County of San Diego

DAHVIA LYNCH
DIRECTOR

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

VINCE NICOLETTI
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

August 3, 2023

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

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

   Dyke Major Grading Plan; PDS2016-LDGRMJ-30079

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

3. a. Contact Souphalak Sakdarak, Project Manager
   b. Phone number: (619) 323-4869
   c. E-mail: Souphalak.Sakdarak@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

   Tavern Road and Taberna Vista Way in the Alpine Community Planning area
   Alpine, CA 91901 (APN 403-380-64-00)

   Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1233, Grid H/5

5. Project Applicant name and address:

   Thomas C. Dyke
   P.O Box 352
   Alpine, CA 91903

6. General Plan

Community Plan:	Alpine
Land Use Designation:	Limited Impact Industrial (I-1)
Density:	-

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) -

7. Zoning
   Use Regulation: Limited Impact Industrial (M52)
   Minimum Lot Size: 3.86 acre(s)
   Special Area Regulation: B

8. Description of project:

   The project is a major grading plan to rectify a grading violation for the Dyke project. The project involves a fill of 9,000 cubic yards of material and 9,000 cubic yards of imported materials. The project site is located off Taberna Vista in the Alpine Community Plan within unincorporated San Diego County. The site is subject to the General Plan Village Regional Category, Limited Impact Industrial (I-1) Land Use Designation. Zoning for the site is Limited Impact Industrial (M52). The site is a vacant lot. Access would be provided by a Taberna Vista Way, private road connecting to Tavern Road, public road. The project would be served by sewer and imported water from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District. No extension of sewer or water utilities will be required by the project.

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

   Lands surrounding the project site are used for industrial and vacant lots. The topography of the project site and adjacent land consists of rolling terrain, some level pads and steeper slopes. Elevations are approximately 1739 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The site is located within 0.13 miles of Highway 8.

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

Permit Type/Action	**Agency**
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Grading Permit Grading Permit Plan Change	County of San Diego
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Industrial Storm water Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Fire District Approval	Alpine Fire Protection District Fire Districts

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

YES	NO
☒	☐

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, public lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and to reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code §21080.3.2). Information is also available from the Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code §5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code §21082.3(e) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

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

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

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

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature	Date
Souphalak Sakdarak	Land Use/Environmental Planner
Printed Name	Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ 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.

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is situated on a relatively flat area at the pad location, surrounded by steep slopes, rolling hills, and substantial boulders in the nearby vicinity. Although the project site is approximately 0.13 miles east from Highway 8, which is identified as a scenic highway, however, due to topography the project site is not visible at any point of that scenic highway. The presence of steep slopes and hillside obstructs the line of sight from the project site to the nearest identified scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project is not 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. Therefore, the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The proposed project is grading plan to correct a grading violation on the industrial zoned parcel. The project involves a fill of 9,000 cubic yards of material and 9,000 cubic yards of imported materials. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality because: The proposed grading is required to correct the violation on the project site. The grading would be performed in a matter that maintain the visual harmony and integrity of the surrounding environment by complying with all applicable codes and regulations. In addition, due to the distance of the project site and intervening structures, landscaping, topography, as well as the project scope which only includes grading, the project would not impact views from any identified scenic vistas. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. As mentioned above, the project site is not visible at any

point of the identified scenic vistas due to the existing topography within the area. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ 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.

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on Staff's research, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway. The nearest officially designated State scenic highway is Route 94 (near Spring Valley)/ I-8 (near La Mesa), which is approximately 13 miles west of the project site.

The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within the composite viewshed of the scenic highway, including the underlying landform and overlaying landcover, establish the visual environment. The visual environment of the subject scenic highway and resources extends from Route 94 to I-8 (near La Mesa); and the visual composition consists of gentle slopes, foothills, and landcover including vegetation and large boulders.

The proposed project is a grading plan to rectify a grading violation on an industrial zoned parcel. The project is compatible with the existing visual environments in terms of visual character and quality for the following reasons: The proposed project is a grading plan to rectify a grading violation on an industrial zoned parcel. The issuance of the grading plan would ensure that grading activities are proceeded in a matter that comply with all required regulations. The grading would also aim to maintain the natural beauty, visual harmony, and aesthetic qualities of the surround landscape while accommodating necessary development. The surrounding areas are also zoned for industrial use and are developed mainly with industrial operations. Any future use on the project site would be required to be in compliant with the Zoning and General Plan guidelines. Furthermore, due to the limited grading that is required, the existing site setting, and the speed of travel by cars on those roadways, and existing topographies, visual resource impacts to those roadways would be minimal during grading.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to

determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. As discussed above, the proposed project is not located near identified scenic vistas and the proposed project is a grading permit. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The project site is located within and is surrounded by parcels that are identified to be urbanized. The project site and its surroundings can be described as having a moderately developed visual character and quality. The area consists of a mix of industrial, commercial, and residential uses, with vacant lots interspersed throughout. In addition, the project is a grading permit to rectify a grading violation on an industrial zoned lot, no structures are proposed as part of the project. The proposed grading will not conflict with any zoning or other regulations governing the scenic quality. All future uses on the lot would be subject to compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan requirements.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. The project is a grading permit to rectify a grading violation on an industrial zone parcel. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a grading plan and 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. As such, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209). The proposed project is a minor grading permit to rectify a grading violation on a residential development lot. Construction would occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., and so would not involve long durations of nighttime work. 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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain any agricultural resources, lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The project site as well as surrounding areas are developed with industrial uses. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned M52, which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code

section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and surrounding area are within a radius of one 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 district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:
The RAQS rely on population and projected growth in the County and project future mobile, area, and all other source emissions. Based on these emissions, the RAQS determine the strategies necessary for the reduction of stationary source emissions through regulatory controls. The project proposes development was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Mobile source emission projections and growth projections are based on population and vehicle trends and land use plans developed by the cities and the County. The project aims to address an existing code violation case related to a grading violation. The project involves a fill of 9,000 cubic yards of material and 9,000 cubic yards of imported materials. The site is zoned Limited Industrial, which is consistent with the use established under the County General Plan and certified by the GPU EIR. As such, projects that are consistent with the growth anticipated in the General Plan would be considered consistent with the RAQS. Although temporary air emissions would be produced during grading activities as discussed in response III. Air Quality, b), no new development is proposed, and no long-term emissions from mobile or other sources would be produced once the construction activities are complete. The project is consistent with the intended use of the site and is consistent with the regional growth projections by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and those used in the development of the RAQS and SIP. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the RAQS or the SIP, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation: The San Diego Air Pollution Control Distract (APCD) does not provide quantitative thresholds for determining the significance of construction or mobile source-related impacts. However, the APCD does specify Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA) trigger levels for new or modified stationary sources (APCD Rules 20.2 and 20.3). If these incremental levels for

stationary sources are exceeded, an AQIA must be performed for the proposed new or modified source. Although these trigger levels do not generally apply to mobile sources or general land development projects, for comparative purposes these levels may used to evaluate the increased emissions which would be discharged to the San Diego Air Basin from proposed land development projects. For projects whose stationary-source emissions are below these criteria, no AQIA is typically required, and project level emissions are presumed to be less than significant.

For CEQA purposes, these screening level thresholds (SLTs) can be used to demonstrate that a project's total emissions would not result in a significant impact to air quality. The daily SLTs are most appropriately used for the standard construction and operational emissions. When project emissions have the potential to approach or exceed the SLTs listed below in Table 1, additional air quality modeling may need to be prepared to demonstrate that ground level concentrations resulting from project emissions (with background levels) will be below National and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively).

APCD Rules 20.2 and 20.3 do not have AQIA thresholds for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and $PM_{2.5}$. The use of the screening level for VOCs specified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which generally has stricter emissions thresholds than San Diego's APCD, is recommended for evaluating projects in San Diego County. For $PM_{2.5}$, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) "Proposed Rule to Implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards" published September 8, 2005, which quantifies significant emissions as 10 tons per year, will be used as the screening-level criteria as shown in Table 1 below:

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

Pollutant	Total Emissions		
	Lbs. per Hour	Lbs. per Day	Tons per Year
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	---	100	15
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	--- *	55	10*
Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)	25	250	40
Sulfur Oxides (SO_x)	25	250	40
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	100	550	100
Lead	---	3.2	0.6
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	---	75**	13.7***

Notes: * USEPA "Proposed Rule to Implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards" published September 8, 2005. Also used by the SCAQMD.
** Threshold for VOCs based on the threshold of significance for VOCs from the SCAQMD for the Coachella Valley.
*** 13.7 Tons Per Year threshold based on 75 lbs/day multiplied by 365 days/year and divided by 2,000 lbs/ton.

Less Than Significant Impact: Currently, San Diego County is in "non-attainment" status for the NAAQS and CAAQS federal and state Ozone (O3) and state Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns and less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM10 and PM2.5). 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_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the

presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM_{10}, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also as the result of increase of traffic from project implementation. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in PM_{10} and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 8 to 44 Average Daily Trips (ADTs) from the imports of materials. In addition, grading operations associated with the project would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance and the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rule 55, which requires the implementation of dust control measures (e.g., watering, application of surfactants, control of vehicle speeds) during grading activities.

