



# County of San Diego

**MARK WARDLAW**  
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123  
[www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds)

**KATHLEEN FLANNERY**  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

August 1, 2019

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

1. Title; Project Numbers; Environmental Log Number:  
  
Lavender and Olive Event Venue; PDS2018-MUP-18-013, PDS2018-ER-18-09-006
2. Lead agency name and address:  
County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110  
San Diego, CA 92123-1239
3.
  - a. Contact Denise Russell, Project Manager
  - b. Phone number: (858) 694-2019
  - c. E-mail: [denise.russell@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:denise.russell@sdcounty.ca.gov)
4. Project location:  
  
633 Montecito Way, Ramona, within unincorporated County of San Diego  
  
Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1152, Grid C/6
5. Project Applicant name and address:  
  
Woodcrest Real Estate Ventures, Steve Powell  
1410 Main Street, Suite C  
Ramona, CA 92065
6. General Plan  
Community Plan: Ramona  
Regional Category: Semi-Rural  
Land Use Designation: Semi-Rural 1 (SR-1)  
Density: N/A  
Floor Area Ratio (FAR): N/A
7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: A70, Limited Agricultural

Minimum Lot Size: 1 Acre  
Special Area Regulation: C (Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Area), portions in F (Flood Plain)

8. Description of project:

The applicant is proposing a Major Use Permit (MUP) for the development of a public event space on approximately 5 acres of land within the Ramona Community Plan area. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Semi-Rural, Land Use Designation Semi-Rural 1 (SR-1). Zoning for the site is Limited Agricultural (A70). Event venues, classified in the Zoning Ordinance as Participant Sports and Recreation: Outdoor, are authorized in the A70 zone upon approval of a MUP pursuant to Section 2705 of the Zoning Ordinance. The project site is located on the corner of Montecito Road and Montecito Way, just north of the Ramona Airport, and south of the existing Copper Meadows Equestrian Training Center.

The project site has an existing single-family home which will remain. The proposed event space will be available to rent seven (7) days per week from 10:00AM to 10:00PM. Events will include weddings, corporate gatherings, birthdays, community events, and various other social gatherings. The facility will have a maximum capacity of 225 people, including guests, employees, and subcontracted staff. Only one event will take place on the property at any given time and only one event may occur each day. Additionally, events will not occur simultaneously with events at the Copper Meadows Equestrian Training Center on the parcel to the north, which shares ownership with the subject project.

In addition to events, the applicant is proposing to implement an overnight hospitality component in the form of seven temporary vintage trailers, and a Bed & Breakfast (B&B) operated out of the existing single-family home. The property owners will operate the overnight hospitality by hosting up to four guests in the B&B and 14 guests in the vintage trailers, for a maximum of two nights. All food and alcohol for events will be prepared off-site and catered by a third-party vendor or prepared within a permitted mobile food truck. Three temporary restroom facilities will be brought in for events and will be located in specific areas to accommodate event restroom needs including accessibility requirements. A total of 115 parking spaces, including four accessible spaces, will be located on-site for guests and employees.

Earthwork will consist of balanced cut and fill of approximately 1,750 cubic yards, most of which is for the proposed dirt parking area and proposed decomposed granite (DG) walking paths. No new structures are proposed to be built as part of the MUP; work consists primarily of grading, landscaping, and repurposing of existing structures. Offsite improvements consist of: construction of asphalt concrete driveways off of Montecito Road for main event access and Montecito Way for secondary access; an eight-foot wide public DG trail along the southern and western property lines; and two-feet of road widening starting on the corner of Montecito Road and Montecito Way and extending to the northern property line on Montecito Way. The project would be served by the Ramona Municipal Water District, and sewer disposal is proposed via on-site wastewater treatment systems.

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

The Project site is located in the community of Ramona within unincorporated eastern San Diego County. The Project site is bounded by Montecito Road to the south and Montecito Way to the west, both two-lane roads. To the north and east is an equestrian event training center. Lands surrounding the project site are primarily rural residential, agricultural uses, and vacant land. To the southwest of the site is the Ramona Airport. The project site is approximately 1.3 miles northwest of State Route 67, and 1.9 miles west of State Route 78. The topography of the project site is relatively flat, as is the surrounding land.

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

<b>Permit Type/Action</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit Grading Permit Plan Change	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm Water Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Ramona Municipal Water District
Fire District Approval	San Diego County Fire Authority

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

YES  NO

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

of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code §21082.3(e) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

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

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Geology & Soils
- Hydrology & Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Utilities & Service Systems
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use & Planning
- Population & Housing
- Transportation
- Wildfire
- Air Quality
- Energy Use
- Hazards & Haz. Materials
- 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, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature	July 25, 2019 Date
Denise Russell Printed Name	Land Use/Environmental Planner Title

**INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

**I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099** -- Would the project:

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- 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.

