



# County of San Diego

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

**DAHVIA LYNCH**  
DIRECTOR

March 23, 2023

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

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

Greenhills Ranch Specific Plan Phase II; PDS2016-SPA-16-001; PDS2016-REZ-16-002; PDS2016-TM-5611; PDS2016-ER-98-14-020B

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services (PDS)  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110  
San Diego, CA 92123-1239

3. a. Contact: Nicolas Gustafson, Project Manager

b. Phone number: (619) 323-7314

c. E-mail: nicolas.gustafson@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

Approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of Adlai Road and Audubon Road in the Lakeside Community Plan Area, in unincorporated San Diego County.  
APNs: 395-151-16 & 73; 395-160-15; 398-400-08, 09, 10, 20, 54 & 55

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Atlas Investments, LLC, 11661 San Vicente Blvd., Suite 701, Los Angeles, CA 90049 –  
Attn: Christopher Dahrling  
Lee Vance, Vance & Associates, 3276 Highland Drive, Carlsbad, CA 92008

6. General Plan

Community Plan: Lakeside

Regional Category: Village and Semi-Rural  
Land Use Designation: Specific Plan Area, Village Residential 4.3 (VR-4.3), and Public/Semi-Public Facilities  
Density: 1.6 du/acre – per Greenhills Ranch Specific Plan  
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) -

7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: S88, Specific Planning Area and Single Family Residential (RS)  
Minimum Lot Size: Varies 10,000 square feet, 6,000 square feet, and -  
Special Area Regulation: -

8. Description of project:

The site is located north of the intersection of Adlai Road and Audubon Road in the Lakeside Community Plan area, within the unincorporated County of San Diego. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Village and Semi-Rural. Land Use Designations are Specific Plan Area, Village Residential 4.3 (VR-4.3), and Public/Semi-Public Facilities. Zoning Classifications for the property are S88 (Specific Planning Area) and Single Family Residential (RS). The site is developed with two existing single-family residential structures and accessory use structures that would be removed/demolished.

The Project consists of the following discretionary actions: a Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) to amend the Greenhills Ranch Specific Plan (GRSP) to include development specifications and regulations for Phase II of the GRSP; a rezone would add the “D” Special Area Regulation to require a Site Plan; and a tentative map (TM) to subdivide the 36.03-acre site into 76 lots including 63 single-family residential lots. Residential lots would range in size from 5,119 square feet to 11,578 square feet. Approximately 18.64 acres would be dedicated as open space on the TM.

Project construction activities would include demolition, excavation and grading, and building construction. The Project would require demolition of two existing single-family residential structures and accessory use structures onsite (a total of approximately 7,000 square feet). Grading would consist of balanced cut and fill of approximately 180,000 cubic yards of material; no import or export is proposed. Excavation would be required to lower the high-point in elevation on the site by approximately 50 feet in the area of proposed residential lot 37. Blasting may also be required to excavate the high-point in elevation, with no more than three blasts limited to 6 tons of ammonium nitrate and 20,000 square feet per day. Much of the proposed excavation would occur in the area surrounding lot 37, and that material would be used onsite for fill material and construction of building pads and final slopes along the north, west, and south boundary of the site. Depths of fill in these areas would be maximum of approximately 30 feet.

The Project includes the following offsite improvements: curb and gutter improvements at the intersection of Adlai Road and Audubon Road, and the intersection of Greenhills Way (proposed) and Lake Jennings Park Road. Improvements along Lake Jennings Park Road would allow for a right-in/right-out traffic movement.

The following project design features would also be implemented to minimize environmental impacts:

- A mix of one and two-story homes along the south boundary that would be higher in elevation and adjacent to existing residences;
- Landscaping to screen from views of the new residences onsite from the south (see Appendix A); and
- Use of security gates along Greenhills Way and Audubon Road to limit cut through traffic from Lake Jennings Park Road and along Adlai Road.

Access would be provided via Adlai Road, a private road connecting to East Lakeview Road and Old Highway 80 (Business Route 8) to the south, and a proposed new private road connecting to Lake Jennings Park Road to the east. The Project would be served by San Diego County Sanitation District for sewer and with imported water from Helix Water District; however, portions of the site would require annexation into each of these districts and a portion of the site would need to be de-annexed from Lakeside Water District.

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

The Project is located in the southern portion of the Greenhills Specific Plan, surrounded by residential neighborhoods, open space, and public facilities. Open space and residential uses developed as a part of Phase I of the GRSP occur northwest of the Project site. Residential development is located directly to the south and east. Additional residential is located further to the north and west. Open space also occurs west of the site boundary. A water filtration plant operated by the Helix Water District is located just northeast of the site. Four residential lots that are not a part of the GRSP occur within, and are mostly surrounded by, the Project site. Lake Jennings Park Road is located immediately east of the Project site, with Lake Jennings and additional residential development (mobile home park) on the east side of this road. Adlai Road provides access to Old Highway 80 (Business Route 8) 0.7 miles to the south. The topography of the surrounding area is hilly. The central portion of the Project site is a high-point in elevation at over 760 feet above mean sea level (amsl). Land slopes down to the north to less than 500 feet amsl at the Greenhills Ranch Phase I development. The land slopes down to the west and south but rises again to approximately 840 feet amsl just south and slightly west of the site. The ground surface dips slightly to the east but then rises again on the other side of Lake Jennings Park Road to over 800 feet amsl.

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

<b>Permit Type/Action</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Air Quality Permit to Construct	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego

Fire District Approval	Lakeside Fire Protection District
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Open Space Easement	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego
Road Opening	County of San Diego
Sewer District Approval	San Diego County Sanitation District
Site Plan	County of San Diego
Specific Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
Utility Easement Vacation	Helix Water District
Water District Approval	Lakeside Water District / Helix Water District

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

YES

NO

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

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

Aesthetics

Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Air Quality

Biological Resources

Cultural Resources

Energy

Geology & Soils

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Hazards & Hazardous Materials

Hydrology & Water Quality

Noise

Recreation

Utilities & Service Systems

Land Use & Planning

Population & Housing

Transportation

Wildfire

Mineral Resources

Public Services

Tribal Cultural Resources

Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



March 23, 2023

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Nicolas Gustafson  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

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

## INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

**I. AESTHETICS.**

Except as provided in Public Resources Code §21099.

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

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on a site visit completed by County staff, the proposed Project is located near or within the viewshed of a scenic vista as the Project site occupies an area higher in elevation than the immediately surrounding area and is vegetated primarily with native vegetation. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying land cover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The visual environment of the subject scenic vista extends from Lake Jennings Road east of the site to Lakeview Road west of the site. The visual composition consists of a ridge trending from northeast to southwest that contains just a few residential and outbuilding structures and high-voltage electric transmission lines. Native vegetation occurs on the slopes of the ridge where it hasn't been cleared for the existing residential structures and outbuildings.

Although the Project would modify the landform onsite through anticipated blasting and grading, the proposed homes would still be located on a higher elevation than the surrounding area. The proposed homes would be visible from lower elevation residential areas south of the site. The proposed development would have limited visibility from the north, east, and west due to dedication of open space and agricultural areas to the west and north, the Helix Water District water filtration plant to the northeast, and Lake Jennings Road to the east.

Section 4.4.2.2 of the proposed SPA describes general standards for future development of the residential lots through Site Plan application(s). Item 3 of this section limits maximum coverage of residential lots to be 60 percent with structures of any type. Item 6 requires residences to be restricted to one-story with a maximum height of 20 feet on lots ~~4-3~~, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 14~~15~~. These lots comprise 11~~9~~ of the 15 lots that face the residential areas to the south along Adlai Road. These standards, or project design features, would reduce the potential for Project impacts to the existing visual character and quality of the surrounding area.

A Conceptual Landscape Plan (CLP) was prepared for the Project by Martin Schmidt (ASLA) of Environs dated February 16, 2016, updated May 25, 2021 (see Appendix A). The CLP requires the Project to include landscaping throughout the Project development to screen views of the development from surrounding areas as mitigation. For example, the CLP requires landscaping on the fill slopes between the proposed homes and residential areas south of the site. The CLP also requires trees on the building pads along the Project boundaries and throughout the development including along the proposed interior streets to further screen the homes. The CLP is an integral component of the Project design, and the Project would be conditioned to obtain approval of a Landscape Plan in conformance with the CLP.

The CLP shows how the proposed Project would be screened by this required landscaping, using existing vegetation to accurately depict photo simulations provided by the applicant's consultants (Landmark Consulting and REC Consultants). These photo simulations also incorporate the landscaping requirements and limitations regarding coverage and one-story homes described above. The photo simulations depict what the Project site would look like when viewed from immediately south of the site (north end of Adlai Road) and from further south (Vecinio Del Este Place and Adlai Road). As demonstrated by the photo simulations, the Project development would be well screened with required landscaping and would not detract from the existing visual character and quality of the surrounding area. Therefore, through implementation of project design features (i.e., development limitations) and mitigation (i.e., landscaping), the Project would result in less than significant impacts to the scenic vista of and from the Project site.

The Project would not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed Project viewshed in addition to past, present and future projects within the vicinity were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to Section XXI. *Mandatory Findings of Significance* for a list of the cumulative projects considered. Of those projects listed in Section XXI, only Riker Ranch is located within the vicinity of the Project site and it is lower in elevation than the proposed Project and approximately 0.25 mile south of the Project along Adlai Road. The Riker Ranch project recently constructed a single-family residential development similar to surrounding residential development and was determined to not result in any impacts to visual resources. Therefore, the Project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact in combination with the Riker Ranch project on a scenic vista.

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

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

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



**No Impact:** There are no State scenic highways within the Project viewshed. The nearest State scenic highway is a segment of State Route 52, approximately 5.4 miles west of the Project site. The nearest eligible highway for a State scenic designation is Interstate 8, approximately 0.77 mile southeast of the Project site. The nearest route in the County Scenic Highway System is El Monte Road located approximately 0.66 mile north of the site (Table COS-1 of the Conservation and Open Space Element of the General Plan). The Project site is not in line with road users' line of site of the roadway and the Project site is not visible due to intervening vegetation, topography, and structures. High-voltage transmission towers are the most visible feature near the Project site. Therefore, the Project would have no impact to State scenic highways or County scenic routes and no potential to contribute to any cumulative impact.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project site and much of the immediately surrounding area of Lakeside is classified as urbanized. The proposed Project would not conflict with applicable regulations, such as General Plan policies governing scenic quality due to the reasons described in Section I(a) and (b) above.

The entire Project site is composed of varied topography that will require grading and modifications. However, the Project site is not considered a scenic resource and grading would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views (see Appendix A).

A list of past, present, and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to Section XXI. *Mandatory Findings of Significance* for a list of the projects considered. Of those projects listed in Section XXI, only Riker Ranch is located within the viewshed surrounding the Project and does not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: the Rikers Ranch project recently constructed single-family residences similar to the surrounding land uses and was determined to not result in any impacts to visual resources. Therefore, the Project would not result in direct or cumulative impacts on visual character or quality onsite or in the surrounding area.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed Project would use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 27 miles west of the Mount Laguna Observatory. The Project would not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the Project would conform to the Light Pollution Code (County 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 would control outdoor lighting and sources of glare in the following ways:

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

The Project would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the Project would conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County PDS 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 of light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this Project in combination with all past, present, and future projects would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the Project would not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

In addition, the Project's outdoor lighting is controlled through the GRSP and subsequent Site Plans that would implement residential development standards of the GRSP and ensure lighting would be consistent with the Light Pollution Code. Therefore, compliance with the Code, in combination with the outdoor lighting and glare controls listed above, would ensure that the Project would not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare.

## **II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.**

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

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

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

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

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

**No Impact:** The Project site is zoned S88, Specific Planning 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) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

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

**No Impact:** The Project site, including offsite improvements, does not contain forest lands or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the Project is consistent with existing zoning, and a rezone would add the "D" Special Area Regulation to require a Site Plan; however, no other rezoning of the property is proposed. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland production zones.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

**No Impact:** The Project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code § 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) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

**No Impact:** The Project site and surrounding area within a radius of 0.25-mile does not contain any active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. A small area of Farmland of Local Importance is located north of the Project site within the Phase I area of the GRSP; however, most this area contains primarily native habitat and is in dedicated open space. A small portion of this area contains several residential lots. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations would be converted to a non-agricultural use by the proposed Project.

### III. AIR QUALITY.

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

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

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

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

The GRSP established an overall density of 1.6 dwelling units per acre for the buildout of Phases I and II. Phase I includes 31 built units and the Project proposes 63 units for Phase II. This would result in an overall density for the entire Specific Plan of approximately 1.03 dwelling units per acre. This density change would result in less development and fewer mobile emissions compared to the allowable use. Because the proposed Project would result in less development,

it would be consistent with the growth assumptions in the General Plan and would not conflict with the County’s ability to comply with the RAQS and SIP. In addition, the construction and operational emissions from the Project are anticipated to be below established screening-level thresholds (SLTs), as addressed under Section III(b), and would not violate any ambient air quality standards.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 8-hour concentrations for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). San Diego County is also in non-attainment for 1-hour concentrations for O<sub>3</sub> under the CAAQS. O<sub>3</sub> is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Additionally, San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter (PM) less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) and PM less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) under the CAAQS. Sources of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> in both urban and rural areas include motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Air quality emissions associated with the Project include emissions from both construction and operation of the Project.