Construction-related activities are temporary, short-term sources of air emissions. Sources of construction-related air emissions include:

- Fugitive dust from demolition and grading activities;
- Construction equipment exhaust;
- Construction-related trips by workers, delivery trucks, and material-hauling trucks; and
- Construction-related power consumption.

Construction-related pollutants result from dust raised during demolition and grading, emissions from construction vehicles, and chemicals used during construction. Fugitive dust emissions vary greatly during construction and are dependent on the amount and type of activity, silt content of the soil, and the weather. Vehicles moving over paved and unpaved surfaces, demolition, excavation, earth movement, grading, and wind erosion from exposed surfaces are all sources of fugitive dust. Construction operations are subject to the requirements established in SDAPCD Regulation 4, Rules 52, 54, and 55. Rule 52 sets limits on the amount of particulate matter that can be discharged into the atmosphere. Rule 54 sets limits on the amount of dust and fumes that can be released into the atmosphere. Rule 55 regulates fugitive dust and provides roadway dust track-out/carry-out requirements.

Construction activities would be subject to several control measures per the requirements of the County, SDAPCD rules, and California Air Resources Board (CARB) Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCM). The following required control measures have been incorporated into the calculations of construction emissions:

- Per the County's Standard Mitigation and Project Design Consideration Grading, Clearing and Watercourses Ordinance Section 87.428, the applicant shall implement one or more of the following measures during all grading activities:
  - Water actively disturbed surfaces three times a day.

- Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive, exposed surfaces when not in use for more than 3 days. Non-toxic soil stabilizers should also be applied to any exposed surfaces immediately (i.e., less than 24 hours) following completion of grading activities if the areas would not be in use for more than 3 days following completion of grading.
- Remove soil track-out from paved surfaces daily or more frequently as necessary.
- Minimize the track-out of soil onto paved surfaces by installation of wheel washers.

- Per CARB's ATCM 13 (California Code of Regulations Chapter 10 Section 2485), the applicant shall not allow idling time to exceed 5 minutes unless more time is required per engine manufacturers' specifications or for safety reasons.

An analysis of estimated construction emissions from project grading was completed using SCAQMD's California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). As shown in Table 2 below, project-related air emissions are not anticipated to reach screening-level thresholds identified in Table 1 as established by the San Diego County APCD. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial emissions such that any criteria pollutant air quality standard would be violated. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant; impacts would be less than significant.

Table 2. Estimated Project-Related Air Emissions

Pollutant	Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day)	Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day)	Above Threshold?
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	2.5	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	4.32	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)	20.0	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO_x)	0.03	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	20.4	550	No
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	2.11	75	No

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

Actual construction activities would vary day to day, with all equipment active on some days, and less equipment active on other days depending on the construction task. Therefore, these are the maximum emissions that would occur in a day. Furthermore, project construction would be limited and would last for approximately six months. No mass grading would be required, and construction equipment would be minimal. There are no proposed projects or reasonably foreseeable future projects within proximity of the project that are anticipated to include construction concurrent with the project. As described above, the County's SLT align with attainment of the NAAQS which were developed to protect the public health, specifically the health of "sensitive" populations, including asthmatics, children, and the elderly. Consequently, project construction would have a less than significant impact to public health. Therefore, project construction wound not 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, and impacts would be less than significant.

Furthermore, the project would not contribute to any operational sources outside of existing conditions because no new development is proposed, and no long-term emissions from mobile or other sources would be produced once the construction activities are complete.

