



# County of San Diego

**JEFF C. MONEDA**  
DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 410  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1237  
(858) 694-2212  
[www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/)

July 23, 2020

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

1. Title; Project Number:

Mapleview Street Green Streets Project; 1023740

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Public Works  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410  
San Diego, CA 92123-1239

3. a. Contact Gail Getz, Project Manager

b. Phone number: (858) 694-3911

c. E-mail: [Gail.Getz@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Gail.Getz@sdcounty.ca.gov)

4. Project location:

The Mapleview Street Green Streets Project is located along Mapleview Street from Vine Street to Pino Drive, within the unincorporated community of Lakeside in San Diego County (Thomas Brothers Guide Page 1232; B-3 to C-2).

5. Project Applicant name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Public Works  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410  
San Diego, CA 92123-1239

6. General Plan.

Community Plan: Lakeside

Properties adjacent to the project are designated as:

Land Use Designation: Village Residential 30 (VR-30)

	Village Residential 7.3 (VR-7.3)
	General Commercial
	Public/Semi-Public Facilities
Density:	1 du/0.5 acre(s)
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	NA

#### 7. Zoning.

Properties adjacent to the project are designated as:

Use Regulation:	RU; RS; C37
Minimum Lot Size:	6000
Special Area Regulation:	B

#### 8. Description of project:

The proposed Mapleview Street Green Streets Project would improve stormwater conveyance and water quality along Mapleview Street through implementation of structural stormwater best management practices (BMPs). The project occurs along approximately 0.69 miles of Mapleview Street from Vine Street to Pino Drive located within the unincorporated community of Lakeside in San Diego County. The existing drainage conveyance along Mapleview Street consists of curb and gutter, asphalt concrete berm, earthen channels, sub-surface storm drains with curb inlets, and concrete-lined channels. Runoff from rain events, ground water infiltration, and irrigation activities flows into the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) with limited treatment before entering the San Diego River. The goal of the project is to improve water quality by treating wet weather flows along Mapleview Street to help meet indicator bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) targets in the San Diego River watershed.

Proposed improvements include installation of approximately 460 linear feet of 5-foot wide sidewalks, 200 linear feet of a 3-foot wide cobble-lined swale, and 550 linear feet of 4-foot wide biofiltration basins along Mapleview Street between Vine Street and Ashwood Street. The new cobble-lined swale and biofiltration basins will be connected to the existing concrete-lined flood control channel and the existing unlined roadside ditch would be improved with an 8-foot wide dispersion area. These improvements would remain unlined and consist of a layer of cobble, amended soil, and a choker layer to increase the amount of retention, infiltration and treatment of stormwater flows. A masonry retaining wall, with heights varying from approximately 4 to 6-feet, would be constructed along a portion of the north side of the dispersion area to stabilize the eroded banks of the channel, as needed. Storm drain improvements would occur at the intersection of Ashwood Street and Mapleview Street and would continue east along the north side of Mapleview Street for approximately 450 feet. An existing 57- by 38-inch corrugated metal pipe (CMP) at Ashwood Street would be replaced with a 6- by 2-foot reinforced concrete box (RCB), and an existing 42- by 29-inch CMP located east of Ashwood Street would be replaced with a 4- by 3-foot RCB to increase the flow capacity. East of the storm drain improvements, 8-foot wide biofiltration basins would be constructed

within the shoulder of the roadway. The basins would consist of a multi-layer treatment area to allow for infiltration and treatment of stormwater runoff and a plastic liner. A 4.5-foot wide decomposed granite maintenance corridor would be constructed north of the basins and a 5-foot wide sidewalk with curb and gutter south of the basins. The sidewalk, curb, gutter, driveway, and road improvements would continue along Mapleview Street and terminate west of Pino Drive. On the south side of Mapleview Street, and located east and west of Duncan Drive, sidewalk, curb, gutter, and driveway improvements would be constructed. Construction is anticipated to last approximately 6 months.

Two facilities under the County’s Regional General Permit-53 (RGP-53) permit program are within the project area and undergo regular maintenance by the County Department of Public Works (DPW). The two maintained facilities are numbered; Facility 33-006 is the maintained roadside ditch that carries flows in a westerly direction to Facility FC-020, the concrete-lined flood control channel. County DPW routinely maintains these facilities by removing sediment, vegetation, and debris.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site and surrounding area can be characterized as developed/urbanized and is surrounded by village residential, general commercial, and public/semi-public facilities land uses. Existing development within the project area includes various businesses, residences, a rodeo arena, and parking lots. El Capitan High School is located just to the north of the project area and Mapleview Street provides freeway access to Highway 67.

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

<b><u>Permit Type/Action</u></b>	<b><u>Agency</u></b>
Waste Discharge Requirement	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
1602 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

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

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB-52), consultation was conducted with cultural affiliated tribes. DPW staff sent letters to the identified tribal representatives on November 26, 2019, and followed up via emails and phone calls on December 11,

2019 and December 30, 2019. Four tribes requested AB52 consultation: the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, the Jamul Indian Village, the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, and the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians. Per the requests made during Native American consultation, the County has agreed to provide a Kumeyaay Native American monitor during project-related ground disturbing activities.