The County has identified SLTs which incorporate the San Diego Air Pollution Control District’s (SDAPCD’s) established air quality impact analysis trigger levels for all new source review in SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and Rule 20.3. These SLTs identified in the County Guidelines can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project’s total emissions (e.g., stationary, fugitive dust, and mobile emissions) would not result in a significant impact to air quality (see Table 1 below). SLTs for VOCs are based on the threshold of significance for VOCs from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which is more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin). The County’s SLTs were developed in support of State and federal ambient air quality standards that are protective of human health.

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

Pollutant	Total Emissions		
	Lbs. per Hour	Lbs. per Day	Tons per Year
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	---	100	15
Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	--- *	55	10*
Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )	25	250	40
Sulfur Oxides (SO <sub>x</sub> )	25	250	40
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	100	550	100

Lead	---	3.2	0.6
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	---	75**	13.7***

Notes: \* USEPA “Proposed Rule to Implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards” published September 8, 2005. Also used by the SCAQMD.

\*\* Threshold for VOCs based on the threshold of significance for VOCs from the SCAQMD for the Coachella Valley.

\*\*\* 13.7 Tons Per Year threshold based on 75 lbs/day multiplied by 365 days/year and divided by 2,000 lbs/ton.

Construction of the project is expected to begin 2024 and be completed in 2025. The first year of full operations would be expected in 2026. Emissions generated during construction activities would be temporary and localized to the Project site and vicinity. Demolition activities would involve the removal of 7,000 square feet of existing structures. Blasting is expected to occur during grading activities and would require a total of three blasts limited to 6 tons of ammonium nitrate and 20,000 square feet per day. Construction activities would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance (Grading Ordinance) and SDAPCD Rule 55 to reduce fugitive dust. The Project would also require all project-related grading and site preparation activities to employ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) certified Tier 4 construction equipment with diesel particulate filters. With the application of fugitive dust control measures, criteria air pollutant emissions during construction activities would be below the County SLTs (see Table 2 below and Appendix B).

**Table 2. Estimated Project Construction-Related Air Emissions**

Pollutant	Maximum Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day)	Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day)	Above Threshold?
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	40.78	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	10.2	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )	107.12	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO <sub>x</sub> )	0.07	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	440.44	550	No
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	7.37	75	No

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

During operation, the Project is expected to result in 640 average daily trips (see Section XVII. *Transportation*). With the implementation of operational design features including light-emitting diode (LED) lighting and water efficient fixtures, Project operational emissions would be below the County’s SLTs (see Table 3 below and Appendix B).

**Table 3. Estimated Project Operational Air Emissions**

Pollutant	Maximum Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day)	Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day)	Above Threshold?
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	5.14	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	1.51	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )	5.74	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO <sub>x</sub> )	0.06	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	20.14	550	No

Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	4.22	75	No
-----------------------------------	------	----	----

Note: CalEEMod does not report on lead emissions and therefore, it is not included in this analysis. The Project no longer includes natural-gas hearths and, therefore, the emissions included in Table 3 represent a conservative analysis (i.e., are higher than what the Project will emit).

Cumulative impacts could occur if the most intensive phases of construction for the proposed Project occur simultaneously with intensive phases of other construction projects in close proximity. The most intensive construction phase for the Project and for typical developments occurs during earthwork and grading activities. During these phases, the primary criteria air pollutant of concern would be PM<sub>10</sub>. The Project’s estimated emissions of criteria air pollutants, specifically PM<sub>10</sub>, were estimated to be 40 lb/day during blasting, which is under the County’s SLTs of 100 lb/day during construction activities. In addition, due to the highly dispersive nature of PM, a cumulative impact during construction activities would only occur if a project adjacent to the proposed Project undergoes simultaneous grading/earthwork activities and emits significantly greater PM<sub>10</sub> emissions than the Project. While the Riker Ranch project is located approximately 0.25 mile south of the Project, the Riker Ranch project emissions were not cumulatively considerable and the proposed Project emissions would not be cumulatively considerable either. Because all projects developed within the County would be required to comply with the County Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55, this scenario is not anticipated to occur.

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

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool – 12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, day-care centers, residences, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. Because the Project proposes residential land uses, the proposed Project would not be considered a point-source of significant emissions. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are residences located approximately 328 feet away from the project centroid. The Project would generate construction emissions in the vicinity of sensitive receptors.

Diesel PM (DPM) is the primary toxic air contaminant (TAC) of concern and is generated from fuel consumption in heavy construction equipment. The Health Risk Assessment prepared as part of the Air Quality Assessment found that the Project would result in a less than significant cancer risk at all receptors surrounding the Project site with the use of Tier 4 construction equipment. Compliance with the County’s Grading Ordinance, SDAPCD Rule 55, and the use

of Tier 4 engines would ensure the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive concentrations of air pollutants. The County's SLTs for human health hazards were developed in support of State and federal ambient air quality strategies that are protective of human health.

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project could produce objectionable odors during the construction phases of paving and painting activities which would require bitumen and solvents from the placement of hot asphalt and architectural coating. Exhaust from construction equipment may also generate odors. However, due to the dispersive nature of odors and short-term, temporary nature of these activities, these impacts would be fairly short-lived and would not cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Furthermore, the Project would be subject to SDAPCD Rule 51, Nuisance Rule, which prohibits emissions of any material that causes nuisance to a considerable number of persons or endangers the comfort, health, or safety of any person. The Project would result in development of residential uses which are not generally associated with the generation of objectionable odors. Thus, the Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people during construction or operation.

#### **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.**

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

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, a Biological Resources Report dated January 2021 prepared by DUDEK (see Appendix C), and a Biological Resources Addendum dated August 2020 prepared by DUDEK (see Appendix D), it has been determined that the Project site and surrounding area support native vegetation, namely, Diegan coastal sage scrub, disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub, and Riversidian upland sage scrub. Special status plant species observed on the Project site include San Diego County viguiera (*Bahiopsis laciniata*), San Diego sagewort (*Artemisia palmeri*), and



ashy spike-moss (*Selaginella cinerascens*), all of which are County List D plant species. Special status wildlife species observed on the Project site include the coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*), a County Group 1 species, the coastal cactus wren (*Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus sandiegensis*), a County Group 1 species, and Belding's orange-throated whiptail (*Cnemidophorus hyperythrus beldingi*), a County Group 2 species. The Project would result in impacts to 87 individuals of San Diego County viguiera, foraging and nesting habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher, foraging habitat for the coastal cactus wren, and suitable habitat for Belding's orange-throated whiptail. No direct impacts to San Diego sagewort and ashy spike-moss, a County List D plant, are expected with implementation of the proposed Project.

There are impacts to approximately 12.05 acres of suitable habitat for special-status plants. According to the Subarea Plan and Section 86.507(a)(1)(c) of the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO), impacts to County List D plants are mitigated based on habitat requirements rather than specific plant populations; therefore, impacts to San Diego County viguiera shall be mitigated through MM BIO-1 (preservation of 8.88 acres of suitable habitat on site and 10.23 acres of suitable habitat off site within open space). Dedication of an onsite and offsite biological open space easement would preserve habitat with a high habitat value for sensitive plant and animal species. To protect the preserve from entry upon Project completion, an open space fence or wall would be required along all open space edges where open space is adjacent to residential uses (MM BIO-8).

Impacts to 12.05 acres of suitable coastal California gnatcatcher habitat and suitable coastal cactus wren foraging habitat shall be mitigated through MM BIO-1 (preservation of a total of 19.11 acres on site and off site in open space), which conserves 19.11 acres contiguous coastal sage scrub adjacent to existing Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) preserves. Impacts to potential nesting coastal California gnatcatchers shall be mitigated through avoidance of clearing occupied habitat between February 15 through August 31 per MM BIO-2 (avoidance of nesting season) and by conducting preconstruction surveys for the species (MM BIO-2 and MM BIO-7). These mitigation measures meet the criteria in the Subarea Plan and Sections 86.507(2)(d) and 86.507(4)(b) of the BMO for impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher. Impacts to suitable habitat for potentially occurring wildlife species shall be mitigated through MM BIO-1 (preservation of 19.11 acres of habitat in open space); and nesting birds through MM BIO-2 (avoidance of nesting season).

Short-term indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species shall be mitigated through MM BIO-3 (biological monitoring) and MM BIO-4 (temporary construction fencing), which prevent inadvertent disturbance outside of the impact areas, monitoring fencing and erosion control measures, and minimizes impacts to wildlife species; MM BIO-5 (preparation of a SWPPP and BMPs), which prohibits litter that attract non-native or nuisance wildlife and pets on site; MM BIO-7 (limitations on construction activities near occupied coastal California gnatcatcher habitat), which prevents indirect impacts to breeding gnatcatchers between February 15 and August 15; and MM BIO-3 (control fugitive dust), which will minimize impact to surrounding habitat for wildlife species during construction activities. Impacts are considered less than significant with incorporation of these mitigation measures.

Long-term indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species shall be mitigated through MM BIO-1 (preservation of 19.11 acres of habitat in open space), which conserves 19.11 acres of

contiguous coastal sage scrub adjacent to existing MSCP preserves and minimizes the effects of habitat fragmentation; MM BIO-8 (permanent fencing and signage), which prevents access into the preserve; MM BIO-9 (landscaping palettes), which prohibits the planting of invasive plant species; MM BIO-10 (weed control treatment), which provides control measures for non-native, invasive species; and MM BIO-11 (fire protection plan), which minimizes fire exposure to the preserve. Impacts are considered less than significant with incorporation of. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with the incorporation of these mitigation measures.

Mitigation for the impact is in conformance with the BMO, which is the implementing ordinance for the County's MSCP. The MSCP is a multi-agency approved plan for the regionwide conservation of species and habitats. Mitigation for impacts of the listed cumulative projects in Section XXI below is also in accordance with the BMO or the City of Santee's MSCP for the Fanita Ranch project. Therefore, the Project would not substantially contribute to any cumulative impact for candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

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

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of the County's GIS records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, the Biological Resources Report (Appendix C), and the Biological Resources Addendum (Appendix D), it has been determined that the proposed Project site contains Diegan coastal sage scrub, disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub, and Riversidian upland sage scrub, which are considered Tier II vegetation communities in the County's MSCP, within the Project boundaries. The Project would result in impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub, disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub, and Riversidian coastal sage scrub, totaling 12.05 acres. Mitigation for these impacts includes the preservation of 8.89 acres onsite and 10.23 acres offsite and adjacent of vegetation communities generally consistent with the assemblage of vegetation communities impacted by the Project (MM BIO-1). Based on the South County MSCP's Schedule of Mitigation Ratios table (Table 4-8, County of San Diego 1997), impacts to 12.05 acres of Tier II vegetation communities require 19.11 acres of in-kind mitigation; therefore, preservation of 19.11 acres of a Tier II vegetation community exceeds the minimum criteria and provides a 1.5 to 1 mitigation ratio. This mitigation meets the criteria in the Subarea Plan and Section 86.506 of the BMO.

Short-term indirect impacts to special-status vegetation communities would be mitigated through MM BIO-5 (preparation of a SWPPP and BMPs), which prevents chemical pollutants from entering surrounding vegetation; and MM BIO-3 (control fugitive dust), which would minimize dust impacts to surrounding vegetation communities during construction activities.

Long-term indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species would be mitigated through MM BIO-1, which conserves 19.11 acres of a Tier II vegetation community adjacent to existing MSCP preserves and minimizes the effects of habitat fragmentation; MM BIO-8 (permanent fencing and signage), which prevents access into the preserve; MM BIO-9 (landscaping palettes), which

prohibits the planting of invasive plant species; MM BIO-10 (weed control treatment), which provides control measures for non-native, invasive species; and MM BIO-11 (fire protection plan), which minimizes fire exposure to the preserve.

Mitigation for the impact to these habitats is in conformance with the BMO, the implementing ordinance for the County's MSCP. Therefore, Project impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego MSCP, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations, are considered less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation.

Mitigation for impacts of the listed cumulative projects in Section XXI below is also in accordance with the BMO or the City of Santee's MSCP for the Fanita Ranch project. Therefore, the Project would not substantially contribute to any cumulative impact of a sensitive natural community.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of the County's GIS records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, the Biological Resources Report (Appendix C), and the Biological Resources Addendum (Appendix D), it has been determined that 0.04 acres of non-wetland ephemeral drainages under the jurisdiction of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) occur on the Project site. However, the Project would not impact by discharging into, directly removing, filling, or hydrologically interrupting, any federally protected wetlands supported on the Project site. The Project proposes complete avoidance of the drainages by dedicating open space easements that would include the drainages. Implementation of MM BIO-5 would require preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and associated best management practices (BMPs) in accordance with the General Construction Permit for stormwater discharges to avoid indirect effects to downstream drainages (see Section X(a)). Additionally, Project construction activities would occur in accordance with the County's Grading Ordinance to avoid erosion and sedimentation impacts on the ephemeral drainages. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur to wetlands or waters of the U.S. as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the USACE.

The Project would not impact state or federally protected wetlands and thus, would not contribute to a cumulative impact for such habitats.