Lastly, 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 XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM10, or any O_3 precursors.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Less Than Significant Impact:
Based on staff's review, there are sensitive receptors identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project. Residential developments are located approximately 0.15 miles to the north of the project site. The project includes a major grading permit to rectify a grading violation that would not result in any permanent structures. Grading activities would be temporary (approximately 12 weeks, however, stabilizing/landscaping may take approximately 4 months). Given the short-term use of equipment that would emit diesel exhaust emissions, no significant health risk impacts would occur. The onsite conditions of the slope variability between the proposed grading location and the existing nearby residences would result in dispersal of diesel exhaust and a reduced concentration. The project would also be required to comply with the County Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55, which would reduce potential emissions of fugitive dust. Grading emissions would be temporary and would not expose sensitive receptors to harmful concentrations of air pollutants. The project would also not result in any operational emissions above existing conditions. Therefore, the project would not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of identified sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Because the project would remedy a grading violation case and no new use types or structures are proposed, the project does not include any uses identified by the Air Quality Guidelines as being associated with odors. Thus, operation of the proposed project is not expected to result in objectionable odors for residents of the neighboring uses. Potential sources that may emit odors during grading activities include combustion engine equipment but would not be considered significant due to the highly dispersive nature of diesel exhaust. As odors associated with the project construction would be temporary and intermittent in nature, and dissipate from the source over increasing distance, no significant odors would be expected to affect surrounding receptors. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated January 11, 2023, prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, it has been determined that the site, and/or surrounding area, supported native vegetation, namely, granitic southern mixed chaparral prior to the illegal activities. No special status wildlife or plant species were observed onsite. The project resulted in impacts to 3.36 acres of granitic southern mixed chaparral. However, staff has determined that removal of this habitat will not result in substantial adverse effects with the incorporation of mitigation. The proposed mitigation consists of the purchase of 1.68 acres (0.5:1 ratio) of granitic southern mixed chaparral (tier III) or higher tier habitat within a County approved mitigation bank within a BRCA in the MSCP. Therefore, the impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated January 11, 2023, prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, it has been determined that the proposed project site contained granitic southern mixed chaparral habitat within the project boundaries prior to the illegal activities. Mitigation measures have been incorporated regarding the granitic southern mixed chaparral as described in part (a). Therefore, project impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:
Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated January 11, 2023, prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, it has been determined that two drainage features that qualify as Waters of the State occur on the project site. However, the project will not impact through, discharging into, directly removing, filling, or hydrologically interrupting, any federally protected wetlands supported on the project site. The eastern feature is intact, and the western feature has been restored to the pre-grading condition, without any loss of original function. Therefore, no significant impacts will occur to wetlands or waters of the U.S. as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated January 11, 2023, prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, it has been determined that the site has limited biological value and impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the proposed project due to the already constrained nature of wildlife movement on the project site from fencing and human activity. Preserved areas located north of the project site provide more suitable cover for movement. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated August 3, 2023 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by Senior Adjunct Archaeologist, Donna Beddow, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any known archaeological resources. However, there is the potential for the presence of subsurface, previously unidentified cultural resources. This Grading Permit was submitted to authorize grading that has occurred without permit. Because of the potential for the presence of resources, and because the analysis that should have taken place prior to the unpermitted grading, a cultural impact fee will be required in the amount of $4,158.00 and is to be paid to the Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site has an open code violation case with the County of San Diego, and obtaining a grading permit is necessary to address the code violation and ensure compliance with all relevant ordinances and regulations. The project would require utilization of energy resources during the grading phase. During grading, the project would require the use of heavy construction equipment that would be fueled by gas and diesel. However, the energy use would be temporary, limited, and cease upon completion of grading activities (approximately 4months). Construction would be conducted in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations (e.g., USEPA and the California Air Resources Board [CARB] engine emission standards, which require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption, and limitations on engine idling times, etc.). Compliance with these regulations would minimize short-term energy demand during the project's grading to the extent feasible. Energy needs for the project grading would be temporary and are not anticipated to require additional capacity or substantially increase peak or base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy. Therefore, no significant impact to energy resources would result.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: Relevant plans that pertain to the efficient use of energy include the 2019 California Energy Efficiency Action Plan, which focuses on energy efficiency. As noted, grading activities would be conducted in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations (e.g., USEPA and CARB engine emissions standards, limitations on engine idling times, etc.). Compliance with these regulations would reduce short-term energy demand during the project's grading to the extent feasible and increase the project's energy efficiency. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Project impacts would be less than significant.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. The nearest Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault is at Point Loma, which is located at approximately 20 miles west of the project site. A site-specific Geotechnical Report prepared by Martin R. Owen PE, GE dated September 14, 2021, was prepared for the site, and confirmed that the project lies outside of any fault-rupture hazard zone. The site is underlain at depth by very dense granite rock. There are no known geotechnical hazards at the site such as landsliding and earthquake faulting. However, the site is subject to ground shaking from earthquakes on nearby or more distant active faults. The purpose of the report is to evaluate existing as-graded condition of the area and the study focused on the soil stability for all the grading restoration. However, no further geology review is required as grading does not involve occupancy or any buildings or structures. In additions, the required grading will be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set forth by the County Grading Ordinance. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is a grading permit to rectify a grading violation on an industrial use lot. During the grading operation, no structure will be constructed, that would be impacted by strong seismic shaking. A Grading Plan and a Geotechnical Investigation have been prepared by a registered Civil Engineer and reviewed for approval by County Engineers. The project grading must conform to the grading requirements outlined in the County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance (Grading Ordinance) and be verified in the field by a licensed or registered Civil Engineer and inspected by County Grading Inspectors. Therefore, the Grading Plan and the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by the registered Civil Engineer and compliance with the Grading Ordinance, ensures the

