and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard in the Spring Valley Community. Each residential condominium unit includes an attached two-car garage, and an exclusive fenced backyard with 350 square feet of private usable open space. The project also includes group-usable open space in the form of a 2.08-acre public park located on the west end of the site. Main access to the site will occur from Jamacha Boulevard at the intersection of Folex Way. The intersection will be signalized. An exclusive eastbound left-turn lane is proposed on Jamacha Boulevard, and the existing exclusive left-turn lane will be restriped to a shared thru/left-turn lane. Secondary access is proposed off of Sweetwater Springs Boulevard via a new public roadway terminating in a cul-de-sac. This road will provide access to the public park and associated surface parking area. The project proposes right in and right out (northbound) movements along Sweetwater Springs Boulevard. Additionally, an exclusive southbound left-turn pocket will be constructed on Sweetwater Springs Boulevard. Outbound left-turn movements exiting the driveway from the site will be prohibited by construction of a median on Sweetwater Springs Boulevard. This intersection will not be signalized but will be controlled by a stop sign. Within the residential area of the project, private internal drives will be improved to 24 feet in width to support internal circulation and fire protection services. Jamacha Boulevard and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard would be improved to a 55-foot half-width with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lane. An eight-foot-wide public trail is proposed along the north side of Jamacha Boulevard. A series of pedestrian pathways are proposed within the project boundaries to enhance connectivity and circulation throughout the site and provide linkage to the public park. Six to eight-foot high sound walls atop a four-foot tall berm would be constructed along the majority of the project frontage along Jamacha Boulevard and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard.

The site is designated as a Special Study Area in the Spring Valley Community Plan, which calls for mixed use town center development. The project site was originally designated as right-of-way for extension of State Highway 54 and previously utilized as a retail nursery (Evergreen Nursery). Evergreen Nursery has since ceased operation and vacated the site. The site is currently 100% disturbed due to the previous use. Water service is expected to be provided by Otay Water District, sewer service by the San Diego County Sanitation District, and fire service by the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District. No extension of sewer or water utilities will be required by the project. Earthwork will consist of cut and fill of 50,000 cubic yards of material.

Permit applications and actions needed are as follows:

1. General Plan Amendment (GPA) – Change RL-80 to VR-7.3 with no change in regional category;
2. Rezone (REZ) – Change Use Regulations from S90 (Holding Zone) to RV (Variable Family Residential), Building Type from “K” to “W”, Setback from “E” to “V”, Open Space from “—” to “J”, and Animal Regulations from “S” to “—”.
3. Tentative Map (TM) – Subdivide site into 2 lots with 122 residential condominium units and a 2.08 acre public park.
4. Site Plan (STP) – Comply with “B” Community Design Review Designator and to establish “V” setbacks.
5. Grading Plan – Required for 33,000 cubic yards of grading.

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

Existing land uses surrounding the project site include undeveloped land to the west/southwest across Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, which is planned for a residential development known as “The Pointe.” Other land uses include a commercial strip mall anchored by a gas station adjacent to the southwest corner of the site; a vegetated County detention basin further to the south, adjacent to Sweetwater Springs Boulevard (south side of Jamacha Boulevard); a self-storage facility, Mardi Gras Café and Market building, and Sweetwater Lodge mobile-home park to the south across Jamacha Boulevard; another self-storage facility adjacent to the east; a vacant lot adjacent to northeast; and, a business park adjacent to the northern property boundary. Single-family residential uses are also present further to the north, adjacent to Austin Drive. The Rancho Jamacha Estates mobile-home park is further to the northeast and more single family uses are further to the northeast/east across Calavo Drive.

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

| <u>Permit Type/Action</u> | <u>Agency</u> |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| General Plan Amendment | County of San Diego |
| Landscape Plans | County of San Diego |
| Rezone | County of San Diego |
| Site Plan | County of San Diego |
| Tentative Map | County of San Diego |
| County Right-of-Way Permits Encroachment Permit | County of San Diego |
| Grading Permit | County of San Diego |
| Improvement Plans | County of San Diego |
| State Highway Encroachment Permit | CalTrans |
| Air Quality Permit to Construct | Air Pollution Control District (APCD) |
| National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit | RWQCB |
| General Construction Storm water | RWQCB |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Permit | |
| Water District Approval | Otay Water District |
| Sewer District Approval | San Diego County Sanitation District |
| Fire District Approval | San Miguel Consolidated Fire District |
| School District Approvals | High Grossmont Union and La Mesa-Spring Valley General Elementary School Districts |

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



Signature
Peter Eichar
Printed Name

9-4-15

Date
Land Use/Environmental Planner
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

No Impact: The project site is located in an area characterized by undeveloped land to the west and southwest; a commercial strip mall anchored by a gas station adjacent to the southwest corner of the project site; a self-storage facility, commercial buildings, mobile-home park to the south; another self-storage facility adjacent to the southwest; a vacant lot adjacent to northwest; and, a business park adjacent to the north. Single-family residential uses are also present further to the north, east, and northeast. Although visible from public roads and trails, the site is not located within a viewshed of a scenic vista. The proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and will not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view because the proposed project would result in similar land uses as those that surround the project site.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because: the project site is not located within a viewshed of a scenic vista; the project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property; residential lighting would be required to conform with the County's Light Pollution Code to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties and minimize impacts to dark skies; and the project would be consistent with existing community character, the project is located in an area characterized by vacant land, commercial, industrial, and residential land uses. The addition of 122 residential condominium units would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

No Impact: The project site is located one mile from State Route 94 (SR94) at the northwestern corner of Sweetwater Springs Boulevard and Jamacha Boulevard. SR94, Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, and Jamacha Boulevard are not classified as a State or County scenic highways. The proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effects or cumulative impacts on a scenic resource within a State or County scenic highway.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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: 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 by undeveloped land to the west and southwest; a commercial strip mall anchored by a gas station adjacent to the southwest corner of the project site; a self-storage facility, commercial buildings, mobile-home park to the south; another self-storage facility adjacent to the southwest; a vacant lot adjacent to northwest; and, a business park adjacent to the north. Single-family residential uses are also present further to the north, east, and northeast. The property slopes upward from Sweetwater Springs Boulevard along its easterly boundary, with the majority of the site leveling off and being generally flat. Onsite elevations

range from approximately 492 feet above mean sea level (amsl) near the northeast corner of the property to approximately 441 feet amsl near the southwest corner of the property. No steep slopes or areas subject to landslides are present onsite. Onsite vegetation communities include disturbed habitat (19.69 acres) and disturbed wetlands (0.64 acre). Conceptual architectural design for the Project has been prepared, offering various housing styles and sizes. Additionally, landscaping is proposed for the main entryway, common areas, and public park in order to enhance the visual appearance of the development and blend it into the existing setting within the community.

The proposed development has been designed in conformance with the Spring Valley Design Guidelines and would be subject to design review by the County. The Project would offer new residential housing opportunities within the Spring Valley community. Design measures, including varied architectural styles, landscape enhancements, and distancing the development areas from Jamacha Boulevard would enhance the existing community character and the environment. Additionally, landscaping is proposed for the common areas to enhance the visual appearance of the development and blend it into the existing setting within the community. Additionally, a Site Plan is required to implement the site's architectural component, as well as a mechanism to comply with the Spring Valley Town Center Special Study Area requirements. The Site Plan is required to implement the proposed "V" designator for setbacks and the "B" designator (Special Area Regulations) to ensure consistency with the Spring Valley Design Review Guidelines.

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 proposed project does not require significant alteration to the existing landform due to the site design and the site's gentle slopes. Likewise, the cumulative projects within the viewshed similarly maintain the existing landform and avoid large cut and/or fill banks. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 33 miles from the Mount Laguna Observatory. 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 Site Plan Permit, which further limits outdoor lighting through strict controls. Therefore, compliance with the Code, in combination with the outdoor lighting and glare controls listed above ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare.

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

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 designated as Unique Farmland as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. In addition, the property was used as a plant nursery in the past. Due to the presence of onsite agricultural resources, the County agricultural resources specialist, Michael Johnson, evaluated the site to determine the importance of the resource based on the County's Local Agricultural Resources Assessment (LARA) model which takes into account local factors that define the importance of San Diego County agricultural resources. The LARA model considers the availability of water resources, climate, soil quality, surrounding land use, topography, and land use or parcel size consistency between the project site and surrounding land uses. A more detailed discussion of the LARA model can be found in the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources at <http://www.sdcPDS.org/PDS/Resource/docs/3~pdf/AG-Guidelines.pdf>.