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

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of the County's GIS records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, the Biological Resources Report (Appendix C), and the Biological Resources Addendum (Appendix D), it has been determined that the Project site represents a portion of the Lake Jennings/Wildcat Canyon Core Resource Area, a core of habitat supporting California gnatcatcher and cactus wren. The Project would result in impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub, disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub, and Riversidian upland sage scrub, totaling 12.05 acres. Diegan coastal sage scrub is the primary vegetation community located within the linkage and provides potential habitat for a variety of species, including the coastal California gnatcatcher.

Short-term indirect impacts to wildlife movement shall be mitigated through MM BIO-3 (biological monitoring) and MM BIO-4 (temporary construction fencing), which prevent inadvertent disturbance outside of the impact areas, monitoring fencing and erosion control measures, and minimizes impacts to wildlife species; MM BIO-5 (preparation of a SWPPP and BMPs), which prohibits litter that attract non-native or nuisance wildlife and pets on site; MM BIO-6 (limitations on construction activities near occupied coastal California gnatcatcher habitat), which prevents indirect impacts to breeding gnatcatchers between February 15 through August 31; and MM BIO-3 (control fugitive dust), which will minimize impact to surrounding habitat for wildlife species during construction activities. Short-term indirect impacts to wildlife movement as a result of noise shall be mitigated through MM BIO-7 (limitations on construction activities near occupied coastal California gnatcatcher habitat), which prevents indirect impacts to breeding gnatcatchers between February 15 through August 31.

Long-term indirect impacts to wildlife movement shall be mitigated through MM BIO-1 (preservation of 19.11 acres of habitat in open space), which conserves 19.11 acres of contiguous coastal sage scrub adjacent to existing MSCP preserves and minimizes the effects of habitat fragmentation; MM BIO-8 (permanent fencing and signage), which prevents access into the preserve; MM BIO-8 (landscaping palettes), which prohibits the planting of invasive plant species; MM BIO-10 (weed control treatment), which provides control measures for non-native, invasive species; and MM BIO-11 (fire protection plan), which minimizes fire exposure to the preserve. The Project is designed to provide open space contiguous with adjacent open space and undeveloped lands, within the Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) of the MSCP. Through this configuration, the design criteria of the BMO have been met. Specifically, the existing corridor and core would be maintained and would continue to provide coastal sage scrub habitat for resident wildlife species, as well as cover and topographical relief for species.

Impacts are considered less than significant with incorporation of these mitigation measures. Therefore, the direct and cumulative impact is less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation.

- e) Would the project conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat

conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

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

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** As described above, the Project would result in impacts to 87 individuals of San Diego County viguiera, foraging and nesting habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher, foraging habitat for the coastal cactus wren, and suitable habitat for Belding’s orange-throated whiptail. Mitigation for the Project consists of the dedication of an onsite and offsite biological open space easement, which would preserve habitat with a high habitat value for sensitive plant and animal species. Breeding season avoidance would also be implemented to avoid impacts to nesting birds, including the coastal California gnatcatcher.

The Project would also result in impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub, disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub, and Riversidian coastal sage scrub, totaling 12.05 acres. Mitigation for these impacts includes the preservation of 8.89 acres onsite and 10.23 acres offsite and adjacent of vegetation communities generally consistent with the assemblage of vegetation communities impacted by the Project. Additionally, since Diegan coastal sage scrub is the primary vegetation community located within the Lake Jennings/Wildcat Canyon Core Resource Area and provides potential habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher, the Project is designed to provide open space contiguous with adjacent open space and undeveloped lands, within the PAMA of the MSCP. MM BIO-1 would require the dedication of an onsite and offsite biological open space easement, which would preserve habitat with a high habitat value for sensitive plant and animal species. Through this configuration, the design criteria of the BMO have been met. To protect the preserve from entry upon Project completion, an open space fence or wall would be required along all open space edges where open space is adjacent to residential uses (MM BIO-8). Breeding and nesting season avoidance would also be implemented to avoid impacts to nesting birds, including the coastal California gnatcatcher (MM BIO-2, MM BIO-6, and MM BIO-7). Implementation of fugitive dust control (MM BIO-3) and temporary construction fencing (MM BIO-4) would further protect sensitive resources in the vicinity from Project construction impacts.

Therefore, Project impacts to 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, are considered less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation.

### **Mitigation Measures**

#### *MM BIO-1 Preservation of Open Space*

The applicant will preserve in permanent open space 8.89 acres onsite and 10.23 acres offsite and adjacent of vegetation communities generally consistent with the assemblage of vegetation communities impacted by the proposed Project. This will include preservation of 19.11 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub to mitigate for Project impacts to 12.05 acres of native vegetation communities; thereby preserving compensatory habitat that provides equal or greater benefit to plant and wildlife species. Mitigation requirements are based on the South County Subarea

Plan’s Schedule of Mitigation Ratios table (Table 4-8, County of San Diego 1997). Both the impact and preserve areas are considered biological resource core area. Based on this information, the mitigation ratios and acreages presented below are required.

**Mitigation for Vegetation Community Impacts**

<b>MSCP Tier</b>	<b>Total Impact (acres)</b>	<b>Mitigation Ratio</b>	<b>Required Mitigation (acres)</b>	<b>Open Space Preserve Onsite (acres)*</b>	<b>Open Space Preserve Offsite (acres)*</b>
Tier II	12.05	1.5:1	18.08	8.88	10.23
Tier IV	7.94	N/A	--	0.01	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.99</b>		<b>18.08</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>10.23</b>

\*Mitigation acreage was set prior to final impacts analysis so the acreage for mitigation is slightly more than the 1.5:1 ratio that is required.

The applicant shall provide for the conservation habitat of the same amount and type of land located in San Diego County as indicated below prior to approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance of this permit:

- a. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and submitted to the PDS and shall be approved pursuant to the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements to the satisfaction of the director of Department of PDS. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be managed by Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), the RMP shall also be prepared and approved to the satisfaction of the director of DPR.
- b. 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.
- c. The dedication of the land and the selection of the Resource Manager and establishment of an endowment to ensure funding of annual ongoing basic stewardship costs shall be complete prior to approval of the RMP.
- d. 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.

***MM BIO-2 Avoidance of Nesting Season***

To avoid any direct impacts to migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, removal of habitat that supports active nests in the limits of grading or fuel modification zones should occur outside of the breeding season for these species (February 15 through August 31). In lieu of avoidance of the breeding season, a nesting bird survey shall be conducted 72 hours prior to impact and any nesting observed shall be avoided until nesting is confirmed completed by the monitoring biologist.

### *MM BIO-3 Control Fugitive Dust*

To prevent inadvertent disturbance to areas outside the limits of grading, all grading located shall be monitored by a biologist. Prior to issuance of land development permits, including clearing, grubbing, grading, and/or construction permits for any areas adjacent to the preserve and the offsite areas, the Proposed Project applicant shall provide written confirmation that a biological monitor approved by the County of San Diego has been retained and shall be present during clearing, grubbing, and periodically during grading activities within sensitive resources.

Biological monitoring shall include the following:

- a. Attend the preconstruction meeting with the contractor and other key construction personnel prior to clearing and grubbing to reduce conflict between the timing and location of construction activities with other mitigation requirements (e.g., seasonal surveys for nesting birds).
- b. Conduct meetings with the contractor and other key construction personnel describing the importance of restricting work to designated areas prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading. Perform inspection of fencing and erosion control measures (daily during rain events) near proposed preservation areas periodically during grading.
- c. Discuss procedures/training for minimizing harm to or harassment of wildlife encountered during construction with the contractor and other key construction personnel prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading.
- d. Supervise and monitor vegetation clearing, grubbing, and periodically during grading to ensure against direct and indirect impacts to biological resources that are intended to be protected and preserved.
- e. Verify that the construction site is implementing the SWPPP BMPs.
- f. Periodically monitor the construction site to see that dust is minimized and that manufactured slopes are revegetated as soon as possible.
- g. Periodically monitor the construction site to verify that artificial security light fixtures are directed away from open space and are shielded.

### *MM BIO-4 Temporary Construction Fencing*

Prior to issuance of land development permits, including clearing, grubbing, grading, and/or construction permits, the Proposed Project applicant shall install prominently colored fencing and signage wherever the limits of grading are adjacent to sensitive vegetation communities or other biological resources, as identified by the qualified monitoring biologist. Fencing shall remain in place during all construction activities. All temporary fencing shall be shown on grading plans for areas adjacent to the Preserve and for all offsite facilities constructed within the Preserve. Prior to release of grading and/or improvement bonds, a qualified biologist shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS (or his/her designee) and the Director of the DPR that work was conducted as authorized under the approved land development permit and associated plans.

### *MM BIO-5 Preparation of a SWPPP and BMPs*

The applicant shall prepare a SWPPP. The SWPPP will include, at a minimum, the BMPs listed below. The combined implementation of these requirements shall protect adjacent habitats and

special-status species during construction to the maximum extent practicable. At a minimum, the following measures and/or restrictions shall be incorporated into the SWPPP and noted on construction plans, where appropriate, to avoid impacts on special-status species, sensitive vegetation communities, and/or jurisdictional waters during construction. The Project Biologist shall verify the implementation of the following design requirements:

- a. Fully covered trash receptacles that are animal-proof and weather-proof will be installed and used by the operator to contain all food, food scraps, food wrappers, beverage containers, and other miscellaneous trash. Prohibit littering and remove trash from construction areas daily. All food-related trash and garbage shall be removed from the construction sites on a daily basis.
- b. Pets on or adjacent to construction sites will not be permitted by the operator.
- c. Construction activity will not be permitted in jurisdictional waters, including wetlands or riparian areas, except as authorized by applicable law and permit(s), including permits and authorizations approved by the USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB.
- d. Temporary structures and storage of construction materials will not be located in jurisdictional waters.
- e. Staging/storage areas for construction equipment and materials will not be located in jurisdictional waters.
- f. Any equipment or vehicles driven and/or operated within a jurisdictional waters, will be checked and maintained by the operator daily to prevent leaks of oil or other petroleum products that could be deleterious to aquatic life if introduced to the watercourse.
- g. No stationary equipment, such as motors, pumps, generators, and welders, or fuel storage tanks will be located within jurisdictional waters, including wetlands and riparian areas.
- h. No debris, bark, slash sawdust, rubbish, cement, or concrete, or washing thereof, oil, or petroleum products will be stored where it may be washed by rainfall or runoff into jurisdictional waters, including wetlands and riparian areas.
- i. When construction operations are completed, any excess materials or debris will be removed from the work area.
- j. No equipment maintenance will be performed within or near jurisdictional waters, including wetlands and riparian areas, where petroleum products or other pollutants from the equipment may enter these areas.

#### *MM BIO-6 Avoidance of Impacts to Coastal California Gnatcatcher*

No clearing or grubbing activities may occur within habitat identified by a qualified biologist as being occupied by coastal California gnatcatcher during the breeding season for the species (February 15 through August 31, annually).

#### *MM BIO-7 Avoidance of Breeding Season*

All vegetation clearing must be done outside of the breeding season. Construction may occur during the breeding season if a waiver or approval is received from the County and the Wildlife Agencies. If construction within suitable nesting habitat occurs during the breeding season and to address avoidance of indirect impacts, a nesting survey for birds protected under Migratory Bird Treaty Act, shall be conducted prior to the onset of construction. Construction may occur if active nests can be avoided and provided an adequate buffer or noise levels are documented to be below 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA) equivalent sound level (Leq) at the nest site.



### *MM BIO-8 Permanent Fencing and Signage*

To protect the preserve from entry upon completion of house construction, an open space fence or wall shall be installed along all open space edges where open space is adjacent to residential uses, not including the impact neutral open space or easements, and as indicated in the RMP. The barrier must be a minimum construction of vertical metal fencing, but may be other suitable construction material, as approved by Department of PDS and the Director of the DPR. To protect the Preserve from entry, informational signs shall be installed, where appropriate, along all open space edges where open space is adjacent to residential uses, along internal streets, and as indicated in the RMP. The signs must be corrosion resistant, a minimum of 6 inches by 9 inches in size, on posts not less than 3 feet in height from the ground surface, and state, "Sensitive Environmental Resources Protected by Easement. Entry without express written permission from the County of San Diego is prohibited." Signs may be placed on open space fences instead of independent posts.

### *MM BIO-9 Landscaping Palettes*

Prior to installation of any landscaping, plant palettes shall be reviewed by the Project Biologist to minimize the effects that proposed landscape plants could have on biological resources outside of the impact footprint due to potential naturalization of landscape plants in the open space. Landscape plants will not include invasive plant species on the most recent version of the Cal-IPC California Invasive Plant Inventory for the project region. Landscape plans will include a plant palette composed of native or non-native, non-invasive species that do not require high irrigation rates. Sections of Fuel Mod Zone 2 adjacent to Preserve Open Space will include only fire-safe native plants, such as those described in page 4 of County form PDS 199.