project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

There are no plans to develop the site for future buildings. The Geotechnical investigation was limited to an inspection of the fill conditions.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Liquefaction typically occurs when a site is located in a zone with seismic activity, onsite soils are cohesionless (such as sand or gravel), groundwater is encountered within 50 feet of the surface, and soil relative densities are less than about 70 percent. The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. There are no plans to develop the site for future buildings. Therefore, there will be there will be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:
Landslides occur when masses of rock, earth, or debris move down a slope, including rock falls, deep failure of slopes, and shallow debris flows. Landslides are influenced by human activities such as grading and other construction activities, irrigation of slopes, mining activity, etc. and by natural factors such as precipitation, geology/soil types, surface/subsurface flow of water, and topography. Frequently, they may be triggered by other hazards such as floods and earthquakes. Landslides result from one or more distinct failure surfaces at rates that vary from a few centimeters per day to tens of meters of instantaneous movement. The most common cause of a landslide is down slope gravitational stress applied to slope materials (overly steep natural slopes, cliffs, man-made cuts and fills, etc.). Another common cause includes excessive rainfall or irrigation on a cliff or slope. A type of soil failure is slope wash, from the

erosion of slopes by surface-water runoff. Earthquakes can trigger rockfalls, rock avalanches, debris flows, or other types of potentially damaging landslide movements.

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on the Geological Investigative report prepared for the project, the fill soils are homogeneous throughout the lot. The fill consists of light brown, silty sand with some gravel and cobbles and rock fragments to about 6 inches in dimension. The soils have a very low expansion potential based on visual observation. According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Cieneba rocky coarse sandy loam, that has a soil erodibility rating of “low” 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. Furthermore, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Storm water Management Plan dated September 16, 2021, prepared by Son Nguyen from Snipes-Dye Associates. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: erosion control for disturbed slopes during construction includes vegetation stabilization planting and hydraulic stabilization hydroseeding; erosion control for disturbed flat areas consists of use of Item A erosion control measures on flat area; energy dissipation; sediment control for all disturbed areas with silt, fiber rolls, and gravel; preventing offsite tracking of sediment by stabilizing construction entrance; material management consists

of spill prevention control; Waste management includes solid waste management, sanitary waste management, and hazardous 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 XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project involves 6,000 cubic yards of grading that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. Based on a Geological Investigation prepared for the project site, it was discovered that the graded fill slopes appear stable. The 2:1 slope inclination conforms with the County requirements for graded slopes. No significant slope erosion was observed, although the silty sand soils are potentially erodible during heavy rainfall or uncontrolled runoff. There are soil berms next to the tops of the slopes and the natural slope vegetation is fairly well established, which has helped reduce the amount of erosion. Furthermore, the site is underlain at depth by very dense granite rock. There are no known geotechnical hazards at the site such as landsliding and earthquake faulting.

In order to assure that any proposed buildings (including those proposed on the project site) are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems.

The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. There are no plans to develop the site for future buildings. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VII Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). Based on staff's review of the project site, it was identified that the soils on-site consist of Cieneba rocky coarse sandy loam. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Based on the Geological Investigative report, the fill soils found on-site are determined to be homogeneous throughout the lot. The fill consists of light brown, silty sand with some gravel and cobbles and rock fragments to about 6 inches in dimension. The soils have a very low expansion potential based on visual observation. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed. The project site will obtain services from the Padres Dam Municipal Water District for both water and sewer services. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

No Impact: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains. The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

VIII GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. A regional GHG inventory prepared for the San Diego Region[1] identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate

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

matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions. It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) states that an EIR shall analyze greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a proposed project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is a grading plan to rectify a grading violation. Earthwork involves a fill of 9,000 cubic yards of material and 9,000 cubic yards of imported materials. Construction of the proposed project would generate temporary GHG emissions primarily associated with the operation of construction equipment and truck trips. Site preparation and grading typically generate the greatest emission quantities because the use of heavy equipment is greatest during this phase of construction. Emissions associated with the construction period were estimated based on the projected maximum amount of equipment that would be used on-site at the same time. Air districts have recommended amortizing temporary construction-related emissions over a 30-year period to calculate annual emissions. The CalEEMod air quality modeling conducted for the project determined that the project is estimated to generate a total of 61.5 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) during grading activities, which represents a minimal amount of GHG emissions comparative to standard construction projects. In addition, grading operations associated with the project would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55, which requires the implementation of standard BMPs (e.g., watering, control of vehicle speeds) to ensure dust and diesel emissions are minimized during grading activities.