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

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Aesthetics</a>                      | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Agriculture and Forestry Resources</a> | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Air Quality</a>                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Biological Resources</a> | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Cultural Resources</a>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Energy</a>                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Geology &amp; Soils</a>  | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Greenhouse Gas Emissions</a>           | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</a>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</a>   | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Land Use &amp; Planning</a>            | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Mineral Resources</a>                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Noise</a>                           | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Population &amp; Housing</a>           | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Public Services</a>                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Recreation</a>                      | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Transportation/Traffic</a>             | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Tribal Cultural Resources</a>          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Utilities &amp; Service Systems</a> | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Wildfire</a>                           | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Mandatory Findings of Significance</a> |

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Public Works Environmental 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, the Department of Public Works Environmental 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, the Department of Public Works Environmental Services finds that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

 for

July 21, 2020

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Gail Getz  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

Environmental Planning Manager  
\_\_\_\_\_  
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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

**No Impact:** The project site and surrounding area can be characterized as developed/urbanized and is surrounded by village residential, general commercial, and public/semi-public facilities land uses. Existing development within the project area includes various businesses, residences, a rodeo arena, and parking lots. Based on a site visit completed by County staff Gail Getz and Keshia Montifolca on May 22, 2019, the proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and will not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view.

The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The proposed visible features of the project would include new landscape features within the parkway which allows for extensive landscaping opportunities that would help retain the rural atmosphere of Lakeside. The sidewalks are not anticipated to have a visual impact on the surrounding site because the project proposes to fill in the missing segments of sidewalks in an already developed area and the sidewalk connectivity would result in a visual improvement in the area. The addition of biofiltration basins would be located along the extruded curb areas, and linear cobble swales, and dispersion areas configured as vegetated swales are proposed in locations in the existing earth swales which would not result in a large visual change. Retaining walls would be required; however, it is not anticipated to have a visual impact as the area currently has a rather long and tall concrete retaining wall in front of the Stone Ridge Apartment Homes, along on the north side of Mapleview Street. The proposed project would be consistent with the

rural residential aesthetic of Lakeside and would not result in a significant visual change. Therefore, the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

**No Impact:** Based on a site visit completed by County staff Gail Getz and Keshia Montifolca on May 22, 2019 the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The project site and surrounding area can be characterized as developed/urbanized and existing development within the project area includes various businesses, residences, a rodeo arena, and parking lots. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site



and surrounding can be characterized as site and surrounding area can be characterized as developed/urbanized and is surrounded by village residential, general commercial, and public/semi-public facilities land uses. Existing development within the project area includes various businesses, residences, a rodeo arena, and parking lots. El Capitan High School is located just to the north of the project area and Mapleview Street provides freeway access to Highway 67.

The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: the proposed visible features of the project would include new landscape features within the parkway which allows for extensive landscaping opportunities that would help retain the rural atmosphere of Lakeside. The sidewalks are not anticipated to have a visual impact on the surrounding site because the project proposes to fill in the missing segments of sidewalks in an already developed area and the sidewalk connectivity would result in a visual improvement in the area. The addition of biofiltration basins would be located along the extruded curb areas, and linear cobble swales, and dispersion areas configured as vegetated swales are proposed in locations in the existing earth swales which would not result in a large visual change. Retaining walls would be required; however, it is not anticipated to have a visual impact as the area currently has a rather long and tall concrete retaining wall in front of the Stone Ridge Apartment Homes, along on the north side of Mapleview Street.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the proposed project, along with the projects listed in Section XVII, would not degrade the existing visual character, or quality of the site and its surroundings, or result in incompatible changes in visual character, or degrade the overall quality of a scenic vista. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level of effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES**

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is zoned Urban Residential (RU), Single Family Residential (RS), and Heavy Commercial (C37). Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is in a developed residential area and does not contain forest lands or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project is consistent with existing zoning and a rezone 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         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site does 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site and surrounding area within a radius of 1/4 mile does not contain any active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no 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 or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project would improve stormwater quality through the implementation of structural Best Management Practices (BMPs) along Mapleview Street that would not affect implementation of applicable air quality plans or SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. The roadside ditches are routinely maintained and the operation of BMPs maintenance would not change after construction of the water quality improvement project, therefore, there would be no increase in operational emissions from before and after construction. In addition, operation of the proposed project will not generate additional vehicle trips that could contribute to air quality impacts. The only new emissions from the project would be from the construction phase, which is anticipated to last approximately 6 months and emissions would be minimal, temporary, and localized. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP on a project-based or cumulative level.

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                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) under the CAAQS. O<sub>3</sub> is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. 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.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs from construction/grading activities. However, grading

operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in PM<sub>10</sub> and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

The proposed project would improve stormwater quality through the implementation of structural Best Management Practices (BMPs) along Mapleview Street and would not increase road trips or road capacity. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an operational increase in O<sub>3</sub> emissions from traffic. The road side ditches are routinely maintained and the operation of BMPs maintenance would not change after construction of the water quality improvement project. In addition, there would be no increase in operational emissions from before and after construction. Furthermore, potential construction and operational emissions associated with the project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM<sub>10</sub> or any O<sub>3</sub> precursors. As such, the proposed project's potential impacts due to a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants would be less than significant.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the 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 PM<sub>10</sub>, 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                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

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 following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: residences, El Capitan High

School, Lindo Park Elementary School, and Foothills Christian School. However, 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 receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

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

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Letter Report dated June 12, 2020, prepared by Environmental Science Associates, no federally listed species or special status plant species were observed within the survey area at the time of the surveys. However, two sensitive wildlife species, Cooper's hawk (CDFW watch list species, MSCP covered species), and Orange-throated whiptail (CDFW species of special concern, MSCP covered species) were observed, and Western yellow bat (CDFW species of special concern) has a low potential to occur within the project survey area.