### *MM BIO-10 Weed Control Treatment*

Weed control treatments shall include all legally permitted chemical, manual, and mechanical methods applied with the authorization of the San Diego County agriculture commissioner. The application of herbicides shall be in compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations under the prescription of a pest control advisor (PCA) and implemented by a licensed applicator for the project owner. Where manual and/or mechanical methods are used, disposal of the plant debris will follow the regulations set by the San Diego County agriculture commissioner. The timing of the weed control treatment shall be determined for each plant species in consultation with the PCA, the San Diego County agriculture commissioner, and Cal-IPC with the goal of controlling populations before they start producing seeds. Weed control shall be implemented at least once per year throughout the life of the project.

### *MM BIO-11 Fire Protection Plan*

To minimize the potential exposure of the project area to fire hazards, all features of the Greenhills Ranch II Fire Protection Plan shall be implemented in conjunction with development of the Greenhills Ranch II.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** A Cultural Resource Survey and Historical Evaluation was completed for the proposed Project by County-approved historian Andrew R. Pigniolo dated November 2016 (Appendix E). The Cultural Resource Survey and Historical Evaluation determined that there are two historic-period resources within the Project site (P-37-030665 and P-37-030666). P-37-030665 is a historic-age single-story wood frame residential house, and P-37-030666 is a historic-age utilitarian structure that may have served as a pump house. These historical resources were evaluated for significance based on a review of historical records, including historic aerials and maps, building records, and an architectural evaluation. P-37-030665 and P-37-030666 were evaluated for historic significance. Based on the results of the evaluation, the structures at P-37-030665 and P-37-030666 both lack integrity and other qualities that would make them eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) or as significant under the County RPO. Based on their lack of integrity and significant qualities, it has been determined that P-37-030665 and P-37-030666 are not significant resources pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. Because the resources are not considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant impact.

b) Would the project 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                    |

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Archaeological resources were identified during the Cultural Resource Survey and Historical Evaluation prepared by County-approved archaeologist Andrew R. Pigniolo dated November 2016 (Appendix E). These resources include a historic foundation of a 1950s barn with minimal historic refuse (CA-SDI-19645) and a prehistoric isolated lithic tool (P-37-035619). One additional archaeological site, CA-SDI-19477, was identified in the record search but determined to be outside of the Project area. It was determined that CA-SDI-19645 does not contain the required significance criteria or retain information potential to qualify as a significant resource. In addition, P-37-035619 does not qualify as significant because it is an isolated resource. Therefore, it has been determined that the archaeological resources are not significant pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. There is the possibility of encountering subsurface cultural resources during grading and construction activities. Mitigation to reduce impacts to unknown, buried, resources to less than significant would consist of the implementation of an Archaeological Monitoring Program that would include a Kumeyaay Native American monitor as outlined below (Mitigation Measure [MM])

CUL-1). With implementation of MM CUL-1, potential impacts to subsurface cultural resources during Project grading and construction activities would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

### *MM CUL-1 Archaeological Monitoring Program*

#### a) Pre-Construction

- i. Contract with a County-approved archaeologist to perform archaeological monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all earth-disturbing activities. The Project Archaeologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, during, and after construction.
- ii. Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.

#### b) Construction

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

iii. Human Remains.

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

c) Rough Grading

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

d) Final Grading

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

v. Cultural Material Conveyance.

- a. The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 79, or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe.
- b. The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

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

## **VI. ENERGY.**

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project would result in the use of electricity, natural gas, petroleum, and other consumption of energy resources during both the construction and operation phases of the project; however, the consumption is not expected to be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary for the following reasons.

During construction, Tier 4 certified construction equipment would be utilized during all phases of construction. Tier 4 diesel engine standards are the strictest USEPA emissions requirement for off-highway diesel engines. This requirement regulates the amount of PM, or black soot, and NOx that can be emitted from an off-highway diesel engine. Tier 4 equipment also runs more efficiently and thus, uses less energy resources. All new construction would be required to comply with the California energy code in effect at the time of construction, which ensures efficient building construction.

Additional measures such as efficient water usage, high-efficiency LED street and area lighting, carpooling, and composting, would be employed by the project. Additionally, the applicant proposes to install 10 300-watt rooftop solar panels on each of the proposed 63 residential units or a total of 630 300-watt solar panels, which would minimize the electricity demand from the power grid. The applicant has also committed to an all-electric design and there would be no natural gas infrastructure or appliances as part of the Project. Therefore, the construction and operation of the project is not expected to result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy, and impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would use only the amount of energy necessary for the construction and operation of the proposed 63 residential units that is typical of residential development. Although site topography requires a significant amount of earthwork, this

work is needed for the development of the proposed residences, which is less than the number anticipated by the GRSP. The proposed residences would also include rooftop solar systems to generate renewable energy and energy efficient features as described further in Section VI(b) below. Therefore, the Project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

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

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

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

- a. Install heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems with sealed (tight) air ducts that minimize heating and cooling HVAC losses.
- b. Install tankless water heaters in each residential unit.
- c. Install low efficacy (Low E) dual pane windows.
- d. Install high efficiency LED street and area lighting.
- e. Install ten 300-watt solar panels on each of the proposed 63 residential units or a total of 630 300-watt solar panels.
- f. Low-flow faucets, kitchen faucets, toilets, and showers shall be installed at each residential unit with maximum flow rates of 1.5 gallons per minute at 60 psi.
- g. Through communication with County staff and the regional/local water district, the Project would determine if incentives/rebates are available for the purchase and installation of rain barrels.
- h. A Landscape Document Package shall be submitted that complies with the County's *Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance* and demonstrates a 40 percent reduction in current Maximum Applied Water Allowance for outdoor water use.
- i. Install weather-based irrigation systems which include rain sensing timers.

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

**VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.**

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

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

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

**No Impact:** The Project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. The nearest Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone to the Project site is the Newport-Inglewood-Rose Canyon Fault Zone approximately 17.3 miles southwest of the Project site. Therefore, there would be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this Project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the Project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. The project grading also must conform to the grading requirements outlined in the County Grading Ordinance and be verified in the field by a licensed or registered Civil Engineer and inspected by County Grading Inspectors. Therefore, compliance with the Grading Plan, Geotechnical Investigation prepared by the registered Civil Engineer, Grading Ordinance, California Building Code, and the County Code would ensure the Project would not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Liquefaction typically occurs when a site is located in a zone with seismic activity, onsite soils are cohesionless (such as sand or gravel), groundwater is encountered within 50 feet of the surface, and soil relative densities are less than about 70 percent. The Project site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project site is not within a “Landslide Susceptibility Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25 percent); 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 percent in grade because these soils are slide prone. Furthermore, the Geotechnical Investigation for Greenhills Ranch Phase 2 by GEOCON Inc, dated July 20, 2009 (Appendix F) states that historic landslide locations are not present on the Project site or at nearby locations that could impact the site. Since the Project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the Project would have a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils onsite are identified as Friant rocky fine sandy loam and Escondido very fine sandy loam that have a soil erodibility rating of “severe” as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. Construction of the project would include site grading, which has the potential



to release sediment into downstream receiving waters. However, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The Project would not result in unprotected erodible soils, would not alter existing drainage patterns, and is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature.
- The Priority Development Project (PDP)-Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for Greenhills Ranch Phase 2 prepared by REC Consultants, Inc., January 27, 2023 includes the implementation of site design, source control, and structural (i.e., biofiltration) BMPs to ensure the Project does not result in substantial soil erosion and sedimentation.
- 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 would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or ground disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations pertaining to grading and stormwater pollution prevention. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed Project involves significant earthwork balanced onsite (180,000 cubic yards) 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 Geotechnical Investigation was prepared for the project. The Geotechnical Investigation determined that no soils supporting the project site are unstable or susceptible to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. According to the Geotechnical Investigation, liquefaction is considered “very low.” The Geotechnical Investigation demonstrated that the site would be suitable for development with compliance with the Grading Ordinance and the California Building Code. Additionally, 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, lateral spreading, and erosion refer to Section VI(a)(iii)-(iv) and (b) listed above.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Geotechnical Investigation performed for the project found the soils encountered during the field investigation to be considered “non-expansive” as defined by 2016 California Building Code Section 1803.5.3 . The soils onsite are Friant rocky fine sandy loam and Escondido very fine sandy loam. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. 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 project would incorporate geotechnical recommendations to ensure soil stability, reducing potential impacts related to geologic units or soils to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Project would not create a substantial risk to life or property.

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

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

**No Impact:** The Project would rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. A Sewer Service Availability Letter dated August 3, 2021 has been received from the San Diego County Sanitation District indicating that the facility has adequate capacity for the Project’s wastewater disposal needs (Appendix G). No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

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

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

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

A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the Project is located on geological formations that have marginal potential to contain unique paleontological resources. The Geotechnical Investigation for Greenhills Ranch Phase 2 prepared by Geocon, Inc. dated July 20, 2009 states the underlying geology is comprised of Cretaceous-age Granitic Rock and Triassic-age Julian Schist (Appendix F). The Project would excavate into the substratum and bedrock below the soil horizons, which could cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

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

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

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

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

## Mitigation Measures

### *MM GEO-1 Paleontological Monitoring Program*

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

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

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

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

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

## **VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.**

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 states that “the determination of the significance of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) calls for careful judgment by the lead agency, consistent with the provisions in Section 15064. A lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project.” Section

15064.4(b) further states that a lead agency should consider the following non-exclusive factors when assessing the significance of GHG emissions:

1. The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;
2. Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency applies to the project; and
3. The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(1) states that “the lead agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable.” A cumulative impact may be significant when the project’s incremental effect, though individually limited, is cumulatively considerable.

The County General Plan incorporates smart growth and land planning principles intended to reduce vehicle miles traveled, and thereby reduce GHG emissions. Specifically, the General Plan directed preparation of a County Climate Action Plan (CAP) with reduction targets; development of regulations to encourage energy-efficient building design and construction; and development of regulations that encourage energy recovery and renewable energy facilities, among other actions. These planning and regulatory efforts are intended to ensure that actions of the County do not impede Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) and Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) mandates.

As such, on February 14, 2018, the County Board of Supervisors (Board) adopted a CAP, which identifies specific strategies and measures to reduce GHG emissions in the largely rural, unincorporated areas of San Diego County as well as County government operations (County of San Diego 2017). The CAP aims to meet the state’s 2020 and 2030 GHG reduction targets (AB 32 and SB 32, respectively), and demonstrate progress towards the 2050 GHG reduction goal.

On September 30, 2020, the Board voted to set aside its approval of the County’s 2018 CAP and related actions because the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (2018 CAP SEIR) was found to be out of compliance with CEQA. In response to this Board action, the County is preparing a CAP Update to revise the 2018 CAP and correct the items identified by the 4th District Court of Appeal in San Diego within the Final 2018 CAP SEIR that were not compliant.

The County does not currently have locally adopted screening criteria or GHG thresholds. Pending adoption of a new CAP, appropriate GHG emissions thresholds were considered for purposes of this analysis. Based on the specific characteristics of this project including its low generation of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), current guidance provided by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) was used to evaluate GHG emissions. For land use development projects, the BAAQMD recommends using the approach endorsed by the California Supreme Court in *Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife* (2015) (62 Cal.4th 204), which evaluates a project based on its effect on California’s efforts to meet the state’s long-term climate goals. As the Supreme Court held in that case, a project that would be consistent with meeting those goals can be found to have a less than significant impact

on climate change under CEQA. If a project would contribute its “fair share” of what would be required to achieve those long-term climate goals, then a reviewing agency can find that the impact would not be significant because the project would help to solve the problem of global climate change (62 Cal.4th 220–223). If a land use project incorporates all of the design elements necessary for it to be carbon neutral by 2045, then it would contribute its portion of what is needed to achieve the state’s climate goals and would help to solve the cumulative problem. It can therefore be found to make a less than cumulatively-considerable climate impact. Because this guidance supports how a project would contribute its “fair share” of the statewide long-term GHG reduction goals, it is not specific to the BAAQMD region and can also be applied in the San Diego region. BAAQMD’s *Justification Report: CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating the Significance of Climate Impacts from Land Use Projects and Plan* (Justification Report), adopted April 2022, is provided in Appendix H. The information provided in the Justification Report is intended to provide the substantial evidence that lead agencies need to support their determinations about significance using these thresholds.

The Justification Report analyzes what would be required of new land use development projects to achieve California’s long-term climate goal of carbon neutrality by 2045. A new land use development project being built today needs to incorporate the following design elements to do its “fair share” of implementing the goal of carbon neutrality by 2045:

- A) Projects must include, at a minimum, the following project design elements:
  - 1) Buildings
    - a) The project will not include natural gas appliances or natural gas plumbing (in both residential and nonresidential development).
    - b) The project will not result in any wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy usage as determined by the analysis required under CEQA Section 21100(b)(3) and Section 15126.2(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines.
  - 2) Transportation
    - a) Achieve a reduction in project-generated VMT below the regional average consistent with the current version of the California Climate Change Scoping Plan (currently 15 percent) or meet a locally adopted SB 743 VMT target, reflecting the recommendations provided in the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA:
      - i. Residential projects: 15 percent below the existing VMT per capita
      - ii. Office projects: 15 percent below the existing VMT per employee
      - iii. Retail projects: no net increase in existing VMT
    - b) Achieve compliance with off-street electric vehicle requirements in the most recently adopted version of the California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Tier 2.