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is located within the Ramona Community Planning area (CPA), approximately 1.2 miles northwest of State Route 67 (SR-67), 1.8 miles west of State Route 78 (SR-78), and 1.9 miles north of Highland Valley Road, all County General Plan Designated Scenic Corridors. For further discussion on Scenic Corridors, please see response I(b).

The existing project site is developed with a single-family residence and an accessory dwelling unit, as well as a shade structure with a patio. The existing structures will remain, and no new permanent structures are proposed with the Major Use Permit. Proposed work consists primarily of grading, landscaping, and erecting temporary shade structures and restroom facilities for events. Based on a site visit by County staff on July 2, 2018, the proposed project would not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. The County has designated several RCAs in the Ramona CPA, the majority of the RCAs would not be visible from the project site. The nearest RCA to the subject parcel within the project viewshed is Orosco Ridge, approximately 1.4 miles to the north. However, due to distance and project consistency with surrounding development, the proposed project would not pose a substantial adverse effect to this scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because all projects are designed to be compatible with the overall visual character of the area. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Based on a site visit completed on July 2, 2018, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway or County Designated Scenic Corridor and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway or County Designated Scenic Corridor. The project site is located approximately 1.2 miles northwest of SR-67, 1.8 miles west of SR-78, and 1.9 miles north of Highland Valley Road. Due to distance, topography and intervening structures and vegetation, the project site would not be visible. Additionally, the project site is located approximately 19 miles west of the portion of SR-78 that is designated as a State Scenic Highway. Due to distance, the Project site would not be visible. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because all projects are compatible with the existing viewshed. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views 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 |
|---|--|

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is in a non-urbanized area of the Ramona community, located at the intersection of Montecito Way and Montecito Road. The project site is currently developed with a single-family residence and accessory uses which will remain. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as rural residential and agricultural on large lots. Much of the land directly west of the project site is undeveloped. To the east, north, and south are primarily single-family residences on similar sized lots. Viewer groups of the project site include those traveling along Montecito Road to access either the residential area north of the project site or the Ramona Airport. Viewer exposure is limited due to travel speed past the property on Montecito Road.

The proposed project within the landscape would not detract from or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of the surrounding area for the following reasons: the design of the proposed event venue is consistent with the rural character of the existing community; the proposed development is subject to design review by the County through a discretionary Major Use Permit for conformance with the Ramona Design Guidelines; and landscaping has been incorporated along Montecito Road and Montecito Way for screening purposes. The location, size, and design of the proposed use would be compatible with adjacent uses due to the following reasons: the proposed event venue is similar to surrounding rural residential parcels and does not involve construction of new structures. Viewer exposure to the project would not be significant since the project is proposed in rural area and has been designed to be compatible with surrounding use types. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in a substantial effect on the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

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

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact



**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 34 miles from the Mount Laguna Observatory and approximately 42 miles from Palomar Observatory. The project will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209), including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

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

In addition, the project’s outdoor lighting is controlled through the Major Use Permit, which is consistent with the Light Pollution Code. Therefore, the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare.

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

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The projects site is underlain with Bonsall-Fallbrook sandy loams, 2 to 5 percent slopes, which have been mapped “Farmland of Statewide Importance” by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency. However, the project site is developed with a single-family residence which does not operate agricultural activities on the parcel and is surrounded by developed residential lots. Due to the existing residence, disturbed areas such as clearing and driveways, setback requirements and potential land use conflicts, the subject lot would not be considered a significant agricultural resource. Additionally, the project site does not contain lands designated as Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland as mapped by FMMP. Due to the existing development and lack of available resources on the site, no agricultural resources would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

**No Impact:** The project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract, nor is not surrounded by any such land. The closest preserve or Williamson Act Contract is approximately 4.7 miles east from the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input 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 do not contain forest lands or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project is consistent with existing zoning and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones.

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

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

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site and surrounding area within a radius of one-quarter mile includes lands designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance. However, the majority of the lots are developed with single-family residences and do not contain any active agricultural operations. Additionally, per response II(b), the site is not a significant agricultural resource. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

**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. Would the project:

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is for a public event space and overnight hospitality within seven proposed trailers and an existing single-family residence proposed as a Bed and Breakfast. Construction and grading activities on-site would be minimal: 1,750 cubic yards of balanced earthwork for the proposed parking area and proposed decomposed granite (DG) walking paths. No new structures are proposed for construction. Offsite improvements consist of construction of asphalt concrete driveways off of Montecito Road for main event access and Montecito Way for secondary access, an eight-foot wide public DG trail along the southern and western property lines, and two feet of road widening along property frontage to Montecito Way. As a result of this minimal construction activity, the project would not be expected to generate air quality emissions in excess of the County's screening level thresholds during construction. The project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan and thus anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operations of the project will result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP.

Further, the maximum capacity of people on site, including guests and employees, would be 225 and only one event would be allowed per day. Pursuant to the Traffic and Parking Study prepared by Darnell & Associates, Inc and dated May 17, 2018, the project ADT would be 180. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines. In comparison, the proposed project would generate 180 ADT would not contribute to a substantial contribution. Additionally, the project would plumb for the installation of an EV charger for future installation to reduce weekday commute VMT.