Non-native grassland habitat would be impacted by the proposed project and it provides adequate habitat for Orange-throated whiptails. The project would impact 0.98 acres of

non-native grassland habitat. However, mitigation to this habitat would reduce the impacts to a level of less than significant with implementation of the below mitigation measure:

#### **Non-Native Grassland Habitat Mitigation**

Temporary impacts to 0.82 acres of non-native grassland and permanent impacts to 0.16 acres of non-native grassland will be mitigated consistent with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance; the mitigation ratio applied would be either 1:1 or 0.5:1 dependent on if the mitigation site is a biological resource core area (BRCA; the project site is not BRCA). Mitigation can be accomplished through on-site preservation, restoration or creation of non-native grassland (or a biologically equivalent habitat type); or preservation, restoration or creation of non-native grassland (or a biologically equivalent habitat type) offsite within a County habitat preserve. Mitigation could also be accomplished via payment of fees into an authorized private mitigation/conservation bank.

Additionally, the project would involve the removal of vegetation, which could result in the accidental destruction of nests or nest abandonment if construction were to occur during the general bird breeding season (January 15 – September 1). To avoid an impact to migratory and nesting birds, including Cooper's hawk, the below avoidance and minimization measure will be implemented:

#### **Nesting Season Avoidance or Pre-Construction Survey**

If construction initiation occurs between January 15 and September 1, a pre-construction nesting bird and raptor survey of the project area and an appropriate buffer of up to 500 feet shall be completed by a qualified biologist prior to vegetation removal. If any active nests are detected, an avian specialist would be consulted to determine the appropriate buffer and other avoidance measures to ensure the project does not affect the success of the nest. The area will be flagged and mapped on construction plans along with a buffer as recommended by the qualified biologist. The buffer area(s) established by the qualified biologist will be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete or it is determined that the nest is no longer active. The qualified biologist shall be a person familiar with bird breeding behavior and capable of identifying the bird species of San Diego County by sign and sound and determining alterations of behavior as a result of human interaction. Buffers will be based on local topography and line of sight, species behavior and tolerance to disturbance, and existing disturbance levels.

Impacts to CDFW Species of special concern, CDFW watch list species, and MSCP covered species and their habitat would be less than significant with implementation of the above mitigation measures. Therefore, no potentially significant project level or cumulative level of 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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will occur as a result of this project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of the County’s Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Letter Report dated June 12, 2020, prepared by Environmental Science Associates, one sensitive vegetation community was identified within the project impact area; non-native grassland habitat. This habitat is a Tier III vegetation community under the MSCP Subarea Plan and will be mitigated as follows:

**Non-Native Grassland Habitat Mitigation**

Temporary impacts to 0.82 acres of non-native grassland and permanent impacts to 0.16 acres of non-native grassland will be mitigated consistent with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance; the mitigation ratio applied would be either 1:1 or 0.5:1 dependent on if the mitigation site is a biological resource core area (BRCA; the project site is not BRCA). Mitigation can be accomplished through on-site preservation, restoration or creation of non-native grassland (or a biologically equivalent habitat type); or preservation, restoration or creation of non-native grassland (or a biologically equivalent habitat type) offsite within a County habitat preserve. Mitigation could also be accomplished via payment of fees into an authorized private mitigation/conservation bank.

The proposed project would result in impacts to non-native grassland habitat, however, impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant with the implementation of the mitigation measure listed above.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on 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                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of the County’s Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive



Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Letter Report dated June 12, 2020 and an Aquatic Resources Delineation Report dated June 11, 2020, prepared by Environmental Science Associates, it has been determined that wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., do not occur on the project site. However, the proposed project would result in impacts to roadside ditches that may be considered waters under the jurisdiction of the RWQCB (waters of the state), and CDFW (streambed). Project impacts to roadside ditches that may be considered RWQCB non-wetland state waters and CDFW vegetated streambed entirely overlap.

Permanent impacts to <0.01 acre (31 linear feet) of State non-wetland waters/streambed and temporary impacts to 0.04 acre (494 linear feet) of State non-wetland waters/streambed would not require compensatory mitigation as the proposed project is considered self-mitigating. As part of the project design, the existing roadside ditch would include the widening and revegetation of the impacted area. However, impacts to CDFW or RWQCB jurisdictional waters may require a 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement and a Waste Discharge Requirement under Porter-Cologne.

The proposed project would result in temporary and a small amount of permanent impacts to roadside ditches that may be non-wetland waters of the state and CDFW vegetated streambed. It is anticipated that the expansion of the roadside ditch would result in a net gain of potential waters of the state and CDFW vegetated streambed such that non net loss of waters of the state and CDFW vegetated streambed would occur. Further, the proposed bioswale improvements are designed to improve water quality within and downstream of the project area. Therefore, the proposed project, along with other current and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not have a significant cumulative impact to jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the state, and CDFW streambed after the project is constructed.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Letter Report dated June 12, 2020, prepared by Environmental Science Associates, it has been determined that the project would not substantially interfere with movement of wildlife or any established wildlife corridors. However, the project site includes potential roosting and maternity habitat for bats, particularly the western yellow bat, within the dead fronds of Mexican fan palm trees.