With incorporation of the design features listed below, the Project would contribute its fair share to help the State meet carbon neutrality as codified in AB 1279, and would not hinder the County

from meeting GHG reduction benchmarks. Therefore, applying BAAQMD significance thresholds, the Project would generate a less than significant GHG impact (see Appendix H).

The Project would be required to implement the following design features (included as conditions of approval by the County):

1. Project-related construction activities would use Tier 4 construction equipment with DPF USEPA/ California Air Resources Board (CARB)-certified construction equipment with DPF. The Project applicant has confirmed commitment to this feature.
2. Comply with the County's Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD's fugitive dust rules outlined in Section 87.426 of the County's Grading Ordinance.
3. The Project will utilize architectural coatings compliant with SDAPCD Rule 67.
4. The Project would utilize no more than 6 tons of ammonium nitrate daily during any particular blast and would not blast an area greater than 20,000 square feet per day.
5. Install high-efficiency LED street and area lighting to achieve reduction in overall lighting energy.
6. In accordance with AB 939, and to be consistent with AB 341's statewide 75 percent diversion policy, the Project will seek to also achieve a 75 percent diversion goal by providing areas for storage and collection of recyclables and provide literature promoting recycling to achieve additional waste diversion.
7. The Project applicant will be required to comply with County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance and demonstrates a 40 percent reduction in outdoor use and will submit a Landscape Document Package to show such compliance. For purposes of this analysis only a 20 percent reduction was applied.
8. Install low flow indoor water fixtures in all residential units.
9. Project will not include natural gas appliances or natural gas plumbing.
10. Project would install 10 300-watt solar panels on each of the proposed 63 residential units or a total of 630 300-watt solar panels.
11. The Project would not result in any wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy usage (see Section VI above).
12. Achieve compliance with off-street electric vehicle requirements in the most recently adopted version of CALGreen Tier 2.
13. The Project would have a less-than-significant impact from vehicle miles traveled (see Section XVII below)
14. The Project will also look to get power from the community choice power program, that consists of 50 percent renewable power.
15. Landscaped and screened parking areas consistent with the County's Parking Design Manual, including Section 7 (Landscaping) and the "cool parking" mitigation requirements identified by the CARB.
16. Building efficiency features such as HVAC systems, sealed (tight) air ducts that minimize heating and cooling HVAC losses, tankless water heaters and Low E dual pane windows.
17. Work with the regional or local water agency to determine if incentives/rebates are available for the purchase and installation of rain barrels.
18. Install weather-based irrigation systems which include rain sensing timers.

The Project site is currently designated Specific Plan Area 1.6 by the General Plan and has a combined allowable density of 1.6 dwelling units per acre for Phases I and II (County of San Diego 2012) or 148 units within the GSRP. Phase I has been approved and the site currently

has built out 31 units. The allowable buildout of the Project site in the County's General Plan would allow for the construction of an additional 117 residential units, as compared to the proposed Project's 63 residential units. Operations from the allowable General Plan buildout of the site would result in fewer GHG emissions annually than would be produced under the General Plan buildout scenario.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 and EO B-30-15 established GHG emission reduction targets for the state, and AB 32 launched the CARB Climate Change Scoping Plan that outlined the reduction measures needed to reach the 2020 target, which the state has achieved. As required by SB 32, CARB's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan outlines reduction measures needed to achieve the 2030 target. AB 1279, the California Climate Crisis Act, codified the carbon neutrality target as 85 percent below 1990 levels by 2045. CARB's 2022 Scoping Plan was adopted by the CARB Board December of 2022. As detailed in the response in Section VIII(a) above, the Project would provide its "fair share" contribution towards the statewide goal of carbon neutrality by 2045.

Furthermore, Project emissions would decline beyond the buildout year of the Project due to continued implementation of federal, state, and local reduction measures, such as increased federal and state vehicle efficiency standards, and San Diego Gas and Electric's (SDG&E's) increased renewable sources of energy in accordance with Renewable Portfolio Standards goals. Based on currently available models and regulatory forecasting, Project emissions would continue to decline through at least 2050. Given the reasonably anticipated decline in Project emissions that would occur post-construction, the Project is in line with the GHG reductions needed to achieve the 2045 GHG emission reduction targets identified by AB 1279.

The Project was also evaluated for consistency with the San Diego Forward, which is the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that demonstrates how the region would meet its transportation related GHG reduction goals. The Project would be consistent with San Diego Forward as it would not conflict with implementation of its key goals. San Diego Forward goals include (1) the efficient movement of people and goods, (2) access to affordable, reliable, and safe mobility options for everyone, and (3) healthier air and reduced GHG emissions regionwide. As detailed in Section VIII(a), the Project would implement 2022 CALGreen Tier 2 voluntary requirements for EV parking and would install rooftop solar panels for clean energy generation, supporting the goal of achieving healthy air and reduced GHG emissions regionwide.

The County of San Diego's General Plan contains various goals, policies, and objectives related to the reduction of GHG emissions and global climate change. Because the Project would generate less emissions than what was estimated in the General Plan, it would be consistent.



The Project would not conflict with implementation of statewide GHG reduction goals, the 2022 Scoping Plan, San Diego Forward, or the County of San Diego General Plan. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, and impacts would be less than significant.

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.**

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project would 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. The Project would place residences within approximately 600 to 700 feet from the Helix Water District Water Filtration Plant, where hazardous substances, such as chlorine, may be stored and used; however, there are already existing residences at this distance and closer to the Water Filtration Plant. The Project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because all storage, handling, transport, emission, and disposal of hazardous substances would be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, §25500-25520.

The Project proposes to demolish structures onsite that were constructed prior to 1980 and that may contain Lead Based Paint (LBP) and Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs). Lead is a highly toxic metal that was used up until 1978 in paint used on walls, woodwork, siding, windows, and doors. Lead-containing materials shall be managed by applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Division 4.5, the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 CCR §1532.1), and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8). Asbestos was used extensively from the 1940's until the late 1970's in the construction industry for fireproofing, thermal and acoustic insulation, condensation control, and decoration. The USEPA has determined that there is no "safe" exposure level to asbestos. It is, therefore, highly regulated by the USEPA, the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), and the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (CalOSHA). Demolition or renovation operations that involve ACMs must conform to SDAPCD Rules 361.140-361.156. In accordance with existing regulations, the Project would be required to complete lead and asbestos surveys to determine the presence or absence of LBP or ACMs prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of onsite structures and prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities.

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above, and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections would occur in compliance with local, State, and federal regulation, the Project would not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances or related to the accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

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

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

**No Impact:** The Project is not located within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school. Lakeview Elementary school is approximately 2,000 feet (approximately 0.38 mile) southwest of the development footprint of the proposed Project. Therefore, the Project would not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

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

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

d) Would the project for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport,

would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

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

**No Impact:** The proposed Project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Height Notification Surface. Gillespie Field in El Cajon is located over 4 miles west-southwest of the Project site. 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 would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area.

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

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

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

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

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

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan would not be interfered with by the Project due to the location of the Project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not

within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed Project is adjacent to dedicated open space lands that have the potential to support wildland fires. The Project would dedicate additional open space lands in the northern portion of the site that would connect to this existing open space.

A Conceptual Fire Protection Plan (FPP) dated January 10, 2018 prepared by Firewise 2000, Inc. (Appendix I) has been accepted by the San Diego County Fire Protection District. The FPP demonstrates the Project would have adequate water supply and facilities for fire protection, adequate emergency access (to/from Lake Jennings Road and Adlai Street), would maintain required fuel modification zones, and would implement ignition resistant construction measures, including automatic fire sprinkler systems in each residence.

The Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires because the Project would comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for San Diego County. Implementation of these fire safety standards would occur during the TM, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process. The Fire Service Availability Letter (Appendix J) indicates the expected emergency travel time to the Project site to be 3.2 minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the General Plan Safety Element is 5 minutes; therefore, the Project meets emergency response travel time. Moreover, the Project would not

contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code.

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

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

**No Impact:** The Project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g., artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the Project does not involve or support uses that would produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (e.g., chicken coops, dairies, etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, any existing conditions onsite, such as the presence of manure would be removed during the site development/construction phase and would not pose the threat of exposure to nearby residents or future residents of the Project. Therefore, the Project would not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats, or flies.

#### **X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.**

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project would greatly increase the amount of impervious area on the Project site by constructing a new residential development. Potential sources of water pollution would include construction phase disturbance of the soils through grading, materials delivery, and waste generation, and post-construction residential development, including impervious surfaces, landscaped areas (fertilizers/pesticides), pet waste, trash storage, and motor vehicles. However, as described in the PDP-SWQMP for Greenhills Ranch Phase 2 prepared by REC Consultants, Inc., January 27, 2023 (Appendix K), the Project would implement several construction and operational stormwater BMPs. Construction BMPs include erosion and sediment control, water flow dissipation, offsite sediment tracking, and materials and waste management. Operational BMPs include site design (landscaping and maintenance of common area and slopes with native or drought-tolerant species, dedication of open space outside of the development footprint), source control (storm drain stenciling/signage, protect trash storage areas, and others), and structural controls including biofiltration and hydromodification control basins. In addition, due to the Project disturbing over one acre of ground surface, a waste discharge identification number and a NPDES General Construction Permit for stormwater discharges must be obtained from the State Water Resources Control Board (Region 9). The General Construction Permit for requires preparation and implementation

of a SWPPP and associated BMPs. With implementation of proposed BMPs and obtaining the required General Construction Permit, the Project would have a less than significant impact on water quality standards and waste discharge requirements and would not substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.

b) Would the project 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                               |

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project lies in the Santee and Coches hydrologic subareas (907.12 and 907.14, respectively), within the San Diego hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, the Los Coches Creek in hydrologic subarea 907.14 is impaired for Selenium and the Lower San Diego River (907.11) is impaired for enterococcus, fecal coliform, low dissolved oxygen, Manganese, Nitrogen, Phosphorus, total dissolved solids, and toxicity.

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

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

c) Would the project 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                               |

**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 Santee and Coches hydrologic subareas (907.12 and 907.14, respectively), within the San Diego hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; commercial and sport fishing; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; shellfish harvesting; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat. Water quality objectives are those as listed in Table 3-2 of the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (San Diego RWQCB 2016) for the San Diego Hydrologic Unit (7.10, 7.11, and 7.12)

The Project would implement construction and operational BMPs to protect water quality as established in the PDP-SWQMP prepared for the Project and described above in Section X(a). The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and stormwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

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

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

**No Impact:** The Project would obtain its water supply from the Helix Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The Project would not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic, or commercial demands. In addition, the 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., 0.25 mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

e) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surface, in a manner which would:

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

- |                                                         |                                                                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project would implement construction and operational BMPs to protect water quality as established in the PDP-SWQMP prepared for the Project and described above in Section X(a). Several of these BMPs are intended to reduce erosion and siltation to the maximum extent feasible. In addition, as shown in Table 7 of the Drainage Study prepared by REC Consultants, Inc. dated July 30, 2020 (Appendix L), the 100-year peak flow from the Project site would be reduced from 19.4 cubic feet per second (cfs) to 12.3 cfs following development of the site. First flush runoff from the site would be treated in biofiltration basins and outflows would pass over an energy dissipator to prevent scouring and erosion. Drainage patterns and basin areas would not be substantially altered by the Project as shown in Table 7 of the Drainage Study. Therefore, the Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Please refer to Section X(e)(i). The proposed Project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff. As show in Table 7 of the Drainage Study prepared by REC Consultants, Inc. dated July 30, 2020 (Appendix L), the 100-year peak flow from the Project site would be reduced from 19.4 cfs to 12.3 cfs following development of the site, and drainage patterns and basin areas would not be substantially altered. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project would implement construction and operational BMPs to protect water quality as established in the PDP-SWQMP prepared for the Project and described above in Section X(a) and would have a less than significant impact with regard to substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. As described in Section X(e)(i) above, the Project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns and would actually reduce the amount of runoff from the Project site (i.e., the 100-year peak flow from the Project site would be reduced from 19.4 cfs to 12.3 cfs in the developed condition). Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to creating or contributing runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.



(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

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

**Less Than Significant:** Please see Section X(e)(i) through (iii). The Drainage Study prepared by REC Consultants, Inc. dated July 30, 2020 (Appendix L) demonstrates that the Project would not impede or redirect flood flows.

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

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

**No Impact:** The Project site is not located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone given its topographical location (on a hill with lower elevation to the north, west, and south) and its distance from the coast.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project would implement construction and operational BMPs established in the PDP-SWQMP prepared for the Project to protect water quality as described above in Section X(a). As a result, the Project would not contribute to a direct or cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. As described in Section X(d) above, the Project would not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the Project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The Project would be required to implement the PDP-SWQMP and be in compliance with the County's WPO. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact with regard to implementation of the Basin Plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.**

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

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

**No Impact:** The Project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure, such as major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed Project would not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project has been reviewed for consistency with the General Plan and the Lakeside Community Plan. A full conformance analysis is included as an appendix to the SPA; however, a few policies are described below:

**General Plan Guiding Principle 1: Support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth.**

The Project proposes a development density which is consistent with the General Plan and Community Plan land use designation (see below).