Pursuant to the aforementioned criteria and the project's consistency with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, the project would not conflict with the RAQS or SIP or violate 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?

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

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for several pollutant concentrations based on the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). Specifically, the County is presently in non-attainment of the federal and state ozone standards, the state PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards. 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. Sources of PM<sub>10</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. PM<sub>2.5</sub> is a subset of PM<sub>10</sub> that is generally generated through combustion processes associated with engine combustion in motor vehicles and construction equipment.

**Less than Significant Impact:** Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions from both construction and operation of the project. The proposed project is for a public event space and overnight hospitality within seven proposed trailers and an existing single-family residence proposed as a Bed and Breakfast.

All structures requiring building construction are existing on the project site. Earthwork would consist of 1,750 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill. Offsite improvements would consist of driveways, public trail along the southern and western property lines, and two feet of road widening along the property frontage to Montecito Way. However, the emissions associated with the improvements would be temporary and localized and would not pose a significant impact.

The operational emissions for the project would be associated with vehicle trips to and from the site for events and for overnight hospitality and to a lesser extent from employee trip generation. Food and drink would either be provided from off-site vendors or by a permitted mobile food truck. The project is consistent with Zoning and the General Plan and therefore does not conflict with RAQS or SIP. RAQS were developed to reduce an existing air quality violation. The County's General Plan was developed consistent with the RAQS, thus project that are consistent with the General Plan would also be developed in a way that is aimed at reducing existing AQ impacts. Additionally, as stated in III(a), the project ADT would be 180. In comparison to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the project would be far less than the 2,000 ADT screening-level criteria established.

As provided in the above analysis, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, the emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM10, or any O<sub>3</sub> precursors.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. The project is for a public event space and overnight hospitality within seven proposed trailers and an existing single-family residence proposed as a Bed and Breakfast. The project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, the project's ADT is less than 2,000, the BAAQMD screening-level criteria. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** Potential onsite odor generators would include short term construction odors from activities such as paving. Odors created during short term construction activities would most likely be from placing asphalt which has a slight odor from the bitumen and solvents used within hot asphalt. Since odors generated during construction are short-term, they would not be considered a significant impact.

For operations, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality (County of San Diego, 2007) includes a list of odor-producing uses that are typically recognized. Events such as weddings or birthdays and Bed and Breakfasts use types are not listed and would

therefore not be a significant odor causing source. Based on this, the Project would not result in significant odors during operations, and impacts would be less than significant.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input 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 a Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Blackhawk Environmental December 6, 2018, it was determined that two County-sensitive wildlife species were present on-site, and 37 sensitive wildlife species and one sensitive plant species have a potential to occur on-site due to appropriate habitats and/or other conditions. However, no impacts would occur to sensitive plant or wildlife species with the implementation of the following mitigation measures: a County-approved biological monitor would be contracted to supervise all ground disturbance activities, and the project shall comply with resource avoidance measures during the bird nesting season. Further, no state or federally threatened and/or endangered plants or wildlife species were observed on-site. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species and would not contribute to cumulative impacts to these designated species.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input 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 Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Blackhawk Environmental, no riparian habitat has been identified on the project site. Wetlands and vernal pool complexes have been found within the project vicinity; however, the proposed project would not impact riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. A drain intake is located on-site and was historically installed from within uplands to serve as a conduit from the north to the south under Montecito Road. No observable drainage, wetland features or hydrophytic vegetation upslope from the intake were present. Additionally, off-site improvements would consist of minor road improvements in existing developed areas where no sensitive communities have been identified. Further, no sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations of by the Agencies are located on-site. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input 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 Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Blackhawk Environmental, no wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act have been identified on the project site or to off-site improvement locations. The entire project site has been completely developed and/or has undergone regular operations and maintenance activities that include grading, tilling, grazing, development, redevelopment and fire reduction. Additionally, as stated in IV(b), a drain intake exists on-site but does not qualify as a wetland. As a result of the aforementioned activities on-site, combined with an absence of observed wetland and/or vernal pool plant species and a lack of depressional landforms, no wetland would be impacted by the proposed project.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Based on the Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Blackhawk Environmental, the site contains numerous large trees that are suitable for nesting. The proposed land use change would alter the potential for raptor foraging and nesting on-site but would be considered less than significant based on the following findings: the history of human activity on the Project site; and suitable unchanged agricultural and grassland areas within the project vicinity that provide far superior foraging habitat. Additionally, no nests were observed during the survey of the site. Moreover, the project is conditioned for resource avoidance during the bird nesting season. Impacts to avian migration and nesting would be less than significant.