Construction activity adjacent to bat maternity colonies could potentially result in significant impacts such as abandonment of young. The following measure is recommended to reduce these impacts to less than significant:

**Pre-Construction Roosting Bat Survey**

If construction initiation occurs between June and August, a pre-construction roosting bat survey of palm trees within 100 feet of the project area shall be completed by a qualified biologist. The survey will involve a visual inspection for signs of bat presence, such as guano, insect parts, and staining. If signs of bat presence are detected, buffer area(s) shall be established by the qualified biologist and avoided until September or until roosting bats are no longer present.

Impacts to potential roosting and maternity habitat for bats, particularly the western yellow bat, would be less than significant with implementation of the above avoidance and minimization measure. Therefore, the proposed 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project falls within the Metro-Lakeside-Jamul Segment of the South County MSCP. MSCP Findings have been prepared, dated July 21, 2020, and have determined that the project is consistent with all applicable local policies, ordinances, and adopted plans. The project will only impact vegetation communities adjacent to the existing road and all feasible mitigation measures have been incorporated into this project, and there are no feasible, less environmentally damaging locations, alignments, or non-structural alternatives that would meet project objectives. The project does not encroach into wetlands or a floodplain; however, non-wetland waters occur within the project but no net loss of non-wetland waters are anticipated. No mature riparian woodland would be destroyed or reduced and no critical populations of sensitive plants would be impacted. Therefore, the project will not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources.

**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         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of records obtained from the South Coastal Information Center on October 30, 2019 and a survey of the project area by County of San Diego approved archaeologist Michael R. Bever, Ph.D., RPA From Environmental Science Associates and Native American monitor Shuuluk Linton with Redtail Environmental on November 7, 2019, it was determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources. The results of the survey are provided in a Negative results Cultural Resources Survey Report dated May 21, 2020, and prepared by Environmental Science Associates.

The entirety of the project area is either paved or otherwise developed, including road construction, installation of sidewalks, grading, channelization of a drainage, landscaping, construction of adjacent buildings and parking lots, and installation of utilities. In addition, none of the built structures in the project area are considered historical. For these reasons, intact historical resources are unlikely within the project area, particularly since proposed construction activities, including ground disturbance, would largely occur within previously disturbed areas. For these reasons, the project would result in no impact 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of records obtained from the South Coastal Information Center on October 30, 2019 and a survey of the project area by County of San Diego approved archaeologist Michael R. Bever, Ph.D., RPA From Environmental Science Associates and Native American monitor Shuuluk Linton with Redtail Environmental on November 7, 2019, it was determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. The results of the survey are provided in a Negative results Cultural Resources Survey Report dated May 21, 2020, and prepared by Environmental Science Associates.

The entirety of the project area is either paved or otherwise developed, including road construction, installation of sidewalks, grading, channelization of a drainage, landscaping, construction of adjacent buildings and parking lots, and installation of utilities. For these reasons, intact archaeological resources are unlikely within the project area, particularly since proposed construction activities, including ground disturbance, would largely occur within previously disturbed areas. However, certain areas would include excavation beyond previously disturbed horizons. Although it is unlikely that archaeological resources are would be encountered during excavation, per the requests made during Native American consultation, the County has agreed to provide a Kumeyaay Native American monitoring during initial project-related ground disturbing activities as a minimization measure.

### **Cultural Resources Avoidance and Minimization Efforts**

A Kumeyaay Native American monitor and on-call archaeologist will be provided during initial project-related ground disturbing activities. If inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources are made, the County, project archaeologist, and appropriate Native American representative shall divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to assess the significance of the resources and confer regarding the appropriate treatment (i.e., preservation, avoidance, and/or mitigation for the resources). As part of the objectives, criteria, and procedures required by Section 21082 of the Public Resources Code, a lead agency shall make provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources inadvertently discovered during construction.

Consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(b) and Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014), avoidance shall be the preferred method of preservation for cultural resources. Work could continue in other parts of the project site while historical or unique archaeological resource mitigation takes place. The project archaeologist, in consultation with the County staff archaeologist, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the archaeologist and approved by the County staff archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods.

Therefore, due to the previously disturbed nature of the site, the low likelihood of archaeological resources being present, and inclusion of a Kumeyaay Native American monitor during initial project-related ground disturbing activities, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA §15064.5.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of records obtained from the South Coastal Information Center on October 30, 2019 and a survey of the project area by County of San Diego approved archaeologist Michael R. Bever, Ph.D., RPA From Environmental Science Associates and Native American monitor Shuuluk Linton with Redtail Environmental on November 7, 2019, it was 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. The results of the survey are provided in a Negative results Cultural Resources Survey Report dated May 21, 2020, and prepared by Environmental Science Associates.