**Land Use 1.9 Achievement of Planned Densities**

When the Lakeside Community Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1975, it included the entire Project area as the Aksyn Specific Plan. The Community Plan established criteria for the GRSP. Phase I of the GRSP was approved in 2004 and has been built out. The Project is consistent with the development standards for Phases I and II as described below:

- 1. Overall density shall not exceed 1.6 dwelling units per acre.**  
The GRSP results in an overall density of 1.03 dwelling units per acre.
- 2. At least 60 percent of the site shall be preserved in open space.**  
Approximately 69 percent of the GRSP is preserved in open space.
- 3. The developed portions of the site shall not exceed an overall gross density of 4.3 dwelling units per acre.**  
The GRSP results in an overall gross density of 3.23 dwelling units per acre for developed portions of the site.

**Land Use 6.1 Environmental Sustainability**

The Project includes 18.64 acres to be dedicated in open space. The majority of this open space would be located directly adjacent to the open space dedicated with the development of Phase I of the GRSP. The placement of this open space increases an already existing open space preserve system.

**Land Use 6.9 Development Conformance with Topography**

The Project locates development in areas which have already been disturbed and away from areas which are biologically sensitive, specifically areas subject to the County RPO for steep slopes. Areas subject to the County RPO for significant steep slopes have been placed in an easement and are not subject to grading or development. The Project proposes excavating and leveling a hill located on the site; excavated material from this hill would be used as fill on other portions of the proposed development area.

**Conservation and Open Space 12.2 Development Location on Ridges**

Ridgeline development along the southerly portion of the site includes a mix of one and two-story homes and landscaping requirements so that building massing is limited to existing residences below and that which is visible has been screened by landscaping. Additionally, development regulations push building envelopes towards the new internal road network, further increasing the distance from existing homes and reducing visual impacts.

**Mobility 3.3 Multiple Ingress and Egress**

The Project would be gated and includes two access points for ingress and egress; one from Adlai/Audubon from the south and one from Lake Jennings Park Road/Greenhills Way from the north. These access points would provide adequate access to and from the Project site and have been accepted by the San Diego County Fire Protection District. Additionally, the Project proposes to gate the development to address neighbor concerns regarding cut through traffic. Access from Adlai to Lake Jennings Park Road through the Project site will be limited to Project residents and the existing four houses; general public vehicles cannot cut through and impact the existing residential neighborhoods to the south of the Project.

**Mobility 11.8 Coordination with County Trails Program**

The County Trails Master Plan identifies a trail connection through the Project site. The GRSP and TM have identified and incorporated the alignment of this trail route.

Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant with regard to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

**XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.**

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). The Project site is underlain by Upper Jurassic and Lower Cretaceous Marine and Nonmarine deposits, which could be suitable for crushed rock. However, given the relatively small area of the site (for a

potential mine), proximity to dedicated open space, residential land uses, and high-voltage transmission lines, and location within a Specific Plan area that anticipates additional residential development; extraction of such mineral resources would likely be an incompatible use due to drilling, blasting, and crushing that would likely occur. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

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

**No Impact:** The Project site is 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 resources delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

### **XIII. NOISE.**

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

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

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** This discussion is based on the findings of the Noise Assessment prepared by LDN dated September 28, 2020 (Appendix M) and Project plans. The Project is comprised of a 63 residential lot subdivision.

#### **General Plan – Noise Element**

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 dBA for single residences (including senior housing, convalescent homes), and 65 dBA CNEL for multi-family residences (including mixed-use commercial/residential). Moreover, if the project is located in an area in excess of 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities as mentioned within Tables N-1 and N-2. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL.

A Noise Assessment was prepared by LDN Consulting, Inc. dated September 28, 2020 (Appendix M), which evaluated potential noise impacts to the existing and future noise sensitive

land uses from the proposed development. Based on the Noise Assessment, the nearest noise source to the Project site would be vehicle traffic on Lake Jennings Park Road. Vehicle traffic along this roadway would generate future noise levels of 60 dBA CNEL east of or outside of the proposed residential lots. This demonstrates conformance with the County Noise Element. The Noise Assessment demonstrated that due to topography and distance separation from Lake Jennings Park Road, all proposed lots are anticipated to comply with the County's 60 dBA CNEL threshold. Additionally, the Noise Assessment evaluated the proposed second floor areas and found that the noise levels would not exceed the 60 dBA CNEL threshold. Furthermore, vehicle traffic associated with the Project would not cause an increase in noise levels of more than 3 dBA CNEL on any roadway segment and no cumulative noise increase of 3 dBA CNEL or more was found. Therefore, the proposed Project's direct and cumulative contributions to offsite roadway noise increases would not cause significant impacts to any existing or future noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the Project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

#### **Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404**

The Project is also subject to the County Noise Ordinance. Temporary construction noise is subject to Section 36.408, 409, and 410 of the Ordinance. Construction equipment operations are subject to a 75 dBA 8-hour average sound level limit at the boundary of an occupied residence. Based on the Noise Assessment, general construction equipment for grading and preparation of the site would be required. Construction equipment is anticipated to be comprised of a loader, dozers, excavators, trucks, and scrapers. In addition, the Project would also include blasting and rock drilling. Grading equipment would be spread out over the Project site from adjacent to the occupied properties to distances of over 300 feet away. The report identified that if grading activities involving more than two pieces of equipment operate within 50 feet of occupied residences or more than four pieces of equipment operate within 100 feet of occupied residences the 8-hour average of 75 dBA would be exceeded, which would be a significant impact. To reduce potential noise impacts from construction equipment, the Noise Assessment includes construction mitigation. MM NOI-1a would require standard construction BMPs and equipment siting. MM NOI-1b would require 8-foot-high temporary noise barriers to screen grading activities along the impacted areas and reduce noise levels at the adjacent occupied residences (see the Appendix M for temporary noise barrier locations). The Project would be conditioned to install these temporary noise barriers prior to commencing grading and construction activities. Incorporation of MM NOI-1a and MM NOI-1b would reduce noise levels to comply with the County Noise Ordinances and result in a less than significant impact.

The Project would also involve blasting and rock drilling and crushing activities onsite. In the event that the rock drilling occurs within 200 feet of any occupied noise sensitive land use, impulsive noise may exceed the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.410 standard of 82 dBA resulting in a potentially significant impact. The Noise Assessment indicated if these activities occur within 225 feet of any occupied noise sensitive land use, a blasting and monitoring plan would be required based upon the location of the construction equipment, topography, and construction schedule be developed by a County-certified acoustical engineer. MM NOI-2 requires that any temporary rock crushing and rock drilling activities shall be adequately setback 225 feet from the nearest property line. MM NOI-3 requires a blasting and monitoring plan be prepared and submitted to PDS for review and approval for conformance with the noise control measures. The blasting and monitoring plan may include an 8- to 12-foot-tall temporary noise

barrier along any property line where the impacts could occur. Since most of the Project drilling and blasting activities would take place in the area of proposed lots 28 to 38, it is likely a noise barrier would be needed along the east boundary of proposed lots 33 to 38 and HOA Lot A (see Appendix M). The Project would be conditioned to develop a specific noise mitigation plan prior to approval of a grading plan to ensure blasting and rock drilling and crushing activities would comply with the County's Noise Ordinance for construction and impulsive noise thresholds.

Non-transportation operational noise generated by the Project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the Project's property line. The site is zoned S88 that has a 1-hour average sound limit of 45 between 10 P.M and 7 A.M and 50 dB between 7 A.M and 10 P.M. The adjacent properties are zoned A70, RR, and S80, which have the same 1-hour average sound limits. Based on review by staff and the County Noise Specialist, the Project's operational noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards, which is 45 dB, because the Project operation would not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

The Project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the Project would not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the Project would not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the Project would not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, with MM NOI-1a, MM NOI-1b, MM NOI-2, and MM NOI-3, the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

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

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** The Project proposes a 63 residential lot subdivision where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the Project site is located more than 200 feet from any public road or transit Right-of-Way with projected noise contours of 65 dB or more; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A distance of 200 feet ensures that the operations would not have any chance of being impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 1995). This distance ensures that the Project would not be affected by any past, present, or future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise.

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.

There are no existing or proposed operational activities on or near the proposed Project site at this time which would cause any significant vibration levels to existing buildings near the Project site. While groundborne vibrations from typical construction activities very rarely reach levels high enough to cause damage to structures, the construction activities that typically generate the highest levels of vibration are blasting and impact pile driving. Isolated events such as blasting are significant when the peak particle velocity (PPV) exceeds one inch per second. Non-transportation vibration sources such as impact pile drivers or hydraulic breakers are significant when their PPV exceeds 0.1 inch per second. MM NOI-4 would require measures to reduce vibration during construction of the Project, such as preparing and submitting a vibration analysis to the County. The Project would be conditioned so that prior to approval of the grading plan and commencement of any blasting events, the applicant must provide a copy of the Sheriff-approved blasting and monitoring plan to the County Department of PDS and must demonstrate that the activity would not exceed 0.1 inch per second PPV. The blasting and monitoring plan shall include any necessary mitigation measures to effectively reduce noise and vibration levels (e.g., altering orientation of blast progression, increased delay between charge detonations, presplitting) to comply with the noise level limits of the County's Noise standards. With implementation of MM NOI-2 through MM NOI-4, Project impacts related to groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels would be less than significant.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project is subject to the County Noise Element which requires proposed residential development not to be exposed to noise levels exceeding 60 dBA CNEL. Based on the Noise Assessment (Appendix M), the nearest noise source to the Project site would be from future vehicle traffic on Lake Jennings Park Road. Vehicle traffic along this roadway would generate future noise levels of 60 dBA CNEL outside of the proposed residential lots. This demonstrates conformance with the County Noise Element. Additionally, the Project-related contributions to vehicle traffic on nearby roadways would not result in offsite direct/cumulative noise impacts. No further noise mitigation and or measures are required for Noise Element conformance.

Non-transportation noise generated by the Project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the Project's property line. The site is zoned S88 that has a 1-hour average sound limit of 50 dB from 7 A.M. to 10 P.M. and 45 dB from 10 P.M. to 7 A.M. based on the residential land use that is proposed. The adjacent properties are zoned A70, RR, and S80, which have the same 1-hour average sound limits. Based on review by staff and/or the County Noise Specialist, the Project's noise levels from the proposed residential land use are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards.

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

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

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Temporary and periodic increases in ambient noise from grading activities (including drilling, blasting, and rock crushing) and construction of the Project are addressed above in Section XIII(a). Potential impacts that would be mitigated to less than significant were identified for those activities. Once the Project is constructed the resulting residential land use would not result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise as compared to adjacent residential land uses.

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

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

**No Impact:** The Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and is not located within an ALUCP for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

### Mitigation Measures

#### *MM NOI-1a Temporary Construction Noise*

In order to minimize temporary construction noise for grading operations associated with the project subdivision and to comply with County Noise Ordinance 36.408 and 36.409, the project shall comply with the following temporary construction noise control measures throughout the duration of the grading activities:

- a) Turn off equipment when not in use.
- b) Equipment used in construction should be maintained in proper operating condition, and all loads should be properly secured, to prevent rattling and banging.
- c) Use equipment with effective mufflers.
- d) Configure traffic pattern to minimize backing movement.
- e) Equipment staging areas should be placed at locations away from noise sensitive receivers.

#### *MM NOI-1b Construction Noise Attenuation Barriers*

In order to comply with the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance 36.409, the following noise attenuation measures shall be implemented until all respective grading activities have been



completed, to reduce construction equipment and grading operational noise in proximity to adjacent occupied residences:

- a) Temporary noise attenuation barriers (8-foot high) shall be installed and remain in place for the following cases:
  - a. Grading activities consist of more than two pieces of equipment operating within 50 feet of occupied residences and/or;
  - b. Grading activities consist of more than four pieces of equipment are located within 100 feet of occupied residences.
- b) Temporary barriers may be removed and/or relocated based on the location of grading activities, in order to demonstrate compliance with the County Noise Ordinance and properly screen the impacted residence, respectively by phase.
- c) Please refer to the Noise Assessment Report prepared by LDN Consulting dated September 28, 2020 for potential temporary noise barrier locations.
  - a. The barrier would need to be located at the edge of the project's property line adjacent to the occupied residence.
  - b. The temporary barrier should be non-gapping, free of any cut-outs and be constructed of  $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch plywood or equivalent materials.
- d) Temporary noise barriers shall be installed as needed in their phased locations of work respectively, for compliance with this condition.
- e) If new information is provided to prove and certify that Noise Ordinance compliance can be demonstrated by other measures, then what was proposed in the noise report, then a new Construction Noise Analysis (or Construction Noise Mitigation Plan) must be reviewed to the satisfaction of the PDS. The supplemental noise analysis shall be prepared by a County Approved Noise Consultant and the report shall comply with the Noise Report Format and Content Requirements. Any proposed alternative methods, or the reduction or elimination of the barrier maybe approved if the construction activities will not create noise greater than 75 dB at the property line and demonstrates compliance with the County Noise Ordinance to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS.

If the noise barrier wall is required, the project engineer shall submit a signed, stamped statement from a California Registered Engineer or licensed surveyor, and photographic evidence that the noise measures have been constructed pursuant to this condition. Any engineering certification must be submitted to PDS for review and approval.