The project site is surrounded by development, agriculture and disturbed habitat lands that have been known to support or potentially support a number of species of invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals. Movement by these species occurs on a local scale throughout the undeveloped or open areas of the general vicinity, as well as within the Project site. Based on the Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Blackhawk Environmental, wildlife may utilize the Project site for passage toward more natural areas and/or agricultural fields. However, given that the largest section of the proposed project site is currently undeveloped and would be softscape developed after project construction, local wildlife movement and corridor usage would be able to continue with implementation of the proposed project.

Based on the aforementioned criteria, the project would not 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. Impacts are less than significant.

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

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

**No Impact:** Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP). The project is consistent with the MSCP, Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO), and Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO).

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

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

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to historical resources.

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

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

**No Impact:** Based on analysis of County of San Diego resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow, it has been determined that the project site is previously disturbed and is negative for cultural resources. The proposed project would not grade beyond the first five feet of fill. As such, the project does not contain any archaeological resources and would not impact buried resources.

- c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?



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

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

**VI. ENERGY USE** -- Would the project:

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The 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.

Construction of the facility is estimated to take three (3) months and requires minimal grading. No structures are proposed as part of the project for construction. Grading disturbance would result in 1,750 cubic yards of balanced earthwork for the proposed parking area and decomposed granite (DG) walking paths. Offsite improvements consist of construction of asphalt concrete driveways off of Montecito Road for main event access and Montecito Way for secondary access, an eight-foot wide public DG trail along the southern and western property lines, and two feet of road widening along property frontage to Montecito Way. As a result of this minimal construction activity, the project would not be expected to result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during the construction phase of the project.

The operation of the project is expected to result in 180 average daily trips. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines. Using the above guideline as a reference, the project would not be expected to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources for vehicle trips for air quality purposes. Additionally, the project would be designed according to the most recent 2016 Title 24 or future, more stringent versions of Title 24 that are applicable as the project is built out. Part 6 of Title 24 specifically establishes energy efficiency standards for residential buildings constructed in the State of California to reduce energy demand and consumption. These requirements are applicable to the tenant improvement of the single-family residence to the Bed and Breakfast. Additionally, the proposed

project is consistent with the County’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) and General Plan through the implementation of the measures identified in the County’s CAP Checklist. Therefore, the construction and operation of the residential project is not expected to result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is for the alteration of an existing single-family dwelling to a bed and breakfast and for hospitality trailers. As stated in response VI(a), the project would be required to meet Title 24 for energy efficiency standard for the tenant improvement. Additionally, a CAP Checklist has been prepared for the project and is therefore consistent with the County’s Climate Action Plan. The project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

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

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- 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. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- 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. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards, indicating that the liquefaction potential at the site exists. A geotechnical study will be reviewed and approved during the building permit process, which specifies foundation design adequate to preclude substantial damage to the proposed structure due to liquefaction. With a site-specific engineering design and conformance with the Seismic Requirements as outlined in the California Building Code, impacts due to liquefaction 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%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as sandy loams that has a soil erodibility rating of moderate. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be

required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patters, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment. Impacts are less than significant.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves minimal grading of 1,750 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill. In order to assure that any proposed buildings (including those proposed on the project site) are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are BnB (Bonsall-Fallbrook Sandy Loams, 2 to 5 percent slopes). However, the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply with the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** Sewer disposal for the proposed Bed and Breakfast and seven (7) hospitality trailers would be provided by on-site septic systems. Septic layout plans have been submitted to the Department of Environmental Health for the project site. Pursuant to the Department of Environmental Health (DEH) review concluded May 18, 2019, no layout changes or expansions would be required to the existing septic system for the Bed and Breakfast. Additionally, pursuant to DEH’s review, the proposed on-site septic system for the seven (7) hospitality trailers would adequately serve the site. Impacts are less than significant.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

**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.

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.

The project site contains no prehistoric resources. Additionally, minimal grading of 1,750 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill is required for the proposed project. As such, the project would not excavate into the substratum and/or bedrock below the soil horizons.

**VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project**

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project would produce GHG emissions during construction activities, as well as during the operation of the project through vehicle trips, use of the bed and breakfast, and other associated uses. However, the project falls below the screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that would have less than cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.

The County of San Diego adopted a Climate Action Plan on February 14, 2018 which outlines actions that the County will undertake to meet its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions targets. Implementation of the CAP requires that new development projects incorporate more

sustainable design standards and implement applicable reduction measures consistent with the CAP. To help streamline this review and determine consistency of proposed projects with the CAP during development review, the County has prepared a CAP Consistency Review Checklist (Checklist). The proposed project would implement all applicable measures identified in the Checklist and would therefore be consistent with the County's Climate Action Plan.

Additionally, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) prepared a white paper which recommends a 900 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year screening level to determine the size of projects that would be likely to have a less than considerable contribution to the cumulative impact of climate change. – 900 metric tons tied to 50 residential units or 30,000 square feet of office space (800 metric tons). Maximum capacity of 225 potentially a day.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** As described under VIII(a) above, the project would comply with all applicable measures from the County's CAP Consistency Review Checklist as conditions of approval. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the County's CAP which was intended to meet the County's GHG reduction targets consistent with AB 32 and SB 32. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

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

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

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

individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets identified in the Climate Action Plan.