The entirety of the project area is either paved or otherwise developed, including road construction, installation of sidewalks, grading, channelization of a drainage, landscaping, construction of adjacent buildings and parking lots, and installation of utilities. For these reasons, intact cultural resources are unlikely within the project area, particularly since proposed construction activities, including ground disturbance, would largely occur within previously disturbed areas. However, certain areas would include excavation beyond previously disturbed horizons. Although it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered during construction, per the requests made during Native American consultation, the County has agreed to provide a Kumeyaay Native American monitoring during initial project-related ground disturbing activities.

**Human Remains Avoidance and Minimization Efforts**

A Kumeyaay Native American monitor and on-call archaeologist will be provided during project-related ground disturbing activities. If human remains are encountered, consistent with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin of the remains. Further, consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), human remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made.

If the County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be contacted within twenty-four (24) hours. The NAHC shall immediately identify the "most likely descendant(s)" (MLD) and notify them of the discovery. The MLD shall make recommendations within forty-eight (48) hours after being allowed access to the site, and engage in consultations with the landowner concerning the treatment of the remains. The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further construction activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been

conducted. Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed.

Therefore, due to the previously disturbed nature of the site, the low likelihood of archaeological resources being present, and inclusion of a Kumeyaay Native American monitor during initial project-related ground disturbing activities, the project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

## **VI. ENERGY**

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                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project does not involve or introduce ongoing operational uses that would create a new source of energy consumption. During construction, temporary consumption of energy resources would occur for approximately six months. During maintenance there would be a temporary consumption of energy resources for the movement of equipment and materials, but the duration is limited to twice a year and after storm events, and the maintenance area would be limited to the roadside ditches, which are currently maintained, and the newly constructed water quality treatment best management practices. Compliance with local, state, and federal regulations, which limit engine idling times and require recycling project-related debris, would reduce short-term energy demand during the project's maintenance to the extent feasible and project would not result in a wasteful or inefficient use of energy. Therefore, the project will not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during the project's maintenance activities.

The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. There would be no potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during the project's maintenance activities.

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

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

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project does not propose any energy consumption during operation and only minor energy consumption will be required during project maintenance activities. For example, during maintenance there would be a temporary consumption of energy resources for the movement of equipment and materials, but the duration is limited to twice a year and after storm events, and the maintenance area would be limited to the roadside ditches, which are currently maintained, and the newly constructed water quality treatment best management practices. The regulations at the state level intended to reduce energy include, among others, California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6–Energy Efficiency Standards and California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11–California Green Building Standards. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

**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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

## ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The design and construction of the proposed Green Streets best management practices and sidewalks would be consistent with applicable California and County codes and would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

## iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. However, the proposed project would install Green Streets best management practices and sidewalks within an existing developed roadway. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is considered low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

## iv. Landslides?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-



slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. The proposed project would improve stormwater quality through the implementation of structural Best Management Practices (BMPs) along Mapleview Street. The project is not expected to expose people or structures to landslides as the project would implement structural improvements within the shoulder of an existing roadway. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from landslides.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Grangeville Fine Sandy Loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes and Tujunga Sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes that have a soil erodibility rating of “slight,” and Greenfield Sandy Loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes and Ramona Sandy Loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes that have a soil erodibility rating of “moderate” as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; and will not develop steep slopes.
- A Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) has been prepared. The SWQMP will include the following Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: gravel bags, fiber rolls, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, solid waste management, and sanitary waste management.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The proposed project involves approximately 1,973 cubic yards of grading that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. However, no buildings or structures are being proposed and the project site is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone. Therefore, the project is not located on unstable soil or geologic conditions, nor would it cause the area to become unstable, so the potential for impacts due to the project would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on-site are Grangeville Fine Sandy Loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes; Greenfield Sandy Loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes; Ramona Sandy Loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes; and Tujunga Sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property. This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the

US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is for treating wet-weather flows to meet bacterial Total Maximum Daily Load targets through the implementation of water quality treatment best management practices, and the installation of sidewalk improvements where there are currently gaps along Mapleview Street. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

The project area is located on upper Jurassic and lower cretaceous marine and nonmarine layers which has a marginal sensitivity rating for containing paleontological resources and on quaternary alluvium which has a low sensitivity rating for containing paleontological resources. The project also involves approximately 1,973 cubic yards of grading. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, as a minimization measure, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

**Paleontological Resources Avoidance and Minimization Efforts**

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

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

If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that the fossil or fossil assemblage is significant; a mitigation program involving salvage, cleaning, and curation of the fossil(s) and documentation shall be implemented. If no fossils or fossil assemblages of greater than 12 inches in any dimension are encountered during excavation, a "No Fossils Found" letter will be submitted to the County Department of Public Works identifying who conducted the monitoring and that no fossils were found. If one or more fossils or fossil assemblages are found, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a report documenting the mitigation program, including field and laboratory methodology, location and the geologic and stratigraphic setting, list(s) of collected fossils and their paleontological significance, descriptions of any analyses, conclusions, and references cited.

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

**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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The State of California has developed guidelines to address the significance of climate change impacts based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, which contains two significance criteria for evaluating greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of a project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 states that the “determination of the significance of greenhouse gas emissions calls for a careful judgment by the lead agency consistent with the provisions in Section 15064. A lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project.”