### *MM NOI-2 Rock Crushing and Drilling*

In order to comply with the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance 36.408 through 36.410, the following noise attenuation measures shall be implemented until all rock crushing and drilling activities have been completed to reduce the noise generated from project rock crushing, rock drilling, and material processing operations. The location of any temporary rock crushing and rock drilling activities shall be adequately setback 225 feet from the nearest property line. This mitigation is designed and placed to reduce noise levels from the rock crushing and drilling

operations that potentially would affect the adjacent residential uses. The rock crushing and drilling shall comply with the following requirements:

- a) Prior to and during all project-related rock crushing activities, the project applicants and primary contractors of all project phases involving rock crushing shall ensure that these activities are located a minimum distance of 225 feet from the nearest property line where an occupied structure is located.
- b) If the rock crushing or drills are staged within 225 feet of any occupied noise sensitive land it is recommended that a specific mitigation plan based upon the location of the construction equipment, topography and construction schedule be identified by a County certified acoustical engineer. The mitigation plan may include a temporary noise barrier along any property line where the impacts could occur. Based on previous projects, a barrier ranging from 8 to 12 feet in height maybe needed.
  - a. The temporary barrier should be non-gapping, free of any cut-outs and be constructed of  $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch plywood or equivalent materials.
- c) All rock drilling and rock crushing activities shall comply with County noise standards pursuant to County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.409 and 36.410.
- d) If new information is provided to prove and certify that the equipment being used is different then what was proposed in the noise report, then a new construction noise analysis maybe reviewed to the satisfaction of the PDS. The supplemental noise analysis shall be prepared by a County Approved Noise Consultant and the report shall comply with the Noise Report Format and Content Requirements. Any proposed alternative methods, or the reduction or elimination of setbacks, barriers, etc. maybe approved if the construction activities will not create noise greater than the noise standards at the property line as indicated above.

### *MM NOI-3 Blasting Operations*

In order to comply with the applicable sections of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, the contractor shall comply with the following requirements during blasting operations. Blastings shall only occur during grading activities and conclude prior to rough grading approval:

- a) Prior to approval of the grading permit for any portion of the proposed project, the project applicant, or its designee, shall direct the designated contractor to prepare a blasting and monitoring plan and submit to PDS for review and approval for conformance with the noise control measures. The blasting and monitoring plan shall include an estimate of noise and vibration levels of each blast at NSLU of each blast. Where potential exceedance of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance is identified, the blast drilling and monitoring plan shall identify mitigation measures shown to effectively reduce noise and vibration levels (e.g., altering orientation of blast progression, increased delay between charge detonations, presplitting) to be implemented to comply with the noise level limits of the County's Noise Ordinance, Sections 36.409 and 36.410, the vibration-level limits of 1 inch per second peak particle velocity. Such measures shall be implemented by the proposed Project applicant, or its designee, prior to the issuance of the grading permit. Additionally, all proposed Project phases involving blasting shall conform to the following requirements:
  - a. The analysis shall be submitted to the County for review prior to the first blast and according to the Blasting Permit process approved by the County Sheriff's Department.
  - b. All blasts shall be performed by a blast contractor and blasting personnel licensed to operate in the County.

- c. Each blast shall be monitored and recorded with an air-blast overpressure monitor and groundbourne vibration accelerometer that is located outside the closest residence to the blast and is approved by the County Blasting shall not exceed 0.1 inch per second peak particle velocity at the nearest occupied residence, in accordance with County of San Diego's Noise Guidelines, Section 4.3.
- b) Blasting is only allowed Monday through Saturday, between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. or ½ hour before sunset, whichever occurs first, unless special circumstances requiring other time or days is approved by the County.
- c) Requires that the property owner is required to provide notice in writing (at a minimum of 24 hours prior to blasting operations) for any proposed blasting to the local fire agency and to all residences, including mobile homes, and businesses within 600 feet of any potential major blast location or 300 feet from any potential minor blast location.
- d) The blaster shall retain an inspector to inspect all structures, including mobile homes, within 300 feet of the blast site before blasting operations, unless inspection is waived by the owner and/or occupant. The inspector shall obtain permission of the owner and/or occupant before conducting the inspection. The inspection shall be only for the purpose of determining the existence of any visible or reasonably recognizable preexisting defects or damages in any structure. Waiver of inspection shall be in writing signed by the owner and/or occupant. Refusal to allow inspection shall also constitute a waiver. The inspector shall notify the owner and/or occupant of the consequences of refusing an inspection shall include a refusal in the summary report filed with the Sheriff. The blaster shall request an inspector conduct post-blast inspections upon receipt of a written complaint of property damage if the complaint is made within 60 days of completion of blasting operations. If the blaster has knowledge of alleged property damage independent of the written complaint, the blaster shall also retain an inspector to conduct a post-blast inspection.
- e) An inspector shall complete and sign pre-blast inspection reports identifying all findings and inspection waivers. The blaster shall retain the inspection reports for three years from the date of the blasting and upon a complaint of alleged damage the blaster shall immediately file a copy of the report with the Sheriff and provide a copy to the complainant. If there is a change in the blasting contractor after blasting has commenced on a project, a re-inspection shall be conducted in accordance with the preceding paragraph before the new blasting contractor undertakes any additional blasting.
- f) The blaster shall retain an inspector to conduct a post-blast inspection of any structure for which a written complaint alleging blast damage has been received. A written report of the inspection shall be immediately filed with the Sheriff and provided to any person who made a complaint for damages.
- g) The blaster shall allow any representative of the Sheriff to inspect the blast site and blast materials or explosives at any reasonable time.
- h) If the blaster wants a representative of the Sheriff to witness a blasting operation the blaster shall make a request with the Sheriff at least 12 hours before the blast. The blaster shall confirm the request for a witness with the Sheriff at least one hour before the blast. The blaster shall be responsible for any cost incurred by the Sheriff in having a representative witness the blast.
- i) The blaster shall notify the Sheriff on the day of a scheduled blasting operation not less than one hour before blasting.

- j) All major blasting operations shall be monitored by an approved seismograph located at the nearest structure within 600 feet of the blasting operation. All daily seismograph reports shall be maintained by the blaster for three years from the blasting.

*MM NOI-4 Construction Vibration*

In order to comply with the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance 36.409 and vibratory requirements within the County Noise Guidelines, the following noise attenuation measures shall be implemented to reduce the temporary construction operations. Prior to and during all phases of grading activities, the project applicant shall:

- a) Not allow heavy equipment to be operated within 225 feet of any inhabited residence.
- b) Rock blasting shall not be performed within 225 feet of a residential structure.
- c) Prior to beginning construction of any project component that involve the usage of heavy construction equipment within 300 feet of an existing or future occupied residence, the applicant, or its designee, shall require preparation of a vibration monitoring plan for submittal to the County for review. The vibration monitoring plan shall require data be sent to the County Noise Specialist or designee on a weekly basis or more frequently as determined by the Specialist. The vibration monitoring plan shall include: the vibration level measurements taken during the previous work period, location of the vibration monitors, the vibration instrumentation used, a data acquisition and retention plan, and exceedance notification and reporting procedures.
- d) The applicant shall submit a vibration analysis the proposed blasting and material handling associated with the project. The analysis shall be submitted to the County for review prior to the first blast and according to the Blasting Permit process performed by the County Sheriff's Department.
- e) If new information is provided to prove and certify that the assessment being used is different than what was proposed in the noise report, then a new noise analysis submitted to PDS for review and approval. The supplemental noise analysis shall be prepared by a County Approved Noise Consultant and the report shall comply with the Noise Report Format and Content Requirements and County noise standards. Any proposed alternative methods, or the reduction or elimination of any noise measure would be determined by the Director of PDS.

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.**

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project proposes residential development for Phase II of the GRSP. The physical changes associated with the Project including residential density and water and sewer service are consistent with and were anticipated by the GRSP and County General Plan.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The property currently has two residences that would be removed to make way for the proposed Project, which includes construction of 63 new residences. Therefore, there would be a net gain of 61 residential units.

### **XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.**

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Based on the service availability forms received for the Project, the proposed Project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided, which indicate services are available to the Project, from the following agencies/districts: Lakeside Union School District, Grossmont Unified High School District, and the San Diego County Fire Protection District.

As stated in the service availability forms, the Project may contribute to overcrowding at the Lakeside Elementary School and El Capitan High School; however, fees would be levied on the Project in accordance with Education Code §17620 prior to the issuance of building permits. These fees would be used for the purpose of funding the construction or reconstruction of school facilities.

A Conceptual FPP dated January 10, 2018 prepared by Firewise 2000, Inc. has been accepted by the Lakeside Fire Protection District (Appendix I). The Conceptual FPP demonstrates the Project would have adequate water supply and facilities for fire protection, adequate emergency access (to and from Lake Jennings Road and Adlai Street), would maintain required fuel modification zones, and would implement ignition resistant construction measures including

automatic fire sprinkler systems in each residence. The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the Project site to be 3.2 minutes (Appendix J). The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the General Plan Safety Element is 5 minutes; therefore, the Project meets emergency response travel time.

The Project involves a residential subdivision that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the Project would be required to pay fees for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO).

The San Diego County Sheriff's Department provides police protection to the Project site from the Lakeside Substation, which serves the communities of Lakeside and unincorporated El Cajon, California.

Therefore, the Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause a significant impact on the environment.

#### **XVI. RECREATION.**

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project involves a residential subdivision that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities, the Project would be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The 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 has opted to provide payment of park fees in lieu of park land dedication. Therefore, the Project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication, thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The Project would 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 Section XXI. *Mandatory Findings of Significance* below for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

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

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** The Project involves new recreational facilities consisting of the dedication and construction of new trails that are consistent with the County Trails Master Plan. An 8-foot-wide public trail easement improved to 6-foot wide decomposed granite would be constructed within the private road easement of proposed Greenhills Way from Lake Jennings Road to Audubon. A 10-foot-wide public trail easement improved to 6-foot wide with natural soil surface would be constructed within the private road easement of Audubon from Greenhills Way through the Not-A-Part portion of the TM. Finally, a 20-foot-wide public trail easement improved to 6-foot wide with natural soil surface would be constructed through the proposed onsite open space lot to the northern Project boundary. However, as outlined in this Initial Study, the new trails would not result in adverse physical effect on the environment because all related impacts from the proposed recreation facilities have been mitigated to a level below significance. Refer to Section IV. *Biological Resources*, Section V. *Cultural Resources*, Section VII. *Geology – Paleontological Resources*, and Section XIII. *Noise* for more information.

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION.**

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

- |                                                                             |                                                                  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <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 County of San Diego’s Transportation Study Guidelines (Guidelines) establish thresholds for transportation using VMT. The Guidelines also establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system by incorporating standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards and 2011 General Plan Mobility Element.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) dated November 18, 2022 was prepared by Linscott, Law, and Greenspan Engineers for the proposed Project (Appendix N). The TIA identified that the proposed Project would generate 640 average daily trips. However, the project would not create a conflict with any performance measures because with the addition of Project trips, the circulation system does not degrade to below standards established in the County’s Transportation Study Guidelines. The Project would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. 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 conflict with any policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and no mitigation is required.

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

- |                                                                             |                                                                  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <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 County of San Diego’s Transportation Study Guidelines (TSG) establish thresholds and screening criteria for transportation VMT.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** A TIA dated November 18, 2022 was prepared by Linscott, Law, and Greenspan, Engineers for the proposed Project (Appendix N). The TIA utilized the County of San Diego Transportation Study Guidelines (TSG) approved by the Board of Supervisors in September of 2022 (incorporated herein by reference). The TSG provides criteria on how projects should be evaluated for consistency related to the County’s transportation goals, policies, and plans, and through procedures established under CEQA. The TSG establishes the contents and procedures for preparing a Transportation Impact Analysis in the County of San Diego. The TSG was updated in 2022 to address legislative changes in SB 743, which changed the basis for evaluating transportation impacts in CEQA from the Level of Service (LOS) metric to the VMT metric. As noted in the TSG, “The legislative intent of SB 743 was to ‘more appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.’” To that end, the County performed a qualitative and quantitative analysis (found in Appendix D of the TSG) to determine the appropriate “infill” areas that support SB 743 goals. Qualitative measures included an analysis of the definition of “infill” used in State law, the Federal Census, and scholarly literature. Quantitative information included the use of population density; housing density; employment density; intersection density; access to jobs within a 15-mile radius; and access to shopping/restaurant uses within a 1-mile radius. The qualitative and quantitative information was applied to the County through GIS to create geographic maps of the County meeting the “infill” criteria.

The TIA identified that the proposed Project is located within an adopted Infill Area. The TSG states that projects located within Infill Areas are screened from further VMT analysis and are considered to have a less than significant impact for transportation, because they meet the qualitative and quantitative criteria in the TSG to determine that they are located in a VMT-efficient area and meet the policy goals of SB 743. Development within Infill Areas meets the legislative intent of SB 743, which established VMT as the metric to evaluate transportation for CEQA because promoting development within the County’s denser village areas create a greater diversity of land uses that would encourage transit and lower average VMT over time. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to VMT, and no mitigation is required.