In order for a site to be considered an important agricultural resource based on the LARA model, all three required LARA model factors (water, soil, and climate) must receive either a high or moderate score. A low score in any of these three categories would render a LARA model result that the site is not an important agricultural resource. The project site only contains Diablo clay, 15 to 30 percent slopes and Huerhuero loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes, eroded. These soils do not meet the soil quality criteria for Farmland of Statewide Importance or Prime Farmland Soils, therefore the site receives a low soil quality score and is not an important agricultural resource.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned S90, Holding Area, which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), 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 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 and surrounding area within radius of one-quarter mile has lands designated as Farmland of Local Importance, Unique Farmland, and Grazing Land. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by Michael Johnson, County Agricultural Specialist and was determined not to have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance or active agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons:

- The surrounding area within a one-quarter mile, including the lands designated as Farmland of Local Importance, Unique Farmland, and Grazing Land do not contain active agricultural operations.
- The surrounding area already contains residences and other non-agricultural uses in closer proximity than the subject parcel to the lands designated as Farmland of Local Importance and Grazing Land.
- The project site only contains Diablo clay, 15 to 30 percent slopes and Huerhuero loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes, eroded. These soils do not meet the soil quality criteria for Farmland of Statewide Importance or Prime Farmland Soils, therefore the site receives a low soil quality score and is not an important agricultural resource.

Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

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

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

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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 was originally designated as right-of-way for extension of State Route 54 and previously utilized as a retail nursery (Evergreen Nursery). Evergreen Nursery has ceased operation and vacated the site. The site is currently 100% disturbed due to the previous use. This previous use has led to the designation of the site as a Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) designated farmland despite its function as a commercial (retail) nursery rather than avocado or citrus groves and is not an active agricultural production site. The site is surrounded by urban and suburban style development and open space to the southwest, across from Sweetwater Springs Blvd. The site does not contain Prime Soils, is not designated within an Agricultural Preserve nor is it under a Williamson Act Contract. Significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance or active agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use are not expected because the site does not currently support active agricultural operations and active agricultural operations are separated from proposed land uses on the project site by other developed parcels and open space that conveys storm water runoff (not agricultural operations).

Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves 122 residential condominium units and 2.08 acre public park. As discussed in the Air Quality Assessment, (*Air Quality Assessment, Sweetwater Place Residential Development*, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015) on file with the Planning

& Development Services as Environmental Review Number 14-19-005 the project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP because the project proposes only 122 residential units and is within the nearly 1,400 units expected to be developed in the Spring Valley area between 2015 and 2030. Therefore, the project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) on a project level.

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

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

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. San Diego County Planning & Development Services has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that 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 APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project proposes construction of 122 residential units and a 2.08 acre park to be developed over a period of 399 days. Grading operations will entail the demolition and removal of approximately 100 tons of onsite concrete footings and pads that is expected to take 11 days to demolish and an additional 11 days to haul offsite. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project is 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 screening-level criteria established by the PDS guidelines for determining significance. In addition to grading activities associated with construction, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 1,031 Average Daily Trips (ADTs) (at 126 dwelling units). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

AIR#1- NATURAL GAS FIREPLACES

In order to reduce area-wide emissions, only natural gas fireplaces shall be installed in the proposed residences.

DOCUMENTATION: Prior to approval of any building plan and the issuance of any building permit, this mitigation measure shall be conditioned in the building plans.

- 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:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Less Than Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also 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, localized and temporary resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance – Air Quality (2007). The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 1,031 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance – Air Quality (2007).

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 proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding

area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance – Air Quality (2007), therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM₁₀, or any O₃ precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: No 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. However, the Air Quality Assessment (*Air Quality Assessment, Sweetwater Place Residential Development*, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015) did find that the maximum Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) was projected to occur approximately 200 meters from the geometric center of the project site and, the number of individuals exposed to DPM from the project would be less than ten in one million. Therefore, because the project increases the risk to more than one person per million the project is required to utilize equipment meeting requirements of T-BACT such as using diesel particulate filters or catalytic converters and utilizing Tier II certified equipment at a minimum. Based on review by PDS staff air quality specialist, this project does propose construction activities that would result in exposure of persons within 200 meters (0.12 miles) to significant DPM concentrations, but will 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 as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance – Air Quality (2007).

AIR#2 – SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

In order to reduce exhaust emissions, the project shall comply with the following Air Quality measure:

- a. All nonroad, diesel engine construction equipment shall comply with United States Environmental Protection Agency –Certified Tier 2 emission standards and include best available control technology devices certified by the California Air Resources Board

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall show compliance with this measure by providing the construction bid/estimate from the construction contractor that will be used.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction and operational phases. However, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). Subsequently, no significant air quality – odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Moreover, the effects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 and a Biological Resources Letter Report (*Sweetwater Place, Biological Resources Letter Report*, RBF Consulting/Michael Baker International, July 2015), the site supports 19.69 acres of disturbed lands, 0.24 acre of Non-native Riparian *Ricinus communis*, 0.38 acre of Non-native Riparian *Washingtonia robusta* and 0.02 acre of Emergent Wetlands. No sensitive plant or animal species were observed on site.

No special-status plant species were observed or are expected to occur onsite based on the results of the general biological survey and the lack of suitable habitats to support the potentially-occurring species. No special-status species were observed onsite based on the results of the general biological survey; however, the following non-listed, County Group 1 sensitive raptors have a potential to nest or forage in portions of the survey area: Cooper's hawk, ferruginous hawk, turkey vulture, northern harrier, whitetailed kite and prairie falcon. The

project would result in the permanent removal of approximately 20 acres of disturbed habitat and trees, or trimming of adjacent offsite trees and shrubs, that could support nesting and foraging opportunities for sensitive raptors and common bird species. Based on the extent of preserved areas further east (San Diego National Wildlife Refuge) and south (Sweetwater Reservoir and surrounding watershed lands) of the project site, these areas would provide ample habitat for sensitive raptors to exist within stable populations in the region. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant direct impacts to these potentially-occurring sensitive wildlife species, and mitigation would not be required.

County staff reviewed the past, present, and probable future projects as listed in Section XVII(b) and has determined that the cumulative loss of Non-native Riparian *Ricinus communis*, Non-native Riparian *Washingtonia robusta* and Emergent Wetlands 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.

Mitigation for impacts to Non-native Riparian *Ricinus communis*, Non-native Riparian *Washingtonia robusta* and Emergent Wetlands will be provided through the purchase of 0.68 acre of offsite wetland mitigation credits. In addition, the project will be conditioned to avoid the nesting bird breeding season and to obtain necessary wetland permits.

With implementation of these mitigation measures, the project's potential cumulative impacts to sensitive raptors and nesting birds would be reduced to less than significant levels. No additional mitigation would be required. Therefore the impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

BIO#1–OFFSITE MITIGATION

The applicant shall purchase habitat credit, or provide for the conservation of habitat of 0.68 acre of wetland mitigation credits, located within the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank or other approved bank within the MSCP as indicated below.

Option 1: If purchasing Mitigation Credit the mitigation bank shall be approved by the California Department of Fish & Game. The following evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank:

1. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased.
2. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land.
3. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land.
4. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project.

Option 2: If habitat credit cannot be purchased in a mitigation bank, then the applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat of the same amount and type of land located in San Diego County as indicated below:

1. The type of habitat and the location of the proposed mitigation, should be pre-approved by *[PDS, PCC]* before purchase or entering into any agreement for purchase.
2. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned and/or managed by DPR, the RMP shall also be approved by the Director of DPR.
3. An open space easement over the land shall be dedicated to the County of San Diego or like agency to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. The land shall be protected in perpetuity.
4. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS: The land shall be purchased, the easements shall be dedicated, a Resource Manager shall be selected, and the RMP funding mechanism shall be in place.
5. In lieu of providing a private habitat manager, the applicant may contract with a federal, state or local government agency with the primary mission of resource management to take fee title and manage the mitigation land. Evidence of satisfaction must include a copy of the contract with the agency, and a written statement from the agency that (1) the land contains the specified acreage and the specified habitat, or like functioning habitat, and (2) the land will be managed by the agency for conservation of natural resources in perpetuity.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall purchase the offsite mitigation credits and provide the evidence to the *PDS* for review and approval. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to the *PDS* that *DPR* agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to the *PDS* for a pre-approval. If an RMP is submitted in-lieu of purchasing credits (option 1), then the RMP shall be prepared and an application for the RMP shall be submitted to the *PDS*.

BIO#3—RESOURCE AVOIDANCE

There shall be no brushing, clearing and/or grading such that none will be allowed within 500 feet of nesting raptor habitat or within 300 feet of migratory bird nesting habitat during the breeding season of raptors and migratory birds. The breeding season is defined as occurring between January 15th and August 31st. The Director of PDS may waive this condition, through written concurrence from the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, provided that no nesting raptors or migratory birds are present in the vicinity of the brushing, clearing or grading.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall provide a letter of agreement with this condition; alternatively, the applicant may submit a written request for waiver of this condition. Although, No Grading shall occur within the RAA until concurrence is received from the County and the Wildlife Agencies.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The project site contains Non-native Riparian *Ricinus communis*, Non-native Riparian *Washingtonia robusta* and Emergent Wetlands 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 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: Project site wetlands were evaluated for Jurisdictional Delineation in Appendix D of the Biological Resources Letter Report (*Sweetwater Place, Biological Resources Letter Report*, RBF Consulting/Michael Baker International, July 2015). The proposed project would result in the permanent loss of approximately 0.23 acre (954 linear feet) of waters of the U.S. under USACE and RWQCB jurisdiction; 0.39 acre (954 linear feet) of CDFW streambed (waters of the State); and 0.03 acre of CDFW associated riparian vegetation. The permanent loss of federal and State jurisdictional resources is a significant direct impact of the project. The project has been conditioned to obtain necessary permits for impacts to Non-native Riparian *Ricinus communis*, Non-native Riparian *Washingtonia robusta* and Emergent Wetlands.