Section 15064.4(b) further states that a lead agency should consider the following nonexclusive list of factors when assessing the significance of GHG emissions:

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

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

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, hydrofluorocarbons, and nitrous oxide, among others. Human-induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of BMPs along a roadway shoulder, roadside ditch, and the installation of sidewalks along Mapleview Street where there are currently gaps. Approximately 460 linear feet of 5-foot wide sidewalks would be installed between Vine Street and Ashwood Street. Emissions

during project implementation would occur temporarily and could include transport of equipment and materials to and from the site, removal of spoils and/or debris, and construction personnel commuting to and from the project site. Emissions from the proposed project would be limited to the construction activities and would not involve land use development that would generate long-term operational impacts. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary, and localized and would cease once the project is constructed.

The County Department of Public Works (DPW) had a *Greenhouse Gas Guidance Letter* developed, dated July 13, 2017 and prepared by RECON Environmental (GHG Guidance Letter), to estimate the potential GHG emissions associated with recurring infrastructure maintenance activities that DPW regularly performs. The most applicable maintenance types covered by the GHG Guidance Letter would be concrete pathway installation, materials hauling, and grading.. The modeled project scenario for concrete pathway installation was estimated to emit 65.2 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MT CO<sub>2</sub>E) per mile. Using the proposed project description length of approximately 920 linear feet (460 linear feet multiplied by two since sidewalks would be installed on both sides of Mapleview Street), amounts to approximately 0.17 miles. Accordingly, the pathway installation for this project is estimated to emit a total of 11.08 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E. The modeled project scenario for materials hauling was estimated to emit 0.056 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E per 20 cubic yards of material. Using the proposed project description of approximately 1,318 cubic yards, the hauling for this project is estimated to emit a total of 3.69 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E. The modeled project scenario for grading was estimated to emit 6.68 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E per acre. Using the proposed project description of approximately 3.02 acres of improvements, the grading for this project is estimated to emit a total of 20.17 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E. The project activities when added together are estimated to emit a total of 34.94 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E.

A screening level based on the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's (CAPCOA) report CEQA & Climate Change has typically been used to determine whether further analysis would be needed to examine the GHG impacts of a proposed project (CAPCOA 2008). CAPCOA developed a 900 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E per year screening threshold by analyzing the capture of 90 percent or more of future discretionary development for residential and commercial projects across the state. Direct and cumulative impacts would be potentially significant and require further analysis if the project results in emissions that exceed 900 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E beyond current baseline emissions. Because the project would be completed during or after 2020, the 900 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E screening threshold may no longer be applicable. Senate Bill (SB) 32 sets a GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, or 540 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E. To achieve this target, a regression trajectory was projected reducing the operational year emissions target from the 900 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E target in 2020 to the 540 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E target in 2030. This trajectory is outlined in Table 1:

**TABLE 1**  
**GHG Screening Thresholds Trajectory**

Year	Emissions Threshold (MT CO <sub>2</sub> e)
2020	900
2021	855
2022	813
2023	772
2024	734
2025	697
2026	662
2027	629
2028	598
2029	568
2030	540

Source: CAPCOA 2008; SB 32 MT = metric tons; CO<sub>2</sub>e = carbon dioxide equivalents

Note: Emissions thresholds reduce by 4.98 percent each year to achieve SB 32's 2030 target.

The annual emissions screening level of 900 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E was originally developed to address operational impact of GHG emissions from land use development. Since the introduction of the CAPCOA guidance, several air districts in the state have issued additional guidance that construction emissions should be included in assessment of operational GHG emissions by amortizing the total GHG construction emissions over the lifespan of a project, and then adding that amortized total to the operational emissions. This approach ensures all GHG emissions that occur from a project are included in the assessment. While similar to land use developments, different improvements or maintenance activities can vary depending on the improvement, unlike typical land use developments where an average lifespan is used, infrastructure projects should be assessed based on the specific improvement life span.

The project would result in GHG emissions from construction of approximately 34.94 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E. When averaged over 20 years, the proposed construction activities would contribute approximately 1.75 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E per year. This would be well below the screening threshold for any year along the trajectory outlined in Table 1, therefore GHG impacts from construction of the project would be less than significant.

The total project emissions (the sum of construction and operations) would be far below any relevant numerical threshold in the state. Furthermore, the project's incremental contribution to cumulative GHG emissions is determined to not be cumulatively considerable because emissions are far below relevant numerical thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which set the GHG emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, state emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions. The State subsequently passed SB 32, which set an additional GHG emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2030, state emissions must be reduced to 40 percent below 1990 levels by reducing GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

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'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.

As described above in this Initial Study, construction of the proposed project is estimated to emit a total of 34.94 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E or 1.75 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E, when amortized over 20 years. The project would not result in additional vehicular traffic and the project's incremental contribution to cumulative GHG emissions is determined to not be cumulatively considerable because emissions are far below relevant numerical thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

The project's minimal incremental contribution to cumulative GHG emissions is determined to not be cumulatively considerable because the total amount far below any relevant numerical thresholds. The project's GHG emissions are, therefore, determined to be consistent with the General Plan which has the most applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose 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, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