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

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



**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed Project would not significantly alter roadway geometry on Lake Jennings Park Road or Adlai Road. 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 would be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. The proposed Project would not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed Project would not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

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

**Less Than Significant:** The proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. A Conceptual FPP dated January 10, 2018 prepared by Firewise 2000, Inc. has been accepted by the Lakeside Fire Protection District (Appendix I). The Conceptual FPP has been reviewed by the San Diego County Fire Protection District and demonstrates the Project would have adequate access to and from Lake Jennings Road to the east and Adlai Street to the south. The Fire Service Availability Letter from the San Diego County Fire Protection District dated July 14, 2021 (Appendix J), states the expected emergency travel time to the Project site to be 3.2 minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the General Plan Safety Element is 5 minutes; therefore, the Project meets emergency response travel time.

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

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

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

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

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

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

**No Impact:** Pursuant to AB 52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes on August 25, 2016. Formal consultation was conducted with only the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel per their request. Consultation with Santa Ysabel concluded on April 1, 2020. No tribal cultural resources were identified during consultation. As such, there are no impacts to tribal cultural resources.

**XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.**

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

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

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** The following service availability forms were provided for the Project: Sewer Service Availability Letter (PDS-399S) from the San Diego County Sanitation District dated August 3, 2021 (Appendix G) and Water Service Availability Letter (PDS-399W) from the Helix Water District dated July 15, 2021 (Appendix O). Based on the service availability forms, extensions of wastewater and potable water lines would be required. Water line extensions to the Project site would be required from the proposed developed area and along proposed Greenhills Way to Lake Jennings Park Road east of the site, and along Audubon Road adjacent to the south boundary of the Project site to Adlai Road. The sewer line would need to extend from the Project site to the existing sewer line in Audubon Road on the south side of the Project site. These extensions would occur in existing or proposed roads. As outlined in this Initial Study, the wastewater and potable water line extensions would not result in an adverse physical effect on the environment because all related impacts from the proposed extensions have been mitigated to a level below significance. Refer to Section IV. *Biological Resources*, Section V. *Cultural Resources*, Section VII. *Geology-Paleontological Resources*, and Section XIII. *Noise* for more information.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project requires water service from the Helix Water District. A Water Service Availability Letter (PDS-399W) from the Helix Water District dated July 15, 2021 has been provided, indicating that facilities and adequate water resources and entitlements would be available to serve the Project (Appendix O). Helix Water District also develops and maintains an Urban Water Management Plan as required by state law that addresses water supply planning for future development in normal, dry, and multiple dry years. The 2020 Urban Water Management Plan was adopted on June 2, 2021. The Project would develop fewer

residential units than what was planned in the General Plan. Therefore, the Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project requires wastewater service from the San Diego County Sanitation District. A Sewer Service Availability Letter from the District has been provided by the San Diego County Sanitation District (PDS-399S) dated August 3, 2021 (Appendix G), indicating adequate wastewater service capacity is available to serve the requested demand. Therefore, the Project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

waste collected and deposited at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**XX. WILDFIRE.**

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** A Conceptual FPP dated January 10, 2018 prepared by Firewise 2000, Inc. (Appendix I) has been accepted by the Lakeside Fire Protection District. The Project would have adequate water supply and facilities for fire protection, adequate emergency access (to and from Lake Jennings Road and Adlai Street), would maintain required fuel modification zones, and would implement ignition resistant construction measures including automatic fire sprinkler systems in each residence.

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** A Conceptual FPP dated January 10, 2018 prepared by Firewise 2000, Inc. (Appendix I) has been accepted by the Lakeside Fire Protection District. The Project would have adequate water supply and facilities for fire protection, adequate emergency access (to/from Lake Jennings Road and Adlai Street), would maintain required fuel modification zones, and would implement ignition resistant construction measures, including automatic fire

sprinkler systems in each residence. Due to these measures, the Project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.

Project occupants would not be exposed to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire in excess of other residents of the County. The Project includes the dedication of additional open space onsite that would connect to existing open space and undeveloped land nearby. This situation occurs in many parts of the County, including in the incorporated cities. Depending on the weather conditions under which a wildfire may develop and spread, pollution can be spread across very large areas exposing all residents to less than healthy air.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** New private roads would be constructed (proposed private roads Audubon Road and Greenhills Way) that would provide access to Adlai Road to the south and Lake Jennings Road to the east, respectively. Additional open space would be dedicated on the northern portion of the site that would connect with existing open space and undeveloped areas. Required fuel medication zones would be maintained and residences would be constructed with ignition resistant features including automatic fire sprinklers. Therefore, the Project would not exacerbate fire risk that would result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Please refer to responses above regarding Geology (Section VII) and Hydrology (Section X), as well as Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Geocon Inc. dated July 20, 2009 (Appendix F), Drainage Study dated July 30, 2020 prepared by REC Consultants, Inc. (Appendix L), and PDP-SWQMP prepared by REC Consultants, Inc. dated January 27, 2023 (Appendix K).

**XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

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

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

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** The potential of the Project to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in Section IV and Section V of this Initial Study. In addition to Project-specific impacts, this evaluation considered the Project’s potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the Project, particularly 12.05 acres of Diegan and Disturbed coastal sage scrub and Riversidian upland sage scrub and potential subsurface cultural and paleontological resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. Please see Section IV(a), (b), and (d), Section V(b), and Section VII(f) above. This mitigation includes dedication of onsite and offsite open space and grading monitoring for cultural and paleontological resources during construction. 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                    |

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER	DETAILS
Lake Jennings Marketplace	TM 5590	Commercial Development, 6 buildings totaling 76,100 sq. ft., 10,992 ADT, Road

		and I-8 ramp/Lake Jennings Park Road improvements required, Cultural Resource monitoring, offsite mitigation for impacts to Coast live oak woodland and non-native grassland, onsite open space for wetlands, mitigation for construction phase noise.
Riker Ranch	TM 5592	Subdivide 6.24 acres into 21 single-family residential lots, 230 ADT, no direct traffic impacts, cumulative traffic impacts addressed by TIF payment, bio impacts - 1.4 acres non-native grassland mitigated at 0.5:1, impacts to cultural and historical resources mitigated through documentation including mapping, construction monitoring for subsurface resources, implement FPP requirements to address fire protection, implement SWMP to address potential for construction and post-construction phase pollutants .
El Monte Sand Mine	MUP-99-014W2	Sand mining for 12.5 million tons over 12 years plus 4 additional years to finish reclamation/revegetation, significant and unavoidable aesthetic, land use, and mineral resources impacts, impacts to 0.12 acres riparian habitat, 3.6 acres coastal sage scrub, 41.8 acres tamarisk scrub, 0.36 acres non-vegetated channel, and 86.6 acres non-native grassland are mitigated to less than significant, impacts to cultural resources mitigated to less than significant with open space and monitoring for unknown subsurface resources, impacts to paleontological resources mitigated to less than significant with monitoring for potential subsurface resources, noise impacts mitigated to less than significant through buffering distance, noise berms, limit operational hours, no queuing of trucks at project entrance, traffic impacts mitigated to less than significant with road/intersection improvements
Fanita Ranch	City of Santee project – GPA2017-2, AEIS2017-11	2,300+ acre project site, ~3,000 residential units, 80,000 sq. ft. commercial, 1,650 acres open space, impacts mitigated to less than significant with mitigation include air quality, biological resources (975 acres critical habitat for California gnatcatcher,

		<p>967 acres critical habitat for Hermes copper butterfly, Engelmann and Coast live oak trees, several other species and habitats), cultural resources (habitation site, artifacts), geology/soils, paleontological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and tribal cultural resources. Impacts that remain unavoidable with incorporation of mitigation include air quality, noise, and transportation/traffic (including VMT).</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in Sections I through XX of Initial Study. In addition to Project-specific impacts, this evaluation considered the Project’s potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, and in consideration of all mitigation required by the Project, there were determined to be no potentially significant cumulative effects the Project would have a considerable contribution to. Mitigation has been included for Project impacts that clearly reduces any potential for a considerable contribution to any cumulative effects to a level below significance. Please refer to Section IV. *Biological Resources*, Section V. *Cultural Resources*, Section VII. *Geology – Paleontological Resources*, and Section XIII. *Noise* above. This mitigation includes but is noted limited to dedication of onsite and offsite open space, grading monitoring for cultural and paleontological resources during construction, construction of temporary noise barriers 8 to 12 feet in height, and approval of a blasting and monitoring plan. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, the Project would have any considerable contribution to a cumulative impact. Therefore, this Project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in Section I. *Aesthetics*, Section III. *Air Quality*, Section VII. *Geology and Soils*, Section IX. *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, Section X. *Hydrology and Water Quality*, Section XIII. *Noise*, Section XIV. *Population and Housing*, and Section XVII. *Transportation*. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to potential Noise impacts. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes construction of temporary noise barriers 8 to 12 feet in height and approval of a blasting and monitoring plan. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this Project. Therefore, this Project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.



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

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

Tentative Map – Greenhills Ranch Phase 2, September 29, 2021  
Preliminary Grading Plan – Greenhills Ranch Phase 2, September 29, 2021  
Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated December 15, 2022  
Multiple Species Conservation Program Conformance Statement for Greenhills Ranch (Phase II), November 1, 2022  
RPO Slope Analysis, REC Consultants, Inc., February 14, 2018  
Conceptual Landscape Plan for Greenhills Ranch Phase 2, dated 5/24/2001 and accepted 07/16/2021.  
Photo Simulations 1 and 2, Landmark Consulting and REC-Consultants, received 03/25/2021  
Air Quality Assessment prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc. dated November 17, 2020  
Global Climate Change Analysis, Ldn Consulting, Inc., November 17, 2020  
Biological Resources Report dated January 2021 prepared by DUDEK  
Biological Resources Report Addendum dated August 10, 2020 prepared by DUDEK  
Cultural Resource Survey and Historical Evaluation of the Green Hills Ranch Phase II Project, Lakeside, San Diego County, California, Andrew R. Pignoli, November 2016  
Geotechnical Investigation Greenhills Ranch Phase 2, GEOCON Inc., July 20, 2009.  
Conceptual Fire Protection Plan Greenhills Ranch Phase 2, Firewise 2000, Inc., January 10, 2018  
Drainage Study for Greenhills Ranch, Phase 2, REC Consultants, Inc., July 30, 2020.  
Priority Development Project Stormwater Quality Management Plan Greenhills Ranch Phase 2, REC Consultants, Inc., July 31, 2020.  
Transportation Study, Greenhills Ranch-Phase 2, Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, November 18, 2022  
Noise Assessment for Greenhills Ranch Phase 2, LDN Consulting, Inc., September 28, 2020  
Fire Service Availability Letter, San Diego County Fire Protection District, July 14, 2021  
Water Service Availability Letter, Helix Water District, July 15, 2021  
Sewer Service Availability Letter (PDS-399S), San Diego County Sanitation District, August 3, 2021

### **AESTHETICS**

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)  
California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)  
County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))  
County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))  
County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))  
County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))  
County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))  
Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).  
Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)  
Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)  
International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. ([www.intl-light.com](http://www.intl-light.com))  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. ([www.lrc.rpi.edu](http://www.lrc.rpi.edu))  
US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)  
US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. ([www.blm.gov](http://www.blm.gov))  
US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.  
US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National

Highway System.  
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

#### AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.  
([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.  
([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov), [www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.  
([www.qp.gov.bc.ca](http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca))

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

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. ([www.sdcounty.ca.gov](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov))

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

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

#### AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

#### BIOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources

Agency, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento, California, 1986.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. ([migratorybirds.fws.gov](http://migratorybirds.fws.gov))

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains.  
([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

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

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

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

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

## GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

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

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

## GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

County of San Diego. (2012). [www.sandiegocounty.gov](http://www.sandiegocounty.gov). Retrieved March 26, 2017, from <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/zoning/z2000.pdf>

County of San Diego. (2017). Draft County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance - Climate Change.

SCAQMD. (2008). Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary. Retrieved from [http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-\(ghg\)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgboardsynopsis.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgboardsynopsis.pdf?sfvrsn=2)

## HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. ([www.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

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

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

Uniform Building Code. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

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

## HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. ([www.dpla2.water.ca.gov](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov))

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

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

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

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

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

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. ([www.projectcleanwater.org](http://www.projectcleanwater.org))

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

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

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

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

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

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

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

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. ([https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water\\_issues/programs/basin\\_plan/docs/R9\\_Basin\\_Plan.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/docs/R9_Basin_Plan.pdf))

#### LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted August 3, 2011. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

#### MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Subdivision Map Act, 2011. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

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

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

#### NOISE

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

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

County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, effective August 3, 2011. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

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

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

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

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

#### POPULATION & HOUSING

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

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

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

#### RECREATION

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

#### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

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

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

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

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

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

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

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

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority ALUCP'S ([http://www.san.org/sdcraa/airport\\_initiatives/land\\_use/adopted\\_docs.aspx](http://www.san.org/sdcraa/airport_initiatives/land_use/adopted_docs.aspx))

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

#### **UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS**

2020 Urban Water Management Plan, Helix Water District, July 2021.

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, California Integrated Waste Management Board Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. ([ccr.oal.ca.gov](http://ccr.oal.ca.gov))

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

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

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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