Further, the grading activities associated with the proposed project are consistent with the existing land use designation and zoning of the property. The M52 land use regulations allow for industrial use types. All future operations on the project site are required to comply with zoning, General Plan, codes, and regulations. Given the project size and the short-term,

temporary emissions that would occur from grading operations to remedy the code violation case, the project would not be expected to result in a substantial contribution of GHG emissions to global climate change. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Therefore, it is determined that the project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions, and no mitigation is required.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: In June 2005, the Governor of California signed Executive Order (EO) S-3-05. EO S-3-05 established the following statewide goals: GHG emissions should be reduced to 2000 levels by 2010, GHG emissions should be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020, and GHG emissions should be reduced to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

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

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

In June 2005, the Governor of California signed Executive Order (EO) S-3-05. EO S-3-05 established the following statewide goals: GHG emissions should be reduced to 2000 levels by 2010, GHG emissions should be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020, and GHG emissions should be reduced to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

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

incorporates various climate change goals and policies. These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets identified in the Climate Action Plan. The County's Climate Action Plan (CAP) includes GHG reduction measures that, if fully implemented, would achieve an emissions reduction target that is consistent with the state-mandated reduction target embodied in AB 32. A set of project-specific implementing thresholds are included in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance and are used to ensure project consistency with the County's CAP, GHG emission reduction target, and the various General Plan goals and policies related to GHG emissions that support CAP goals.

Through its goals, policies, and land use designations, the County's General Plan aims to reduce Countywide GHG emissions. The project is in accordance with relevant COS (Community Open Space)-14 Sustainable Land Development policies (COS-14.10 Use of low-emission construction vehicles for construction; COS-14.11 Native Vegetation will be replanted with similar genetic vegetative stock at a 3:1 ratio unless otherwise stated). These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets. As discussed in response VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions, a), the project's emissions would be below screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that would generate less than cumulatively considerable GHG emissions. Projects that do not exceed the threshold would have a nominal, and therefore less than cumulatively considerable, impact related to GHG emissions. The project's consistency with the policies discussed above would assist in meeting the County's contribution to GHG emissions reduction targets in California. As such, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impacts.

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed grading would involve the transport of gasoline and other petroleum-based products associated with construction equipment. These materials are considered hazardous as they could cause temporary localized soil and water contamination. Incidents of spills or other localized contamination could occur during refueling, operation of machinery, undetected fluid leaks, or mechanical failure. However, all storage, handling, and disposal of these materials are regulated by California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the USEPA, and the North County Fire Protection Department. All construction activities involving the transportation, usage, and disposal of hazardous materials

would be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local requirements, which would reduce impacts associated with the use and handling of hazardous materials during construction to less than significant. The project would not involve additional operational components from existing site conditions. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.

In addition, the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of onsite. The plan also contains an emergency response plan which describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local Fire Agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations; to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release; and to suggest preventative measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

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

Furthermore, the project does not include a demolition or renovation to structures on site that were constructed prior to 1980 and that may contain Lead Based Paint (LBP) and Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs). Lead is a highly toxic metal that was used up until 1978 in paint used on walls, woodwork, siding, windows and doors. Lead containing materials shall be managed by applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 CCR Division 4.5, the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 CCR Section 1532.1) and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8). Asbestos was used extensively from the 1940’s until the late 1970’s in the construction industry for fireproofing, thermal and acoustic insulation, condensation control, and decoration. The USEPA has determined that there is no “safe” exposure level to asbestos. It is therefore highly regulated by the USEPA, CalEPA, and the CalOSHA. Demolition or renovation operations that involve asbestos-containing materials must conform to San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rules 361.140-361.156. In accordance with existing regulations, the project will be required to complete asbestos and lead surveys to determine the presence or absence of ACMs or LBP prior to issuance of a

building permit that includes demolition of onsite structures and prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities.

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school to the project site is the Alpine Elementary School, approximately 0.75 miles away. Further, the transport and handling of minor amounts of hazardous materials during construction would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations that control hazardous material handling. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of onsite. The plan also contains an emergency response plan which describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local Fire Agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations; to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release; and to suggest preventative measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections will occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulation; the project will not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment. 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 (UST) 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.

Furthermore, this project site is not on or within 2000 ft of a property listed in DTSC’s Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database (“CalSites” Envirostor Database). It is therefore not considered a contaminated property and no precautions need to be taken by the proposed project as a result of this listing.