The County's Climate Action Plan (CAP) includes GHG reduction measures that would achieve an emissions reduction target that is consistent with the state-mandated reduction target embodied in AB 32. A set of project-specific implementing thresholds are included in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance and are used to ensure project consistency with the County's CAP, GHG emission reduction target, and the various General Plan goals and policies related to GHG emissions that support CAP goals.

The proposed project is an allowed use type by the zone and General Plan with the approval of a Major Use Permit. Additionally, as discussed in VIII(a) above, the project would implement all applicable measures identified in the CAP Checklist and would therefore be consistent with the County's Climate Action Plan. As such, the project would not conflict with the County CAP or GHG goals and policies of the General Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**No Impact:** No schools are located within a quarter mile of the Project. Additionally, the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

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

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

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project 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 is located adjacent to the Ramona Airport and is within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). However, no construction is proposed on-site with the exception of hospitality trailers; the Project would not constitute a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Additionally, the Project is for events, a B&B and hospitality trailers with a maximum overnight stay of two nights. Thus, the project would not result in excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. Impacts are less than significant.

- e) 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 |
|---|--|



- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

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

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

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

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is located within a County identified Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) zone. A WUI is defined as an area where development is in proximity to open space or lands with native vegetation and habitat that are prone to brush fires. Most of the unincorporated County is within the WUI. In addition, CAL FIRE has mapped areas of significant fire hazards throughout the state and classifies lands different Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) based upon fuels, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors. The FHSZ are divided into three levels of fire hazard severity: Moderate, High and Very High. The majority of the County is in the High and Very High FHSZ. The project site is located within the High FHSZ.

The proposed Project is located within the jurisdiction of the County of San Diego Fire Authority, Ramona Fire Department. A Fire Service Availability Letter dated May 31, 2018 has been received from the Ramona Fire Department. Pursuant to the approved Fire Service Availability Letter and the Fire Protection Plan for the project dated September 14, 2018, the Project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The site location is approximately 2.8 miles from the nearest fire station with an expected emergency travel time to the project of eight (8) minutes. The project site would meet the maximum travel time allowed pursuant to the Safety Element of ten (10) minutes. The project site would also be required to implement fire safety measures discussed further below. In addition, the adjacent properties surround the subject property would not pose a serious wildfire threat due to the lack of native vegetation and the ongoing commercial and agricultural practices occurring.

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 the 16 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Major Use Permit and/or building permit process. Therefore, based on the location of the project and review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and through compliance with the San Diego County Fire Authority, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- 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 will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. An existing horse facility existing north of the project site with an approved Administrative Permit for a Horse Facility. The site is required to meet specific standards for BMPs in compliance with the Grading, Stormwater and Watershed Protection Ordinances as well as comply with an approved Manure Management Plan and vector control plan. \_ Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident’s exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

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

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed Project is for events, B&B and hospitality trailers. Projects have the potential to generate pollutants during both the construction and post-construction phases. In order for the project to avoid potential violations of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, storm water management plans are prepared for both phases of the development project.

During the construction phase, the project would prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would implement the following erosion control BMPs: hydraulic stabilization and hydroseeding on disturbed slopes and mulch, straw, wood chips, and soil application on disturbed flat areas; County Standard lot perimeter protection detail and County Standard desilting basin for erosion control on disturbed flat areas; silt fencing, gravel and sand bags for sediment control; stabilized construction entrance for offsite tracking of sediment; and measures to control materials management and waste management.

The SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with Order No. 2009-009-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Order CAS000002 Construction General Permit (CGP) adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) on September 9, 2009. During the post-construction phase, as outlined in the Standard Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) dated May 2019, prepared by Project Engineering, Inc., the project would implement site design, source control and structural BMPs to prevent potential pollutants from entering storm water runoff. The SWQMP has been prepared in accordance with the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual (2019) and SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (2013), as adopted by the RWQCB on May 8, 2013.

The project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements of both the CGP and MS4 storm water permits listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts and addresses human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

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

- |                          |  |                                     |                              |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input 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 will obtain all potable water from the Ramona Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project would use groundwater for irrigation purposes on the property only and would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to, the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project will not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site because storm water management plans are prepared for both the construction and post-construction phases of the development project. During the construction phase, the project will prepare and implement a SWPPP. The SWPPP will implement the following erosion control BMPs: hydraulic stabilization hydroseeding on disturbed slopes; County Standard lot perimeter protection detail and County Standard desilting basin for erosion control on disturbed flat areas; silt fencing, gravel and sand bags for sediment control; stabilized construction entrance for offsite tracking of sediment; and measures to control materials management and waste management. The SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with Order No. 2009-009-DWQ, NPDES Order CAS000002 CGP adopted by the SWRCB on September 9, 2009. During the post-construction phase, as outlined in the Standard Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) dated May 2019, prepared by Project Engineering, Inc., the project would implement site design, source control and structural BMPs to prevent potential pollutants from entering storm water runoff. The SWQMP has been prepared in accordance with the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual (2019) and SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (2013), as adopted by the RWQCB on May 8, 2013.