The cumulative projects identified herein would be required to implement mitigation measures that are similar to those identified for the proposed project to avoid, reduce and/or compensate for significant direct, indirect and cumulative impacts with respect to this issue. As described in Mitigation Measure Bio-2, the purchase of wetland mitigation credits would reduce the project's cumulative impacts to federal and State jurisdictional resources to less than significant levels. No additional mitigation would be required.

BIO#2–WETLAND PERMITS:

The following permit and agreement shall be obtained, or provide evidence from the respective resource agency satisfactory to the Director of PDS that such an agreement or permit is not required:

- a. A Clean Water Act, Section 401/404 permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for all project related disturbances of waters of the U.S. and/or associated wetlands.
- b. A Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for all project related disturbances of any streambed.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall consult each agency to determine if a permit or agreement is required. Upon completion of the agency review of this project, the applicant shall provide a copy of the permit(s)/agreement(s), or evidence from each agency that such an agreement or permit is not required to the *PDS* for compliance.

- 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 and a Biological Resources Letter Report (*Sweetwater Place, Biological Resources Letter Report*, RBF Consulting/Michael Baker International, July 2015), 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: No known identified wildlife corridors or linkages occur within the site or in the immediate vicinity. The site does not support habitats that could facilitate wildlife movements for large mammals on a local or regional scale; is surrounded by roads and urban land uses; and does not have direct connectivity to adjacent lands of higher quality habitats that extend offsite undisturbed over large distances.

Specifically, the proposed project would not result in significant direct, indirect, and/or cumulative impacts under the following guidelines for the following reasons:

County Threshold 4.4.A. The proposed project would not impede wildlife access to foraging habitat, and there is no evidence that breeding habitat occurs onsite or other adjacent areas.

County Threshold 4.4.B. No known identified wildlife corridors or linkages occur within the site or in the immediate vicinity. The site does not support habitats that could facilitate wildlife movements for large mammals on a local or regional scale; is surrounded by roads and urban land uses; and does not have direct connectivity to adjacent lands of higher quality habitats that extend offsite undisturbed over large distances. Due to these obstructions to wildlife movements around the site and the lack of surrounding blocks of natural areas, no core areas of habitat suitable for use by resident populations of wildlife, as either wildlife corridors or parts of a larger regional linkage, exist on or adjacent to the site. Further, the County MSCP Subarea Plan does not recognize or designate any locally or regionally important wildlife corridors or linkages on or in the immediate vicinity of the site. Therefore, the project would not block or substantially interfere with a regional wildlife corridor or linkage.

County Threshold 4.4.C. Due to the disturbed conditions onsite, the project would not create artificial wildlife corridors that do not follow natural movement patterns. In addition, based on the extent of preserved habitats further east and south of the site, it is assumed these areas would provide ample habitat for species to exist within stable populations in the region.

County Threshold 4.4.D. As noted above, there is no evidence of breeding habitat adjacent to the site or any wildlife corridors or linkages onsite or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the project would not increase noise and/or nighttime lighting within a wildlife corridor or linkage at levels that could affect animal behavior or wildlife movement.

County Threshold 4.4.E. As noted above, there is no evidence that any wildlife corridors or linkages are identified onsite or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the project would not affect the widths of existing wildlife corridors or linkages nor constrain an already narrow corridor that may occur in the region.

County Threshold 4.4.F. As noted above, there is no evidence that any wildlife corridors or linkages are identified onsite or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the project would not affect the visual continuity of existing wildlife corridors or linkages that may occur in the region. Further, the site is not located between a potential nursery site and important foraging resource. Therefore, the project would not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

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

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

An Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated June 3, 2015 was completed by County Staff to evaluate the proposed projects 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).

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would not result in significant direct, indirect, and/or cumulative impacts under the following guidelines for the following reasons:

County Thresholds 4.5.A and 4.5.D. The project would not impact coastal sage scrub vegetation in excess of the County's 5% habitat loss threshold.

County Thresholds 4.5.B, 4.5.E, and 4.5.F. The project would not result in any impacts to resources of regional importance; it would not impact a Biological Resource Core Area as defined in the County's BMO; and it would not prevent the County MSCP Subarea Plan from meeting its conservation goals and objectives. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or State HCP. In addition, there is no Habitat Management Plan, Special Area Management Plan, Watershed Plan, or similar regional planning effort to which the project must conform.

County Thresholds 4.5.G. and 4.5.H. As noted above, there is no evidence of breeding habitat adjacent to the site or any wildlife corridors or linkages onsite or in the immediate vicinity. In addition, based on the extent of preserved habitats further east and south of the site, it is assumed these areas would provide ample habitat for species to exist within stable populations in the region.

County Thresholds 4.5.I and 4.5.J. The project would not impact MSCP narrow endemic species or core populations of narrow endemics, nor would it reduce the likelihood of survival and recovery of listed species.

County Thresholds 4.5.K and 4.5.L. The proposed project could result in the removal or disturbance of nesting habitat during the general bird nesting season (January 15-August 31), and therefore, could result in impacts to nesting birds (including sensitive raptors), in violation of the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code. Implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-1 would reduce project impacts to nesting birds and sensitive raptors (including eagles protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act) to less than significant levels. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the requirements of the MBTA and State Fish and Game Code.

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 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 impact known historical resources, because prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to historical resources as there are no known resources within the project area; the site is vacant of buildings and does not support historical resources of any kind.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The project will not impact known archaeological resources since prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to archaeological resources on the surface of the landscape. However, there is the potential for unknown and buried archaeological resources within the project area. In order to mitigate for potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources, an Archaeological Monitoring Program and potential Data Recovery Program shall be implemented.

CULT#1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING

A County Approved Principal Investigator (PI) known as the "Project Archaeologist," shall be contracted to perform archaeological monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all grading, clearing, grubbing, trenching, and construction activities. The archaeological monitoring program shall include the following:

- a. The Project Archaeologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, during and after construction pursuant to the most current version of the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Requirements for Cultural Resources, and this permit. The contract or letter of acceptance provided to the County shall include an agreement that the archaeological monitoring will be completed, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Project Archaeologist and the County of San Diego shall be executed. The contract or letter of acceptance shall include a cost estimate for the monitoring work and reporting.
- b. The Project Archeologist shall provide evidence that a Kumeyaay Native American has been contracted to perform Native American Monitoring for the project.
- c. The cost of the monitoring shall be added to the grading bonds or bonded separately.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall provide a copy of the Archaeological Monitoring Contract or letter of acceptance, cost estimate, and MOU to the [PPD]. Additionally, the cost amount of the monitoring work shall be added to the grading bond cost estimate.

CULT#2 CULTURAL RESOURCES REPORT

A final Archaeological Monitoring and Data Recovery Report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program shall be prepared. The report shall include the following items:

- a. DPR Primary and Archaeological Site forms.
- b. Daily Monitoring Logs
- c. Evidence that the disposition of all cultural materials has been completed which may include but is not limited to the following:
 - (1) Prehistoric archaeological materials collected during the grading monitoring program shall be submitted and curated at a San Diego curation facility or a culturally affiliated Native American Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and, therefore, would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records, including title, shall be transferred to the San Diego curation facility or culturally affiliated Native American Tribal curation facility and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that the prehistoric archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.
 - (2) Historic materials shall be curated at a San Diego curation facility, as identified above and shall not be curated at a Tribal curation facility. The collections and associated records, including title, shall be transferred to the San Diego curation facility and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that the historic materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.
- d. If no cultural resources are discovered, a Negative Monitoring Report must be submitted stating that the grading monitoring activities have been completed. Grading Monitoring Logs must be submitted with the negative monitoring report.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant's archaeologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to the *PPD* for approval. Once approved, a final copy of the report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) and the culturally-affiliated Tribe.

- 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:

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

No Impact: 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?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <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: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. The project is in an area having high potential for containing unique paleontological resources and will excavate 2,500 cubic yards or more of undisturbed material below the soil horizons. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance. To mitigate for the potential project impacts to paleontological resources, the project will be conditioned to require implementation of a mitigation program by a Qualified Paleontologist.