Lastly, the project site is not listed in the DEH SAM listing and/or CalSites Envirstor database, the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because all site remediation and clean up has occurred and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines

lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. The project is a grading plan for an industrial zoned lot. Any proposed future development on the lot would be required to comply with all healthy and safety codes and requirements.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. The project site is also listed as a high fire hazard severity zone (FHSZ) area and is located within the Urban-Wildland Interface Zone. However, the project is a grading plan and as such will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The project does not involve any construction of buildings and is solely to rectify a grading violation case. The project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 16 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the building permit process. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a major grading plan to for rectifying grading violation for non-residential pad on an industrial zoned lot. The project involves 9,000 cubic yards of fill and 9,000 cubic yards of imports of material. The project applicant has provided a copy of a Standard Development Storm Water Quality Management Plan for standard projects dated September 16, 2021 and Hydrology/Hydraulic Analysis report dated September 16, 2021, which demonstrate that the project will comply with all requirements of NPDES permits, and the 2013 MS4 permit. The project requires NPDES permits for discharges of storm water associated with construction activitiesThe project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: erosion control for disturbed slopes includes vegetation stabilization planting and hydraulic stabilization hydroseeding; erosion control for disturbed flat areas consists of use of Item A erosion control measures on flat area; energy dissipation; sediment control for all disturbed areas with silt, fiber rolls, and gravel; preventing offsite tracking of sediment by stabilizing construction entrance; material management consists of spill prevention control; Waste management includes solid waste management, sanitary waste management, and hazardous 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 (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Best Management Practices 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) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the Alpine hydrologic sub-basin, within the San Diego hydrologic unit (907.33). The project is tributary to already impaired waterbodies as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list starting from San Diego River (Lower) to El Capitan Lake. As discussed in the Stormwater Management Plan dated according to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, this watershed is impaired for typical pollutants that can occur in runoff from residential, industrial, and commercial activities in urban areas including: Metals (cadmium, manganese), Nuisance (color), nutrients (primarily phosphorous, nitrogen, and

dissolved oxygen), pH, pathogens (indicator bacteria), total dissolved solids, and total toxics. (California Integrated Report, 2018).

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: major grading to rectify a grading violation on an industrial zoned parcel. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: erosion control for disturbed slopes and flat areas includes vegetation stabilization planting and hydraulic stabilization hydroseeding; energy dissipation; sediment control for all disturbed areas with silt, fiber rolls, and gravel; preventing offsite tracking of sediment by stabilizing construction entrance; material management consists of spill prevention control; Waste management includes solid waste management, sanitary waste management, and hazardous waste management.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego includes the following: San Diego Region, Order No. R9-2013-0001 (and subsequent amendments), NPDES No. CAS 0108758; County Watershed Protection Ordinance; Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO); County BMP Design Manual. The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. The Watershed Protection Ordinance has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit. The project lies in the Alpine (907.33) hydrologic subarea, within the San Diego hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential

beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water:

San Diego municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; commercial and sport fishing; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; shellfish harvesting; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: grading to rectify a grading violation on the project site. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: The project will include erosion control for disturbed slopes and flat areas includes vegetation stabilization planting and hydraulic stabilization hydroseeding; energy dissipation; sediment control for all disturbed areas with silt, fiber rolls, and gravel; preventing offsite tracking of sediment by stabilizing construction entrance; material management consists of spill prevention control; Waste management includes solid waste management, sanitary waste management, and hazardous waste management.

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will obtain its water supply from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project would not require additional restroom facilities or associated use of additional potable water due to the project remedying a code violation case with no proposed structures. Limited water will be required during the construction phase and obtained from the Rainbow Municipal Water Utility District. No groundwater would be used for any purposes during construction or operation phases of the project. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would

interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

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

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

☐	Potentially Significant Impact	☒	Less than Significant Impact
☐	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: As outlined in the Standard SWQMP prepared for the project, the project would implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or permanent post construction pollutant and hydromodification control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, from entering stormwater runoff to the maximum extent practicable. These measures would 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 MS4 Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program and BMP Design Manual. The Standard SWQMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that would address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation. The Department of Public Works would ensure that the Standard SWQMP is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, the project would not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and impacts would be less than significant. For further information on soil erosion, refer to response VII. Geology and Soils, b).

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

☐	Potentially Significant Impact	☒	Less than Significant Impact
☐	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐	No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: The Hydrology/Hydraulics Analysis reportprepared for the project analyzes drainage before and after proposed development of the project site, including BMPs required to control runoff rate and quality to ensure that no adverse effects would occur to downgradient neighboring properties, consistent with the County's Hydrology Manual,

Hydraulic Design Manual, and BMP Design Manual. The Hydrology Memorandum determined that the proposed grading would:

- not increase runoff at peak runoff flows, onsite and offsite; The project site-maintained drainage patterns are at or below pre-developed flow volume and velocity; and
- Due to the grading of the site, flow lengths have been extended hence increasing the time of concentration. As a result, the discharges to the downstream in the proposed conditions will be equal or less than discharges in the existing conditions at all three outfalls.