The SWPPP and SWQMP specify and describe the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream receiving waters. The Department of Public Works will ensure that these Plans are implemented as proposed. Therefore, it has been determined that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project proposes minimal grading of 1,750 cubic yards of balanced earthwork for the proposed parking area and proposed decomposed granite (DG) walking paths. No new structures are proposed for construction. Offsite improvements consist of construction of asphalt concrete driveways off of Montecito Road for main event access and Montecito Way for secondary access, an eight-foot wide public DG trail along the southern and western property lines, and two feet of road widening along property frontage to Montecito Way. Pursuant to the Drainage Certification Letter prepared by Project Engineering, Inc. June 5, 2019 in accordance with the County of San Diego Hydrology Manual (2003) and Hydraulic Design Manual (2014), the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

- (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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The SWQMP as well as the Drainage Certification Letter both prepared by Project Engineering, Inc., June 2019, determined that runoff water would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Additionally, see response C(i) for a list of site design measures, source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs proposed to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.

- (iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

**Less Than Significant Impact:** As described in response C(ii), the Drainage Study determined that the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. All runoff would coincide with existing site drainage patterns.

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

- i. FLOOD HAZARD

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

ii. TSUNAMI

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

iii. SEICHE

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

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

**Less than Significant Impact:** As described in response X(a), the project would implement a combination of site design and source control BMPs to prevent potential pollutants from entering storm water runoff. The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. Moreover, the project would obtain all of its potable water supply from the Ramona Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. Groundwater would be used for irrigation purposes only. The Project would not impact a sustainable groundwater management plan. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to obstruction to implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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. The project will add an event venue on an existing residential property. The proposed project is consistent with the surrounding rural areas to the northeast, south, west and northwest and the project would provide for a seamless addition within the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide an established community.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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 subject to the General Plan Semi-Rural Regional Category and contains lands within the Semi-Rural (SR-1) Land Use Designation. The project is also subject to the policies of the Ramona Community Plan which support new

development which can be compared to, or transition with, existing development and “fits” with the community. The proposed project would not be incompatible with the surrounding use types of rural residential, agricultural lands and equestrian uses. Additionally, the property is zoned A70 which permits events, hospitality trailers and a B&B with a Major Use Permit pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance Section 2703. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted.

**XII. MINERAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the project site is currently developed and is surrounded by rural residential and agricultural land use types which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

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

**No Impact:** The project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands or is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

**XIII. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input 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 for events such as weddings, corporate gatherings, birthdays, community events, etc., and for a B&B and hospitality trailers. The maximum capacity of people on the site per event per day, including guests and employees, would be 225. Only one event would be allowed per day. Additionally, the Project would not host events the same day as the equestrian center to the north as a condition of approval.

Based on the Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, dated December 19, 2018, the project is consistent with the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable noise standards for the following reasons:

#### General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of 60 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities as mentioned within Tables N-1 and N-2. The proposed project is not a noise sensitive land use. Based on the Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, dated December 19, 2018, project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of the outside sound level threshold of CNEL 65 dB(A).

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Non-transportation noise for the proposed project would be sources from events as well as an HVAC system. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, dated December 19, 2018, 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 with the implementation of project conditions. The Noise Analysis and staff's review has determined that project's noise levels would not exceed County Noise Standards during the day. However, if events were to occur into the nighttime (10:00 p.m. – 7 a.m.) the project would not meet the nighttime dBA requirement of 45 dBA. As such, the project has been conditioned to allow events up until 10:00 p.m. No events would occur after 10:00 p.m. The HVAC unit has been determined to not exceed thresholds for nighttime or daytime criteria.

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, dated December 19, 2018, the project would not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409 and would be minimal. The earthwork proposed would be to create small pads for proposed guest trailers, the tent area and to reconstruct the pool area. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75 dBA standard. No blasting or rock crushing is anticipated during the grading operations.

Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc. dated December 19, 2018. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a



cumulatively considerable permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

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

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed development would not be exposed to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. 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. Additionally, no blasting or rock crushing is anticipated during the grading operations. Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise on a project or cumulative level.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). However, sensitive receptors (school, day care, etc.) are not proposed as part of the project. Five to fifteen (5 – 15) employees would be on-site based on guests needs. Per the County Geographical Information System which includes various noise inputs into its data and layers, including noise generated from airports, the southern portion of the property is within noise contour lines of 60 dBA. This is consistent with the County's General Plan Noise Element requirement and would therefore not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING** -- Would the project:

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input 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 events, a B&B and hospitality vintage trailers. Therefore, the project would not induce a substantial unplanned population growth either directly or indirectly. Additionally, no major infrastructure upgrades would be required for the project. Impacts are less than significant.