CULT#3 PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING

A County Approved Principal Investigator (PI) known as the "Project Paleontologist," shall be contracted to perform paleontological monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all grading, clearing, grubbing, trenching, and construction activities. The paleontological monitoring program shall include the following:

- Monitoring of excavation operations to discover unearthed fossil remains, generally involving monitoring of ongoing excavation activities (e.g., sheet grading pads, cutting slopes and roadways, basement and foundation excavations, and trenching). A Paleontological Resources Monitor must have at least one year of experience in field identification and collection of fossil materials.
- Salvaging of unearthed fossil remains, typically involving simple excavation of the exposed specimens, but possibly also plaster-jacketing of individual large and/or fragile specimens, or more elaborate quarry excavation of richly fossiliferous deposits.
- Recording of stratigraphic, geologic and geographic data to provide a context for the recovered fossil remains, including accurate plotting (mapping) on grading plans and standard topographic maps of all fossil localities, description of lithologies of fossil-bearing strata, measurement and description of the overall stratigraphic section (unless considered by the project paleontologist to be infeasible), and photographic documentation of the geologic setting.

- Laboratory preparation (cleaning and repair) of collected fossil remains to the point of identification (not exhibition), generally involving removal of enclosing sedimentary rock material, stabilization of fragile specimens (using glues and other hardeners), and repair of broken specimens.
- Curating of prepared fossil remains, typically involving scientific identification and cataloguing of specimens; and entry of data into one or more accredited institutional (museum or university) collection (specimen/species lot and/or locality) databases. Curation is necessary so that the specimens are available for scientific research.
- Transferal, for archival storage, of cataloged fossil remains and copies of relevant field notes, maps, stratigraphic sections and photographs to an accredited institution (museum or university) in California that maintains paleontological collections, preferably:
 - San Diego Natural History Museum
 - Los Angeles County Museum
 - San Bernardino Museum of Natural History
 - University of California Museum of Paleontology, Berkeley
 - Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (if the fossils were salvaged in the desert).
- Preparation of a final report summarizing the results of the field investigation, laboratory methods, stratigraphic information, types and importance of collected fossils, and any necessary graphics to document the stratigraphy and precise fossil collecting localities.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project will not impact known archaeological resources since prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to archaeological resources on the surface of the landscape. However, there is the potential for unknown and buried archaeological resources within the project area. In order to mitigate for potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources, an Archaeological Monitoring Program and potential Data Recovery Program shall be implemented consistent with the mitigation **CULT#1** and **CULT#2** identified in V b, above.

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.

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

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, a geotechnical investigation for the project by Petra GeoSciences dated September 4, 2013 (Reissued January 19, 2015) indicated that based on site-specific information of encountering moderately hard bedrock materials beneath the site, the potential for manifestation of liquefaction or settlement was considered nil. Therefore, 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 site is not located within a “Landslide Susceptibility Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. In addition, a geotechnical investigation for the project by Petra GeoSciences dated September 4, 2013 (Reissued January 19, 2015) indicated that based on the generally flat topography and no mapped landslides within or near the site, the potential for landslides is considered low. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from adverse effects of landslides.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Diablo clay, 15 to 30 percent slopes and Huerhuero loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes, eroded that have a soil erodibility rating of “moderate” and “severe”, respectively, 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 Major Storm Water Management Plan (*Major Stormwater Management Plan and Hydromodification Study (Major SWMP) for Sweetwater Place*, July 2015 by RBF Consulting). The plan includes the following temporary (during construction) Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: Silt fence; fiber rolls; street sweeping and vacuuming; storm drain inlet protections; stockpile management; solid waste management; stabilized construction entrance/exit; vehicle and equipment maintenance; desilting basin; gravel bag berm; sandbag barrier; material delivery and storage; spill prevention and control; concrete waste management; water conservation practices; paving and grinding operations; protection of minor slopes. Additionally, the project will incorporate (permanent installation, post-construction) permeable pavement along the drive aisles within low traffic areas, flat slopes and minimal erodible areas onto pavement and bioretention areas which will benefit both hydromodification and water quality.
- 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project involves 50,000 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 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 Diablo clay, 15 to 30 percent slopes and Huerhuero loam, 9 to 15 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 is a residential condominium project and will be connected to a sewer system through the local sanitation district. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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: GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), 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 Region¹ identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

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

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

¹ San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory: An Analysis of Regional Emissions and Strategies to Achieve AB 32 Targets. University of San Diego and the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC), September 2008.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will 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.

Screening thresholds have been published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) for determining the need for additional analysis and mitigation for GHG-related impacts under CEQA. The annual 900 metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO₂e) screening level referenced in the CAPCOA white paper (<http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/05/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf>) is being used by the County as a conservative criterion for determining the size of projects that would require further analysis and mitigation with regard to climate change. The CAPCOA white paper reports that the 900 metric ton screening level would capture more than 90% of development projects, allowing for mitigation towards achieving the State's GHG reduction goals. It should be noted that the screening level assumes that the project does not involve unusually extensive construction activities and does not involve operational characteristics that would generate unusually high GHG emissions. The proposed project includes more than 50 residential units (122 are proposed) therefore the screening threshold of 900 metric tons would be expected to be exceeded, therefore a GHG emission analysis was conducted.

GHG emissions associated with the project were quantified within the Global Climate Change Study (*Global Climate Change, Sweetwater Place Residential Development*, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015) using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2, the results of that analysis are shown in the Table below.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

| Project | CO ₂ e ¹ MT/year |
|---|--|
| Construction | 45.75 |
| Operation | 1,882.19 |
| CO ₂ = Carbon dioxide; CO ₂ e = Carbon dioxide equivalent MT = Metric tons; 1 ton = 0.907 metric tons ¹ . U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Climate Leaders Greenhouse Gas Inventory Protocol Core Module Guidance. Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources. EPA430-K-08-004. May 2008. Methane and nitrous oxide can constitute up to 5% total GHG emissions from mobile sources. This factor is conservatively used for estimating CO ₂ e emissions. | |

As shown in the table above, total GHG emissions associated with the project would be below the Bright Line Threshold of 2,500 metric tons per year. Project GHG impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. The project is anticipated to be fully constructed by 2017.

Furthermore, projects that generate less than 2,500 MTCO₂e per year of GHG will participate in emission reductions because air emissions, including GHGs, are under the purview of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) (or other regulatory agencies) and will be "regulated" either by CARB, the Federal Government, or other entities. For example, new vehicles will be

subject to increased fuel economy standards and emission reductions², large and small appliances will be subject to more strict emissions standards, and energy delivered to consumers will increasingly come from renewable sources³. As a result, even the emissions that result from projects that produce less than 2,500 MTCO₂e per year of GHG will be subject to emission reductions.

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?

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

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

² On September 15, 2009, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Transportation's National Highway Safety Administration (NHTSA) proposed a national program to reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel economy for new cars and trucks sold in the United States. The proposed standards would cut CO₂ emissions by an estimated 950 million metric tons and 1.8 billion barrels of oil over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program.

³ California's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) requires electric corporations to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources by at least 1% of their retail sales annually, until they reach 20% by 2010. In 2008, the governor signed Executive Order S-14-08 (EO) to streamline California's renewable energy project approval process and increase the state's Renewable Energy Standard to 33% renewable power by 2020. The Air Resources Board is in the process of developing regulations to implement the 33% standard known as the California Renewable Electricity Standard (RES).

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 various climate change goals and policies. These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet GHG emission reduction targets established by the state via legislative actions (i.e. AB 32 SB 375) or Executive Orders issued by the Governor (e.g. B-30-15 and S-3-05). The County has issued a guidance document to assist in the evaluation of GHG emissions (*2015 GHG GUIDANCE, Recommended Approach to Addressing Climate Change in CEQA Documents*, County of San Diego Planning & Development Services (PDS), January 21, 2015). This guidance describes the recommended methodology for determining impact significance relative to the Significance Criteria.

As discussed in VII(a) above, the project's emissions would be below the Bright Line Threshold, fully constructed by 2017 and will be required to implement Title 24 2013 building efficiency standards. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 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?

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

Soil samples collected within areas of possible impact from Organochlorine Pesticides were analyzed. Soil residues exceeding CHHSL and RSL values for DDE were encountered at 16 locations and soil residues for DDT were encountered at one location. Soils within these locations are not suitable for re-use as fill for residential development and must be excavated and removed from the site under the oversight of a registered engineer or professional geologist and the DEH Voluntary Assistance Program (VAP).

Soil samples collected within areas of possible impact from total hydrocarbons were analyzed. Two soil samples reported concentrations of TPHmo exceeding the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (SRBRWQCB) 2013 Tier 1 Environmental Screening Level. Soils within these locations are not suitable for re-use as fill for residential development and must be excavated and removed from the site under the oversight of a registered engineer or professional geologist and the DEH Voluntary Assistance Program (VAP).

HAZ#1-ENV SITE ASSESSMENT

As determined in the [County of San Diego Hazardous Materials and Existing Contamination Guidelines for Determining Significance](#), A Report shall be submitted to determine the extent of any soil contamination at the reported soil sample locations detailed in the *Revised Limited Phase II Environmental Soil Residue Assessment*, July 2015, Petra GeoSciences INC. The ESA and any potential work plan shall be prepared and implemented pursuant to the [DEH SAM Manual](#).