- Potentially Significant Impact       Less than Significant Impact



- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures that are known to contain hazardous materials 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) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Although the project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school: El Capitan High School and Lindo Park Elementary School, 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Dam Evacuation Plan for Chet Harritt Dam, El Capitan Dam, and San Vicente Dam will not be interfered with because even though the project is located within a dam inundation zone, the project is not a unique institution that would be difficult to safely evaluate in the event of a dam failure. Unique institutions, as defined by the Office of Emergency Services, include hospitals, schools, skilled nursing facilities, retirement homes, mental health care facilities, care facilities for patients with disabilities, adult and childcare facilities, jails/detention facilities, stadiums, arenas, amphitheatres, or a similar use. Since the project does not propose a unique institution in a dam inundation zone, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is completely surrounded by urbanized areas and/or irrigated lands and no wildlands are adjacent to the project. The proposed project involves the installation of Green Streets best management practices and sidewalks as part of an existing roadway within a developed areas. Small patches of non-native grassland habitat are located on the west and east ends of the project site that could be subject to wildfire. However, the roads adjacent to the project would remain open for traffic at all times during construction, thus, traffic flow, access to homes, and emergency access will be maintained throughout the construction period. Therefore, based on the location of the project, review of the project by County staff; the project is not expected to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Therefore, no impact will result due to the implementation of this project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

#### **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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The goal of the project is to treat wet weather flows along Mapleview Street to meet indicator bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load targets in the San Diego River watershed.

The project is required to implement the following construction BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: gravel bags, fiber rolls, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, solid waste management, and sanitary waste management. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by Order Nos. R9-2015-001 and R9-2015-0100), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and BMP Design Manual (BMP DM).

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a 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;

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The goal of the project is to treat wet weather flows along Mapleview Street to meet indicator bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load targets in the San Diego River watershed.

A Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) has been prepared, and the project will implement the following construction BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: gravel bags, fiber rolls, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, solid waste management, and sanitary waste management. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by Order Nos. R9-2015-001 and R9-2015-0100), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and BMP Design Manual (BMP DM). The SWQMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

ii.) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons,

- The goal of the project is to treat wet weather flows a long Mapleview Street to meet indicator bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load targets in the San Diego River watershed.
- The proposed modifications will increase the amount of retention, infiltration and treatment of stormwater flows.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The goal of the project is to treat wet weather flows along Mapleview Street to meet indicator bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load targets in the San Diego River watershed. The proposed modifications will increase the amount of retention, infiltration and treatment of stormwater flows. Therefore the proposed project would not contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is not located in a floodway or flood plain; therefore, could not be inundated by a flood hazard. The project site is not located along the shoreline or a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche. The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated. Therefore, the project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, as detailed above.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:



**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The goal of the project is to treat wet weather flows along Mapleview Street to meet indicator bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load targets in the San Diego River watershed.

A Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) has been prepared, and the project will implement the following construction BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: gravel bags, fiber rolls, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, solid waste management, and sanitary waste management. The project is designed to improve stormwater quality and downstream water quality of the project area, and therefore will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan at this location.

#### **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         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is subject to the Lakeside Community Plan. According to the Land Use Policies and Recommendations of the community Plan, the community encourages “street tree planting and landscaping, as well as the preservation of indigenous plant life.” The proposed project involves the installation of Green Streets best management practices and sidewalks. The proposed project elements would include new

landscape features within the parkway which allows for extensive landscaping opportunities that would help retain the rural atmosphere of Lakeside and is consistent with the community plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.

## **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                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site or land within the vicinity of a 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 “Identified Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-2). However, the project site is surrounded by densely developed land uses including residential, general commercial, and public/semi-public facilities land uses. Existing development within the project area includes various businesses, residences, a rodeo arena, and parking lots 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 ability to extract 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands or is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. However, the project site will not result in the loss of locally important mineral resources because the project site is currently surrounded by densely developed land uses including residential, general commercial, and public/semi-public facilities land uses. Existing development within the project area includes various businesses, residences, a rodeo arena, and parking lots which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. The

placement of the proposed use on the project site would not result in a loss of mineral resources because the feasibility of future mining at the site is already impacted by existing land use incompatibilities. Based on current land use conditions, a future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and other impacts, thereby reducing the feasibility of future mining operations occurring, regardless of the proposed project.

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

### **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 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                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. Based on a site visit completed by Gail Getz and Keshia Montifolca on May 22, 2019, the surrounding area supports residential, general commercial, and public/semi-public facilities land uses and is occupied by residents, workers, and students. There will be short-term noise associated with construction of the project. Construction noise will be intermittent over the 6-month construction period. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

#### General Plan – Noise Element

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

land uses. The proposed project is a water quality improvement project and isn't anticipated to have any sources of noise, other than during the construction phase, and would not have any ongoing noise generating activity.

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

The project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could

generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

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         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not displace any existing housing since the proposed project would only involve the installation of Green Streets best management practices and sidewalks.

#### **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         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The project would not require new or altered public services or facilities to

be constructed to meet acceptable service ratios or response times. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobilehome 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

### **XVII. TRANSPORTATION**

Would the project:

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

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

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

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

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The project will not result in increased vehicle trips, vehicle miles travelled, or roadway capacity. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system.

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

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

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The project would not change the traffic patterns or capacity, or result in an increase of vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b).