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

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

**No Impact:** The proposed project would not displace a substantial number of existing people or housing since the site has an existing residence which would remain. The existing residence would be utilized as a B&B but would not displace the current residents. No impacts would occur.

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

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

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

**No Impact:** Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the

following agencies/districts: County of San Diego Fire Authority, Ramona Municipal Water District, and Ramona Unified School District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

**XVI. RECREATION**

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any residential uses, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile-home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

**Less Than Significant:** The project does not propose any residential development and would have a significant impact on recreational facilities. However, the project has been conditioned to construct two improved 8' pathways of trails to connect into the existing trail system. Offsite impacts, including the trails, have been analyzed as part of this project and would not pose a significant impact. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION** -- Would the project:

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project is for an event space, hospitality trailers and a B&B. Trip generation would be from guests to and from the site for events and overnight hospitality and to a lesser extent from employees. A Traffic Impact Study, dated May17, 2018 was prepared by Darnell & Associates, Inc. The Project was estimated to generate 180 ADT. The project will not have an impact related to a conflict with any performance measures establishing measures of effectiveness of the circulation system because the project trips do not exceed any of the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for direct impacts related to Traffic and Transportation. As identified in the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation, the project trips would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. The project site is located off of Montecito Road and Montecito Way which has been determined by County Traffic Specialist to provide adequate capacity for the proposed project. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Moreover, the Project trips would not contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact. The project is surrounded by rural residences and agricultural fields as well as an equestrian facility. The Project and the equestrian facility to the north would not schedule events the same days as part of condition of approval for the Major Use Permit. Impacts are less than significant.

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

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

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

**No Impact:** The County of San Diego has not adopted a threshold for VMT and is not expected to until July 2020, when the provisions of the section apply statewide. As the VMT threshold does not yet apply, no impact would occur. In addition, the primary intention of the VMT threshold is to reduce GHG emissions associated with vehicle trips. As stated previously in Section VIII, the proposed project would not pose a significant impact on GHG. The project is consistent with the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance and is therefore consistent with the RAQS and SIP. No impacts would occur.

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

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

- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed development is for events, B&B, and hospitality trailers. No new infrastructure such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections are proposed for the Project. However, pursuant to the Site Distance Assessment prepared by Darnell & Associates April 25, 2019, the Project would not meet the minimum site distance of 400 ft required for a design speed of 40 MPH. A Design Exemption Request has been approved by the Department of Public Works, allowing for a minimum site distance requirement of 300 ft. per the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) criteria in Lieu of the County criteria. The County Traffic Engineer has found the request to be consistent with the sight distance requirements outlines in A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, Exhibit 3-2 per AASHTO standards. The design exemption request was determined to not adversely affect traffic safety and flow of traffic in the area. Additionally, the Traffic Study identified that the proposed project ADT would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ration on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. Moreover, the use would not conflict with the surrounding development of rural residential and open agricultural land uses. Therefore, the project would not directly or cumulatively increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

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

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

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

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public

Resources Code §5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1, the Lead Agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

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

**Less than Significant:** At this time, no tribal cultural resources have been identified. Pending AB-52 consultation with culturally affiliated tribes, resources may be present. Any such resources would be avoided.

**XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** -- Would the project:

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** All potable water for the Project will be supplied by the Ramona Municipal Water District and irrigation for the property will be supplied via an existing well located on the contiguous northern property with a common-ownership easement. Sewer disposal for the Single-family dwelling/ B&B will be provided for by on-site septic systems and has been approved by the Department of Environmental Health. The proposed project does not include or require the construction or expansion of utility and service system facilities which would cause significant environmental effects. Prior to building permit sign-off and use of the site in relation to electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities approval from San Diego Gas and Electric and applicable telecommunication company would be required. Additionally, based on the service availability form received from the Ramona Municipal Water District for water, the project would not require construction of new or expanded facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project requires water service from the Ramona Municipal Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Ramona Municipal Water District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project would be served by on-site septic systems. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

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

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

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

- e) 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 (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

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

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** As described in the response to IX(f) above, the project site is located in a high FHSZ. The project is surrounded by residential and/or irrigated lands which have been identified as high and very high FHSZ. However, the proposed project would not substantially impair any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project would be serviced by the County Fire Authority. Pursuant to the fire service availability form submitted for the project, The County Fire Authority has indicated the project is eligible for service and nearest fire station is located 2.8 miles from the project. Response time to the project site has been estimated to be eight (8) minutes, meeting the time allowed pursuant to the Safety Element of ten (10) minutes. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** As indicated above in response a), the proposed project is located within a high fire hazard severity zone. However, the majority of the County is in the High and Very High FHSZ. Accordingly, the County has implemented fire safety measures depending on specific factors, such as location, vegetation, etc. The proposed project has prepared a fire protection plan which has been approved by the County Fire Authority. The proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risk due to slope, prevailing winds or other factors because the project site is relatively flat and is located near residences and agricultural fields. Pursuant to the Fire Protection Plan for the project, the adjacent properties which surround the subject property would not pose a serious wildfire threat due to the lack of native vegetation and the ongoing commercial and agricultural practices occurring. The project would also be required to meet applicable fire measures such as fire sprinklers, site inspections, premises identification, fire apparatus access, access road requirements, fire hydrants and vegetation removal/clearance. Additionally, the County of San Diego Fire Authority has indicated the availability to serve the site in the case that a fire would occur. The nearest fire station is located 2.8 miles from the project site and would meet the maximum travel time pursuant to the Safety Element.