- a. Enrollment in the DEH [Voluntary Assistance Program \(VAP\)](#) is required to review and approve the Revised Phase II ESA report.
- b. For the contaminated soil, a full assessment and remediation shall be completed under supervision of the VAP or LOP as required. All required grading work shall comply with the [County of San Diego Grading Ordinance 87.101 et seq.](#) If a grading permit is required for the remediation work, it shall be issued for the remediation work only.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall contract with a California Licensed Environmental Consultant company to submit the Revised Limited Phase II ESA, dated January 15, 2015, prepared by Petra Geosciences, and implement any required work plan for soil remediation. Upon completion of the VAP or LOP project, a "Closure Letter" from the *DEH* shall be submitted to the *PDS* for approval.

HAZ#2–SOIL REMEDIATION

A California Licensed Environmental Consultant company shall prepare a Soil Management Plan (SMP), for the remediation of hazardous materials as identified above. The plan shall be prepared and implemented pursuant to the [DEH SAM Manual](#) under direction from the DEH [SAM](#):

- a. Enrollment in the DEH, [Voluntary Assistance Program \(VAP\)](#) is required. All soil remediation shall be completed under supervision of the SAM/VAP.
- b. All above ground (AST) and underground storage tanks (UST) shall be removed under permit from *DEH* if contamination is discovered from a AST or UST, then compliance enrollment in the DEH, LOP is required.
- c. All required grading work shall comply with the [County of San Diego Grading Ordinance 87.101 et. al.](#) If a grading permit is required for the remediation work, it shall be issued for the remediation work only.
- d. If the Director of PDS determines the remediation work will take an enormous amount of time that would be detrimental to ultimate project implementation, approval of other engineering plans and/or issuance of other project permits may be permitted as long as there is no risk of effects to public health and safety. Concurrence from the DEH is required, and the applicant shall enter into a secured agreement for the completion of the remediation work.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall contract with a California Licensed Environmental Consultant to prepare the SMP and implement any required work plan for soil remediation. The applicant shall also enroll in the VAP and pay all applicable fees for review and completion of this requirement. Upon completion of the VAP, a "Closure Letter" from *DEH* shall be submitted to the *PDS* for approval.

HAZ#3–DEBRIS REMOVAL AND SOIL TESTING

A signed, stamped addendum to the Revised Limited Phase II ESA shall be prepared by a Registered Engineer or Professional Geologist. The addendum shall include the following information or as modified by DEH:

- a. Documentation that the soil sampling occurred between six inches and six feet (depending on the type of contamination) in depth.
- b. Findings which identify whether onsite soils in this location exceed regulatory screening levels for pesticides, fertilizers, petroleum, heavy metals, or other contaminants.
- c. If contaminated soils are detected, provide a letter from DEH stating that a VAP work plan has been prepared and approved to remediate contaminated soils.
- d. If contaminated soils are detected, provide a copy of the contract and a signed sealed statement from the Registered Engineer or Professional Geologist, which

states that they will implement the VAP work plan. Grading required to implement the site remediation activities is permitted.

DOCUMENTATION: Upon completion of the debris removal and soil test, the applicant shall submit copies of the assessment (and a work plan for soil remediation, if applicable) to the *PDS* for approval.

HAZ#4–RIGHT OF ENTRY AGREEMENT [PDS, FEE X 2]

Grant to the County of San Diego a Right of Entry (ROE) to allow ongoing access to the remediation for contaminated soils on a *DEH* case number (to be determined), located at 2657 Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, Spring Valley, per the current agreement between the DEH and Sweetwater Spring Tentative Map (PDS2014-TM-5588). Upon completion of remediation activities, the ROE Agreement will become null and void.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall prepare, and execute the ROE with the *DGS* and pay all applicable fees associated with preparation of the documents. Upon Recordation of the ROE, the applicant shall provide copies of the executed documents to *PDS* for approval.

HAZ#5–CERTIFICATION OF COMPLETION [PDS, FEE]

All soil remediation and shall be completed, and all contamination hazards removed pursuant to the Department of Environmental Health (DEH), [Voluntary Assistance Program \(VAP\)](#) or the DEH, [Local Oversight Program \(LOP\)](#) as determined.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall provide the “Closure Letter, or Concurrence Letter,” to the *PDS* that the soil remediation has been completed to the satisfaction of the *DEH*. If the Director of *PDS* determines the remediation work will take an enormous amount of time that would be detrimental to ultimate project implementation, approval of other engineering plans and/or issuance of other project permits may be permitted as long as there is no risk of effects to public health and safety. Concurrence from the DEH is required, and the applicant shall enter into a secured agreement for the completion of the remediation work.

- 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 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?

| | |
|---|---|
| <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 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The following 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 completely surrounded by urbanized areas and/or irrigated lands and no wildlands are adjacent to the project. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated May 22, 2014, have been received from the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District. The conditions from the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District include the following conditions, provisions or requirements: Fire Sprinklers; Site inspections; Street numbers/Premises Identification; and Fire Apparatus Access. Fire Apparatus Access Road conditions include: Road Markings; Dead Ends; Dimensions; Surface; Name; Turning Radius; Grade; Roadway Design Features; and Gates. Additional conditions relate to: Response Map Updates; Fire Hydrants and Clearance of Brush or Vegetative Growth from Structures. The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be two and a half minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the Safety Element is five minutes. Therefore, based on the location of the project; review of the project by County staff; and through compliance with the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District's conditions, the project is not expected to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

- 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. 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 proposes 122 residential units and a 2.08 acre park which requires a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Drainage Study (*Preliminary CEQA Drainage Study*, July 2015 by RBF Consulting) and a Major Stormwater Management Plan (*Major Stormwater Management Plan and Hydromodification Study (Major SWMP) for Sweetwater Place*, July 2015 by RBF Consulting) which, in combination, demonstrate the project will comply with all requirements of the NPDES permit. The project proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: set-back development envelope from drainages; on-site impervious areas will be disconnected prior to discharging from the site; restrict heavy construction equipment access to planned green/open space areas; re-till soils compacted by construction vehicles/equipment; stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces will drain to landscaping and/or bioretention areas via curb-cuts; use permeable pavement where feasible; pitch pavements toward landscaping for sheet flow; building downspouts to permeable pavement and/or bioretention areas; erosion of slopes will be minimized by disturbing slopes only when necessary and minimize cut and fill areas to reduce slope lengths; incorporate

retaining walls to reduce steepness of slopes or to shorten slopes, rounding and shaping of slopes to reduce concentrated flow and collect concentrated flows in stabilized drainages and channels. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. [R9-2007-0001](#)), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

- 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 lies in the Jamacha (Basin No. 909.2) hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater 909 hydrologic unit. As discussed in the Stormwater Management Plan (*Major Stormwater Management Plan and Hydromodification Study (Major SWMP) for Sweetwater Place*, July 2015 by RBF Consulting), according to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, this watershed is impaired for Dissolved Oxygen, Enterococcus, Fecal Coliform, Phosphorus, Selenium, Total Dissolved Solids, Total Nitrogen as N, Toxicity and Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs).

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: construction of 122 residential unit subdivision including necessary infrastructure, roads, stormwater drainage and a 2.08 are park. Post construction activities include maintenance and operation of the same. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment 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: set-back development envelope from drainages; on-site impervious areas will be disconnected prior to discharging from the site; restrict heavy construction equipment access to planned green/open space areas; re-till soils compacted by construction vehicles/equipment; stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces will drain to landscaping and/or bioretention areas via curb-cuts; use permeable pavement where feasible; pitch pavements toward landscaping for sheet flow; building downspouts to permeable pavement and/or bioretention areas; erosion of slopes will be minimized by disturbing slopes

only when necessary and minimize cut and fill areas to reduce slope lengths; incorporate retaining walls to reduce steepness of slopes or to shorten slopes, rounding and shaping of slopes to reduce concentrated flow and collect concentrated flows in stabilized drainages and channels.

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. R9-2007-0001, (NPDES No. CAS 0108758); County Watershed Protection Ordinance; Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO); County Stormwater Standards Manual. The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that 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 Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

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 Jamacha (Basin No. 909.2) hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater 909 hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water:

(Sweetwater) 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; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; and rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: sediments, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, pesticides associated with detached residential development; sediments, nutrients, heavy metals, organic compounds, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances and oil and grease associated with the improved and proposed streets. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment 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: set-back development envelope from drainages; on-site impervious areas will be disconnected prior to discharging from the site; restrict heavy construction equipment access to planned green/open space areas; re-till soils compacted by construction vehicles/equipment; stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces will drain to landscaping and/or bioretention areas via curb-cuts; use permeable pavement where feasible; pitch pavements toward landscaping for sheet flow; building downspouts to permeable pavement and/or bioretention areas; erosion of slopes will be minimized by disturbing slopes only when necessary and minimize cut and fill areas to reduce slope lengths; incorporate retaining walls to reduce steepness of slopes or to shorten slopes, rounding and shaping of slopes to reduce concentrated flow and collect concentrated flows in stabilized drainages and channels.