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The proposed project would not alter traffic patterns, increase hazards due to design features, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways,



or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impedes adequate site distances on a road.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. During construction, access along Mapleview Street would be provided at all times for emergency vehicles. Periodic and temporary detours may be needed during equipment or materials mobilization, but the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

### **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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. The County of San Diego Department of Public Works sent out consultation letters on November 26, 2019, and followed up via emails and phone calls on December 11, 2019 and December 30, 2019. Four tribes requested AB52 consultation: the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, the Jamul Indian Village, the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, and the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians. DPW staff consulted with the Viejas Band of

Kumeyaay Indians on January 2, 2020 and they requested that a Kumeyaay Cultural Monitor be on site for ground disturbing activities. DPW staff met with the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel and Jamul Indian Village on March 10, 2020. They requested to have cultural monitoring in areas that were not previously disturbed. DPW staff consulted with the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians on March 25, 2020, explained the project, and they had no further comments or requests for the project. No tribal cultural resources were identified during consultation. As such, the project would result in no impact to tribal cultural resources. However, per the requests made during Native American consultation, the County has agreed to provide a Kumeyaay Native American monitor during project-related ground disturbing activities.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. No tribal cultural resources were identified during consultation. As such, there are no impacts to tribal cultural resources. The County of San Diego Department of Public Works sent out consultation letters on November 26, 2019. Four tribes requested AB52 consultation: the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, the Jamul Indian Village, the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, and the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians. Per the requests made during Native American consultation, the County has agreed to provide a Kumeyaay Native American monitor during project-related ground disturbing activities.

**XVIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:

- a) Require or result in the relocation or 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 could cause significant environmental effects?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. However, the proposed project involves storm drain improvements at the intersection of Ashwood Street and Mapleview Street. An existing 57- by 38-inch corrugated metal pipe (CMP) would be replaced with a 6- by 2-foot reinforced concrete box (RCB), and an existing 42- by 29-inch CMP would be replaced with a 4- by 3-foot RCB to increase the flow capacity. The replacement of the CMPs will not exceed the storm water capacity of the existing storm water drainage systems and are designed to accommodate existing flows up to the 100-year storm event, based on current design standards. A Storm Water Quality Management Plan has been prepared for the proposed project to identify measures to avoid water quality impacts during construction. Therefore, there would be no significant environmental effects caused by the construction or relocation of above-listed utilities associated with the project. Specifically, refer to Sections IV Biological Resources and X Hydrology & Water Quality for more information.

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                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. Irrigation lines would be installed for the water quality treatment best management practices and a permanent water connection will be established. The proposed project would require water service from the Lakeside Water District. 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 type="checkbox"/>            | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact                    |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The proposed project will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The proposed project will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County.

- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

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

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The proposed project will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County. Therefore, compliance with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulation related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

**XX. WILDFIRE**

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire severity zones, would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. The project will not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. Therefore, the project would not result in an impact to emergency plans.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. Therefore, the project would not add or increase occupants, or exacerbate wildfire risks thereby exposing occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. As such, the project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project involves the implementation of structural best management practices such as biofiltration basins, cobble swales, and dispersion areas along Mapleview Street to improve stormwater quality within the project area and downstream. As such, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

**XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range

of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly Biological Resources and Geology and Soils. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes mitigating impacts to sensitive vegetation communities through on-site and/or off-site restoration, pre-construction nesting surveys, bat roosting surveys, and biological monitoring during construction as needed would also be included to reduce the effects to a level below significance. Cultural Resources has been evaluated to not be potentially impacted by the project, but as a minimization and avoidance measure, the County would provide a Kumeyaay Native American monitor during project-related ground disturbing activities and a paleontological monitoring program will be implemented by the contractor to avoid impacts to previously undiscovered cultural and paleontological resources. No additional mitigation under Mandatory Findings of Significance is required. 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 Impact  
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Ashwood Street Corridor Improvements Project	SCH 2019119032
El Capitan Townhome Apartments	PDS2015-LP-15-012
Seven Church	PDS2015-MUP-73-050W1M3
Lakeside Christian Church	PDS2015-MUP-70-346M2
Elite Vision Senior Care Facility	PDS2015-MPA-15-016
Laurel Street Apartments	PDS2014-STP-14-002
Lindo Lake Restoration Project	SCH 1990010240

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 Impact  
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, IX Hydrology and Water Quality XII. Noise, XIII. Population and Housing, and XVI. Transportation. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

**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/legregs/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.sandiego.ca.us](http://www.co.sandiego.ca.us))

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

Greenhouse Gas Guidance Letter. Dated July 13, 2017. Prepared by RECON Environmental.

## BIOLOGY

Aquatic Resources Delineation Report for the Mapleview Street Green Streets Project. Date June 11, 2020. Prepared by Environmental Science Associates.

Biological Resources Letter Report for the Mapleview Street Green Streets Project. Dated June 12, 2020. Prepared by Environmental Science Associates.

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.sandiego.ca.us](http://www.co.sandiego.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.

Multiple Species Conservation Program Conformance Statement for the Mapleview Street Green Streets Project. Dated July 21, 2020. Prepared by the County of San Diego Department of Public Works

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.

Mapleview Street Green Streets Project Cultural Resources Survey Report – Negative Findings. Dated May 21, 2020. Prepared by Environmental Services Associates.

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

## GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, <http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/CAPCOAWhite-Paper.pdf>, January 2008.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc., Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Technical Memorandum for the Sycuan-Sloane Trail Project, March 27, 2020.

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

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

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/attacha.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))