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



- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input 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 for an event space, a B&B and hospitality trailers. No installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, such as roads, fuel breaks, or emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities would be required for the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes?

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project site is relatively flat and is not located near County Steep Slopes. Pursuant to the Fire Protection Plan, there are no significant terrain or geological features that would affect the site plan or fire hazard assessment on the subject property. Additionally, the surrounding area has been either developed as a commercial property or as tilled agricultural fields with a lack of native vegetation. Moreover, as indicated within response VII(a)(iv), the project site is not within a landslide susceptibility area as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. The project site has a low probability to become unstable. Therefore, 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 instability, or drainage changes. Impacts are less than significant.

**XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

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

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to

project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects.

Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly two County-sensitive wildlife species and potential other sensitive wildlife species and a plant species identified to have a potential to occur on-site. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes requiring a County-approved biological monitor to be contracted to supervise all ground disturbance activities, and compliance with resource avoidance measures during the bird nesting season. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

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

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT TYPE	LOCATION	STATUS
Copper Meadows Horse Stable	Administrative Permit (PDS2017-AD-17-023)	N of Montecito Road and Montecito Way, San Diego, CA 92065	Approved October 30, 2017

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

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

**Less than Significant Impact:** In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the

response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VII. Geology and Soils, IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, X. Hydrology and Water Quality XIII. Noise, XIV. Population and Housing, XVII. Transportation, and XX. Wildfire. As a result of this evaluation, there were no identified potentially significant effects to human beings related to the project. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that 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.

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

**TECHNICAL STUDIES: The following is a list of project specific technical studies used to support the analysis of each potential environmental effect:**

- Blackhawk Environmental, Kris Alberts (December 2018). Biological Resources Letter Report for the Lavender and Olive Project, PDS2018-MUP-18-013, APN: 281-540-38-00
- County of San Diego Fire Authority, Jeremy Davis (May 2018). Project Facility Availability – Fire, Lavender and Olive, LLC, 633 Montecito Way, 281-540-38-00
- Darnell & Associates, Bill E. Darnell (May 2018). Focused Traffic and Parking Study for Lavender and Olive Event Venue located at 633 Montecito Way Ramona, California
- Darnell & Associates, Bill E. Darnell (April 2019). Sight Distance Assessment, Lavender and Olive Wedding Venue, PDS2018-MUP-18-013
- Department of Environmental Health, Scott Rosecrans (May 2019). Scoping Discussion, PDS2018-MUP-18-013, Lavender and Olive, 633 Montecito Way, Ramona, APN: 281-540-38-00
- Department of Public Works, Derek R. Gade (May 2018). Requests for exception(s) to public road standard(s) – Lavender and Olive Wedding Venue located in the Unincorporated portion of San Diego County within the Ramona Community Planning Area, APN 281-540-38-00, PDS2018-MUP-18-013
- FIREWISE 2000, Inc., Ronald J. Woychak (September 2018). Fire Protection Plan – Letter Report, Lavender and Olive Event Venue, PDS2018-MUP-18-013.
- Heritage Resources, Sue Wade (January 2018). Lavender & Olive: previously completed cultural resource survey
- Ldn Consulting, Inc., Jeremy Loudon (April 2019). Appendix A: Final Climate Action Plan Consistency Review Checklist, Permit Number PDS2018-MUP-18-013.
- Ldn Consulting, Inc., Jeremy Loudon (December 2018). Lavender & Olive Major Use Permit Event Noise Assessment – County of San Diego
- Project Engineering, Paul Fisher (June 2019). Drainage Certification Letter, Lavender and Olive Wedding Venue, PDS2018-MUP-18-013, 633 Montecito Way, Ramona, CA
- Project Engineering, Paul Fisher (May 2019). County of San Diego Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) For Standard Projects, Lavender and Olive, 633 Montecito Way, Ramona, CA 92065, PDS2018-MUP-18-013
- Ramona Municipal Water District, M. Moore (June 2018). Project Facility Availability – Water, Lavender and Olive, LLC, 633 Montecito Way, 281-540-38-00
- Ramona Unified School District, Ana Machado (May 2018). Project Facility Availability – School, Lavender and Olive, LLC, 633 Montecito Way, 281-540-38-00

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.

#### 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 (NLRPIP), 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.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.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.sdcounty.ca.gov](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov))

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

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

## HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

#### LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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