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.

- 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)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 obtain its water supply from the Otay 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 not alter the existing drainage pattern across the site. Upon completion of the project, runoff will continue to flow southwesterly towards Sweetwater Springs Boulevard and Jamacha Boulevard. Runoff will discharge from the project site as either pipe flow or sheet flow from pavement to pavement directly connected to existing storm drains (at Jamacha Boulevard) or as pipe flow directly to the curb and gutter (Sweetwater Springs Boulevard). As outlined in the Storm water Management Plan (*Major Stormwater Management Plan and Hydromodification Study (Major SWMP) for Sweetwater Place*, July 2015 by RBF Consulting), the project will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: set-back development envelope from drainages; on-site impervious areas will be disconnected prior to discharging from the site; restrict heavy construction equipment access to planned green/open space areas; re-till soils compacted by construction vehicles/equipment; stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces will drain to landscaping and/or bioretention areas via curb-cuts; use permeable pavement where feasible; pitch pavements toward landscaping for sheet flow; building downspouts to permeable pavement and/or bioretention areas; erosion of slopes will be minimized by disturbing slopes only when necessary and minimize cut and fill areas to reduce slope lengths; incorporate retaining walls to reduce steepness of slopes or to shorten slopes, rounding and shaping of slopes to reduce concentrated flow and collect concentrated flows in stabilized drainages and channels. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not

contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

- 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 construction of new or expanded development that could alter the 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. The project will not increase water surface elevations across the site or downstream. Proposed improvements will not alter the existing hydrologic and hydraulic properties of the site. No increase in peak flow discharge is anticipated as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project will not alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on-site or off-site.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, nor will it have any adverse impact on the potential for erosion. Proposed conditions will reduce the amount of concentrated flow throughout the site through the strategic placement of permeable pavement and bioretention areas, as compared to predevelopment conditions. Along Jamacha Boulevard, the proposed bioretention areas are tiered such that weir flow is achieved as runoff conveys westerly overland. Riprap (or similar) energy dissipaters will be utilized along the weirs to prevent scour. Riprap energy dissipaters, or similar, will be included downstream of all proposed on-site storm drain outfalls to protect against scour and erosion. Under post development conditions, runoff will discharge from the site as pipe flow in two locations. (1) In the southwesterly corner, adjacent to Jamacha Boulevard, on-site runoff will discharge to the existing storm drain system (dual 36-inch RCP) conveying flow southerly beneath Jamacha Boulevard to the regional detention facility. (2) Along the westerly project boundary, on-site runoff will discharge to the curb and gutter of Sweetwater Springs Boulevard via the proposed

bioretention area subdrain. As such, discharge from the project site is not anticipated to have any adverse impact on the potential for erosion. A proposed 54 inch RCP will be installed to convey off-site flow to the existing 60-inch RCP located in the southwest corner of the site. This does not result in the diversion of flow as compared to pre development conditions. The proposed 54-inch RCP will prevent the comingling of off-site runoff with on-site runoff. At the point of connection with the existing 60-inch RCP (southwest corner), a proposed 36-inch RCP lateral with headwall will be included for secondary project site discharge (primary discharge being the perforated sub-drains associated with the bioretention area). The regional detention facility located across Jamacha Boulevard from the project site will not be adversely impacted as a result of the proposed development. Minor surface improvements are proposed along Jamacha Boulevard and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard. The proposed on-site bioretention areas have been sized to treat the equivalent area of off-site improvements.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: sediments, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, pesticides associated with detached residential development; sediments, nutrients, heavy metals, organic compounds, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances and oil and grease associated with the improved and proposed streets. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: set-back development envelope from drainages; on-site impervious areas will be disconnected prior to discharging from the site; restrict heavy construction equipment access to planned green/open space areas; re-till soils compacted by construction vehicles/equipment; stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces will drain to landscaping and/or bioretention areas via curb-cuts; use permeable pavement where feasible; pitch pavements toward landscaping for sheet flow; building downspouts to permeable pavement and/or bioretention areas; erosion of slopes will be minimized by disturbing slopes only when necessary and minimize cut and fill areas to reduce slope lengths; incorporate retaining walls to reduce steepness of slopes or to shorten slopes, rounding and shaping of slopes to reduce concentrated flow and collect concentrated flows in stabilized drainages and channels. Refer to IX Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

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?

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

Incorporated

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 or off-site improvement locations; therefore, no impact will occur.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations. The project will not result in placing housing within a 100-year floodplain or other special flood hazard area; therefore, no impact will occur.

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

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

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?

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

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?

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

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. Also, staff geologist has 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. The project will add a 2.08 acre park and 122 residential units to a site that was previously intended for an extension of State Route 54. Therefore, the proposed 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 lies within the Spring Valley Community Plan Area of the County of San Diego General Plan. The Project site has a General Plan land use designation of Public/Semi-Public Lands, with a Regional Category of Village. Pursuant to Land Use Policy 1.6 of the Land Use Element, sites with a Public/Semi-Public land use designation have an underlying land use designation of Rural Lands (RL-80). When the site becomes privately owned (which the subject site is under private ownership), the RL-80 land use designation is applied until a GPA and rezone applications are approved by the County to change the land use designation and zoning to accommodate the anticipated development.

A General Plan Amendment (GPA) is required to change the current General Plan designator from RL-80 to a Village Residential (VR-7.3) designator. The Regional Category of Village applies to the property; no change to the Regional Category is proposed with the Project. The Project is generally considered to be consistent with applicable goals, policies, and objectives contained within the General Plan, Spring Valley Community Plan, and other such documents, such as the County Wildland Urban Interface Ordinance and County Dark Skies Ordinance. However, the Spring Valley Community Plan identifies the 34-acre SSA as a potential “town center” that would enhance the community identity, character, and economic vibrancy. Further, the Community Plan states that the SSA should be developed with a mixture of uses that may include a community gathering area; condominiums or loft type housing; restaurants; retail stores; a shared parking facility; pedestrian connectivity to a community park and the County Trails network; and/or, boutique wineries and micro-breweries.

A mixed-use viability, retail potential analysis, market overview and optimization study and, a land use consistency report were submitted by the applicant (*Sweetwater Village Center Market Overview and Land Optimization*, John Burns Real Estate Consulting, July 2015; *Market Viability of Mixed-Use Development, Sweetwater Place, Spring Valley, CA*, John Burns Real Estate Consulting, July 2015; *Land Use Compatibility Analysis, Sweetwater Place*, July 2015, RBF Consulting; Memorandum with Appendix: *Retail Development Potential Analysis, Sweetwater Village Site*, to Mr. Dan Thompson, President, Sweetwater Springs, LLC, July 2015, Stoffel & Associates). These studies were intended to evaluate the current and future market conditions in the area and evaluate the appropriateness of development of the Project site with retail uses, as intended by the Spring Valley Community Plan. The studies determined that development of the Project site as a mixed-use “town center” or for commercial retail uses is not supported. Rather, development of the site with residential uses, consistent with that proposed with the Project, was determined to be a more viable use as the submarket suffers from an oversupply of retail-oriented

businesses and a lack of sufficient new household growth needed to support additional retail space. A mixed-use "town center" development consistent with the goals and policies of the SSA would therefore not be viable. Therefore, conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project are not expected and impacts are considered 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 lands within the project site have not 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); but the site is MRZ-3 (NO ALLUVIUM/NO MINES).

However, the project site is surrounded by densely developed land uses including dense residential, commercial, industrial and other land 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?

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

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?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <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: The project is the development of the Sweetwater Village Residential Project comprised of condominium style residential uses with a park. Based on the Noise Assessment (*Noise Assessment, Sweetwater Place Residential Development*, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015), noise mitigation in the form of sound walls and a noise restriction easement would be required to ensure the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 65 decibels (dBA) for multi-family developments. Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 65 dB(A), modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Based on the Noise Assessment (*Noise Assessment, Sweetwater Place Residential Development*, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015), project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 65 dB(A) with the incorporation of noise mitigation measures.

The project falls under the multi-family category within the County Noise Element and would be subject to the exterior outdoor area sound level limit of 65 dBA CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) and an interior habitable requirement of 45 dBA. Based on the noise study, future traffic noise is to potentially impact the site and expose the proposed exterior noise sensitive areas to noise levels over 65 dBA CNEL. The primary noise source would be generated from Sweetwater Boulevard and Jamacha Boulevard. Noise mitigation would be required to reduce the proposed outdoor areas and would be consisting of six foot high sound walls located facing and screening Jamacha Boulevard. Additionally, the noise walls would have a return design, running north and south, further extending the ends of the sound walls (please see Figure 2-C and Section 2.4 for a conceptual sound wall design and layout). The sound wall would be located on top of slope at the rear yards of the units. Incorporation of the sound walls would reduce traffic noise to 65 dBA CNEL and below at the exterior residential units. Additionally, the project would be required to dedicate a noise restriction easement to ensure the project will demonstrate interior noise levels of 45 dBA and exterior noise levels of 65 dBA CNEL are demonstrated prior to building permit approval. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Based on the Noise Assessment (*Noise Assessment, Sweetwater Place Residential Development*, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015) , on-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The Noise Analysis and staff's review has determined that project's noise levels are not anticipated to exceed County Noise Standards.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

Based on the Noise Assessment (*Noise Assessment, Sweetwater Place Residential Development*, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015), the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

The project is also subject to the County Noise Ordinance which regulates construction activities to a 75 dBA eight-hour sound level limit at any occupied property line. Construction noise represents short-term noise activities associated with grading utilizing equipment such as graders, dozers, water trucks, loaders, etc. The construction equipment hours would be limited pursuant to Section 36.408. Additionally, the equipment would be spread out over the project site from distances ranging up to 400 feet from any occupied property line. No blasting and no rock crushing is proposed and no impulsive equipment is anticipated. Based on the aforementioned reasons, staff does not anticipate noise levels to exceed the 75 dBA eight-hour average construction noise limit. Therefore, incorporation of noise mitigation measure consisting of permanent sound walls and the dedication of a noise restriction easement would ensure the project would be in conformance with County noise standards.

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 36.408, 409 & 410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

NOISE#1– NOISE BARRIER REQUIREMENT [PDS, FEE X3]

The following noise design and noise attenuation measures shall be implemented and constructed pursuant to the approved Landscape Plans:

- a. Sound barriers shall be installed, located facing and screening Jamacha Boulevard. Additionally, the noise walls would have a return design, running north and south, further extending the ends of the sound walls (please see Figure 2-C and Section 2.4 for a conceptual sound wall design and layout within the Noise Report prepared by

LDN Consulting dated March 25, 2015) and as referenced within the Landscape Plan. The sound wall would be located on top of slope at the rear yards of the units.

- b. Any proposed alternative methods, or the reduction and/or addition of the noise barrier(s) maybe approved if Noise Element conformance can be demonstrated while no new impacts are a result of the updated noise barrier design.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall place the design elements, or notes on the building plans and submit the plans to *[PDS, BPPR]* for review and approval. Note that the noise barrier design may be shown on the landscape plan instead of the building plans.

NOISE#2–NOISE RESTRICTION EASEMENT

A Noise Restriction Easement shall include the entire property and shall comply with the following:

- a. Prior to the approval of any Building Plan and issuance of any Building Permit, a County Approved Acoustical Consultant, shall perform an acoustical analysis, which demonstrates that the proposed residential dwelling units would not be exposed to present and anticipated future noise levels exceeding the allowable sound level limit of the General Plan community noise equivalent levels (CNEL) of 45 dB for interior noise, and a (CNEL) of 65 dB for exterior noise levels. Exterior noise sensitive land uses include all Group or [Private Usable Open Space as defined by the General Plan Noise Element \(Table N-1 & N-2\).](#)
 - 1. Future traffic noise level estimates, must utilize a Level of Service “C” traffic flow for Jamacha Boulevard and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard which is its designated General Plan Mobility Element buildout roadway classification.
- b. The acoustical analysis shall make recommendations that shall be implemented in the project design and building plans, so the proposed structures (interior noise levels) and project site (exterior noise levels) can comply with the noise standards referenced above.
- c. The unauthorized removal of documented noise control measures at a future date after the initial installation of noise control measures and satisfaction of this mitigation, must be rectified before any future building permits can be approved and issued; affected noise sensitive land uses are subject to this building restriction regardless of unauthorized removal of documented noise control measures
- d. Prior to the approval of any Building Plan and issuance of any Building Permit, the applicant shall prepare the acoustic analysis and incorporate the proposed project design recommendations and mitigation measures, into the Building Plans. The applicant shall submit the acoustical analysis along with the building plans to the *[PDS, BD]* for review and approval before the building permits can be issued. To the satisfaction of the *[PDS, PCC]*, the applicant shall revise the

- building plans or site design to incorporate any additional noise control measures necessary to meet the requirements of this mitigation.
- e. Any proposed alternative methods, or the reduction and/or addition of the noise barrier(s) maybe approved if Noise Element conformance can be demonstrated while no new impacts are a result of the updated noise barrier design.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall show the easement on the Final map with the appropriate granting language on the title sheet concurrent with Final Map Review.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Vehicular traffic on nearby roadways and activities associated with . As indicated in the response listed under Section XI 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 assessment (*Noise Assessment, Sweetwater Place Residential Development*, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015).

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to cumulative noise over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period.

The project is also subject to the County Noise Ordinance which regulates construction activities to a 75 dBA eight-hour sound level limit at any occupied property line. Construction noise represents short-term noise activities associated with grading utilizing equipment such as graders, dozers, water trucks, loaders, etc. The construction equipment hours would be limited pursuant to Section 36.408. Additionally, the equipment would be spread out over the project site from distances ranging up to 400 feet from any occupied property line. No blasting and no rock crushing is proposed and no impulsive equipment is anticipated. Based on the aforementioned reasons, staff does not anticipate noise levels to exceed the 75 dBA eight-hour average construction noise limit. Therefore, incorporation of noise mitigation measure

consisting of permanent sound walls and the dedication of a noise restriction easement would ensure the project would be in conformance with County noise standards. 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 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)?

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

Discussion/Explanation: The project proposes 122 residential units and a 2.08 acre park and has a General Plan land use designation of Public/Semi-Public Lands, with a Regional

Category of Village. Pursuant to Land Use Policy 1.6 of the Land Use Element, sites with a Public/Semi-Public land use designation have an underlying land use designation of Rural Lands (RL-80). When the site becomes privately owned (which the subject site is under private ownership), the RL-80 land use designation is applied until a GPA and rezone applications are approved by the County to change the land use designation and zoning to accommodate the anticipated development.

Less Than Significant Impact: A General Plan Amendment (GPA) is required to change the current General Plan designator from RL-80 to a Village Residential (VR-7.3) designator. The Regional Category of Village applies to the property; no change to the Regional Category is proposed with the Project. New roads and infrastructure is required to implement the project. However, this physical and regulatory change will not induce substantial population growth in an area, because the regulatory change does not increase density or intensity of the land use inconsistent with the General Plan and the road and infrastructure installation will comply with applicable construction permits and their related conditions of approval in addition to the mitigation measures identified in this checklist

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace existing housing since the site is currently vacant. The addition of 122 dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing since the site is currently vacant. The addition of 122 dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing.

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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 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: Otay Water District, San Diego County Sanitation District, San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District, Grossmont Union High School District, and La Mesa-Spring Valley General Elementary School District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, or schools 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves a 122-unit residential development that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the

mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to construct and dedicate a 2.08 acre (gross) public park and an 8-foot wide public riding and hiking trail (within a 12-foot wide graded easement) along the northern side of Jamacha Boulevard to enhance the existing public pedestrian network, consistent with the County Trails Network (and Spring Valley Community Plan). Additionally, a 10-foot wide (cleared) trail easement is proposed located along the eastern Project boundary (for future construction of a public trail by others); no physical trail improvements are proposed with the Project along this easement. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication as well as the requirement for the provision of group useable open space per the County Zoning Ordinance, thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves new recreational facilities. The new facilities include the construction and dedication a 2.08 acre (gross) public park and an 8-foot wide public riding and hiking trail (within a 12-foot wide graded easement) along the northern side of Jamacha Boulevard to enhance the existing public pedestrian network, consistent with

the County Trails Network (and Spring Valley Community Plan). The park will include a small-scale amphitheater to enable public events such as plays or concerts, however, no amplified sound (i.e. use of sound systems) will be permitted. Children's play areas, shade structures, paths and turf areas are also proposed. As outlined in this Initial study Environmental Checklist Form, the new facilities will not result in 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?

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A Traffic Impact Analysis (*Traffic Impact Analysis, Sweetwater Place*, July 2015, Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers), was completed for the proposed project. The traffic study originally analyzed a 126-unit project with a 1.14-acre park. The now proposed project of 122-units would generate less traffic than analyzed in the original traffic study. The study was not revised to reflect the diminished project and therefore reflects a conservative analysis. The Traffic Impact Study identified that the proposed project will result in an additional 1031 ADT (at 126 units). The project trips will be distributed to Austin Drive, SR-94 EB Ramps, San Miguel Street, Huron Street, Sweetwater Springs Blvd, Folex Way and Jamacha Blvd. 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.

The proposed project generates 1031 ADT. These trips will be distributed on circulation 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 circulation 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.

TRANS#1 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE: The project is subject to County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) pursuant to County TIF Ordinance number 77.201 – 77.223. The Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) shall be paid. The fee is required for the entire project, or it can be paid at building permit issuance for each phase of the project. The fee is calculated pursuant to the ordinance at the time of building permit issuance. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall pay the TIF at the *PDS* and provide a copy of the receipt to the building department at time of permit issuance.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation: The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) of which the Congestion Management Program (CMP) is an element to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced CEQA review applicable to certain large developments

that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project's impacts on CMP system roadways, their associated costs, and identify appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on CMP transit performance measures are identified.

Less Than Significant Impact: A Traffic Impact Analysis (*Traffic Impact Analysis, Sweetwater Place*, July 2015, Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers), was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study identified that the proposed project would result in an additional 1031 ADT with 126 residential units which has been reduced to 122 units by the project applicant so the ADT is actually less. The proposed project does not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact related to conflicts with the applicable CMP and no mitigation is required.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter roadway geometry on Jamacha Boulevard and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard. A safe and adequate sight distance shall be required at all driveways and intersections to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. All road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

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 designed and will be constructed 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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: A Traffic Impact Analysis (*Traffic Impact Analysis, Sweetwater Place*, July 2015, Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers) was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study identified that the proposed project would result in an additional 1,031 ADT. Consistent with the County Trails Network (and Spring Valley Community Plan), the Project proposes provision of an 8-foot wide public riding and hiking trail (within a 12-foot wide graded easement) along the northern side of Jamacha Boulevard to enhance the existing public pedestrian network. A series of pedestrian pathways are proposed within the Project boundaries to enhance connectivity and circulation throughout the site and provide linkage to the public park. Access from the Jamacha Road public trail to the residential portion of the Project and public park will be provided. Additionally, a 10-foot wide (cleared) trail easement is proposed located along the eastern Project boundary (for future construction of a public trail by others); no physical trail improvements are proposed with the Project along this easement. Therefore, with the construction and dedication of the trail along the northern side of Jamacha Boulevard and the dedication of a trail easement along the eastern project boundary, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

XVII. 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 domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project facility availability form has been received from San Diego County Sanitation District that indicates the district will serve the project. Therefore, because the project will be discharging wastewater to a RWQCB permitted community sewer system and will be required to satisfy the conditions listed above, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, including the Regional Basin Plan.

- 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Based on the service availability forms received, the project will not require construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate adequate water and wastewater treatment facilities are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Otay Water District and San Diego County Sanitation District. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. The new facilities will reduce the amount of concentrated flow throughout the site through the strategic placement of permeable

pavement and bioretention areas, as compared to predevelopment conditions. Along Jamacha Boulevard, the proposed bioretention areas are tiered such that weir flow is achieved as runoff conveys westerly overland. Riprap (or similar) energy dissipaters will be utilized along the weirs to prevent scour. Riprap energy dissipaters, or similar, will be included downstream of all proposed on-site storm drain outfalls to protect against scour and erosion. Under post development conditions, runoff will discharge from the site as pipe flow in two locations. (1) In the southwesterly corner, adjacent to Jamacha Boulevard, on-site runoff will discharge to the existing storm drain system (dual 36-inch RCP) conveying flow southerly beneath Jamacha Boulevard to the regional detention facility. (2) Along the westerly project boundary, on-site runoff will discharge to the curb and gutter of Sweetwater Springs Boulevard via the proposed bioretention area subdrain. As such, discharge from the project site is not anticipated to have any adverse impact on the potential for erosion.

A proposed 54-inch RCP will be installed to convey off-site flow to the existing 60-inch RCP located in the southwest corner of the site. This does not result in the diversion of flow as compared to pre development conditions. The proposed 54-inch RCP will prevent the comingling of off-site runoff with on-site runoff. At the point of connection with the existing 60-inch RCP (southwest corner), a proposed 36-inch RCP lateral with headwall will be included for secondary project site discharge (primary discharge being the perforated sub-drains associated with the bioretention area).

The regional detention facility located across Jamacha Boulevard from the project site will not be adversely impacted as a result of the proposed development. Minor surface improvements are proposed along Jamacha Boulevard and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard. The proposed on-site bioretention areas have been sized to treat the equivalent area of off-site improvements. Refer to the project specific Storm Water Management Plan and drainage study (*Major Stormwater Management Plan and Hydromodification Study (Major SWMP) for Sweetwater Place*, July 2015 by RBF Consulting; *Preliminary CEQA Drainage Study*, July 2015 by RBF Consulting) for additional information. However, as outlined in this Initial Study Environmental Checklist Form, the new facilities will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment.

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

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

- 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?

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

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

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

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

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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 Cultural resources, Noise, Transportation, Hazardous materials and Biological resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes Payment of the County TIF, Noise barriers and acoustical treatments to residences, archaeological and paleological monitoring and proper handling of discovered resources, and soil testing and remedial actions in case of contaminated soils given historical land use on the site. 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)?

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

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

| PROJECT NAME/TYPE | LOCATION |
|--|---|
| Jamul Indian Village /Casino | SW of SR-94/Campo Road and Melody Road |
| Cuyamaca College Facilities Master Plan Update | 900 Rancho San Diego Parkway, El Cajon |
| Simpson Farms /Commercial and Single Family Residential | NE corner of SR-94/Jefferson Rd intersection |
| Morgan Minor Subdivision (TPM 20550) /Single Family Residential | N of Procter Valley Rd/Poplar Meadow Ln intersection |
| Hendrix Subdivision (TM 5154) / Single Family Residential | E of Campo Rd on Las Palmas Rd |
| Mintz Subdivision (TM 5213 RPL2) / Single Family Residential | N of Skyline Truck Trail, E of Hidden Trail Dr |
| Jamul Highlands Subdivision (TM 5289 RPL2) / Single Family Residential | S of the Valley Rd/Jamul Highlands Rd intersection |
| Residential Development (TPM 20626) / Single Family Residential | N of Procter Valley Rd/Melody Rd intersection |
| Yacoo Minor Subdivision (TPM 20628 RPLI) / Single Family Residential | Schlee Canyon Rd north of Procter Valley Rd |
| Residential Development / Single Family Residential | S of Olive Vista Dr |
| Blanco Parcel Map (TPM 20599 RPLI) / Single Family Residential | E side of SR-94, N of Melody Rd |
| Stein Barth Minor Subdivision (TPM 20868) / Single Family Residential | S of Olive Vista Dr |
| Pioneer Minor Subdivision (TPM 20594) / Single Family Residential | N of Melody Ln |
| Otay Ranch – Village 19 / Single Family Residential | S of Melody Ln |
| Jamul Estates II / Single Family Residential | NE of Jamacha Blvd/Sweetwater Springs Blvd intersection |
| Peaceful Valley Ranch / Residential, equestrian, fire facility | E of SR-94/Melody Rd intersection |
| | |
| | |

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I

through XVIII of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

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 the following resources: Air Quality, Noise, and Transportation and Hazardous materials. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes proper testing and remedial actions for contaminated soils, payment of the County TIF, installation of sound-walls and acoustical treatments to residential structures. 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.

XIX. 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.

Applicant Provided Technical Analysis/Studies used in preparation of this Initial Study

Air Quality Assessment, Sweetwater Place Residential Development, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015

Global Climate Change, Sweetwater Place Residential Development, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015

2015 GHG GUIDANCE, Recommended Approach to Addressing Climate Change in CEQA Documents, County of San Diego Planning & Development Services (PDS), January 21, 2015

Revised Limited Phase II Environmental Soil Residue Assessment, July 2015, Petra GeoSciences INC

Revised Feasibility/Due-Diligence Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Residential Development, Sweetwater Village Project, Petra GeoSciences INC., January 2015.

Fire Protection Plan – Letter Report, Michael Baker International, July 2015

Fire Service Availability Letter and Conditions, dated May 22, 2014

Preliminary CEQA Drainage Study, July 2015 by RBF Consulting

Major Stormwater Management Plan and Hydromodification Study (Major SWMP) for Sweetwater Place, July 2015 by RBF Consulting

Sweetwater Village Center Market Overview and Land Optimization, John Burns Real Estate Consulting, July 2015

Market Viability of Mixed-Use Development, Sweetwater Place, Spring Valley, CA, John Burns Real Estate Consulting, July 2015

Land Use Compatibility Analysis, Sweetwater Place, July 2015, RBF Consulting

Memorandum with Appendix: *Retail Development Potential Analysis, Sweetwater Village Site*, to Mr. Dan Thompson, President, Sweetwater Springs, LLC, July 2015, Stoffel & Associates

Noise Assessment, Sweetwater Place Residential Development, Ldn Consulting, Inc., July 2015

Traffic Impact Analysis, Sweetwater Place, July 2015, Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers

Sweetwater Place, Biological Resources Letter Report, RBF Consulting/Michael Baker International, July 2015

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 (NLPPI), 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/legisregs/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.sdcounty.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)

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

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

NOISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POPULATION & HOUSING

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

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

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

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

RECREATION

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.sdcountry.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.

Sweetwater Village
GPA-14-003, REZ-14-003,
TM-5588, STP-14-015; ER-14-19-005

- 74 -

September 4, 2015

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