Furthermore, since the project site is not currently prone to flooding and future site grading would not substantially alter the drainage patterns, the project site would not be prone to onsite flooding under design peak flow conditions. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: As discussed above in response X. Hydrology and Water Quality, e(ii), the project would not result in increased peak runoff flows. The discharges to the downstream in the proposed conditions will be equal or less than discharges in the existing conditions at all three outfalls. Therefore, the project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: As discussed above in response X. Hydrology and Water Quality, e(ii), runoff would maintain flow at or below pre-development values. Flows would be controlled at the points where existing runoff leaves the property. Therefore, the project would not impede or redirect flows. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Incorporated

No Impact: The project site is not located within a Dam Inundation Zone or with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), County Floodplain, or County Floodway flood zones, or located within a tsunami or seiche inundation zone. In addition, the project would remedy a code violation case and no permanent or habitable structures are proposed.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: The project site would be in compliance with the San Diego Basin Water Quality Control Plan and is not located within a County Sustainable Groundwater Management Act or Groundwater Sustainability Plan basin area. See responses X. Hydrology and Water Quality, a) through d). Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

a) Physically divide an established community?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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. The proposed grading and future development on the project site will not create physical barriers that change the connectivity between areas of the existing community, which separates them from other areas of the community. In addition, the project would not divide existing public spaces in the vicinity of the site or extend beyond the project site's boundaries. No streets or sidewalks would be permanently closed as a result of the development. The project would utilize existing roadways and there would be no change in roadway patterns. No separation of uses or disruption of access between land use types would occur as a result of the project. Future development on the project site would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan Designations. Future development on the project site would also be compatible with the surrounding uses as there are other industrial uses within the close vicinity to the project site. Therefore, the project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community. Instead, the future development of the project site will further establish rather than divide the 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the General Plan Village Regional Category and contains lands within the Limited Impact Industrial (I-1) Land Use Designation. The project is also subject to the policies of the Alpine Community Plan. The property is zoned M52 which permits a wide range of industrial and commercial uses frequently associated with industrial operations, such as wholesaling, auto and truck repair and administrative and professional offices. The project is a major grading plan for an industrial zoned lot. As such, the project is consistent with the General Plan, Zoning and Alpine Community Plan.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project will result in a loss of availability of mineral resources that could be of value to the region. The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as an area of "Potential Mineral Resource Significance" (MRZ-3), but with no active mines. The project site is situated in close proximity to residential development to the north and is surrounded by parcels that consist of a mix of industrial and commercial development. These existing land uses are not compatible with any future extraction of mineral resources on the site. Mining operations require an adequate setback from these land uses due to the variety of environmental issues associated with mining, which include, but are not limited to, noise, traffic, air quality, and visual resources impacts. Impacts from noise typically require the largest setback and past County approved noise studies indicate a setback of approximately 1,300 feet is needed for most typical extractive operations. The setback is relative to the property line and may vary depending on site specific conditions such as topography or intervening structures that reduce noise levels at the property line. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands or is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. The proposed project will not result in the loss of locally important mineral resources because the project site is currently surrounded by developed land uses including industrial, commercial, and residential uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. The placement of the proposed use on the project site would not result in a loss of mineral resources because the feasibility of future mining at the site is already impacted by existing land use incompatibilities. Based on current land use conditions, a future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and other impacts, thereby reducing the feasibility of future mining operations occurring, regardless of the proposed project.

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

XIII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:
The project is a grading plan to rectify a grading violation on an industrial zoned lot and will be occupied by the owner. Based on a staff's review of the site, the surrounding area supports industrial uses and vacant lots and is occupied by workers. 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. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL. The nearest noise sensitive land use is approximately 823 feet north of the project site. This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours). Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404
Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned M52 and is surrounded by parcels that are also zoned M52, therefore is subject to the noise threshold of a one-hour average sound limit of 70 dBA CNEL at the nearest property line. Based on review by staff, the project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards, which is 70 dBA, because the project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

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

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address

human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: 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.

In addition, as discussed in response XIII. Noise, a), no blasting or rock crushing is anticipated during grading operations. Therefore, no impulsive noise sources are expected, and the project would comply with Section 36.410 of the County Noise Ordinance. In addition, 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. Potential for vibration and groundborne noise would be minimal and would substantially attenuate with distance such that impacts at sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

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?

☐ 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) 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.

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)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ 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. The proposed project is a grading plan to rectify a grading violation on an industrial zoned parcel. The project site is zoned M52, which allows industrial use. The site is also surrounded by parcels that are zoned for industrial use and are developed with uses that are consistent with the zoning requirements.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace any existing housing since the site is currently vacant. In addition, the project site is zoned for industrial use and is surrounded by parcels that are developed with industrial and commercial uses. Residential development within the project site would not be consistent with the zoning requirements.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project would rectify a grading code violation case and does not support the construction of any structures, or new use types. The project would not result in the need for significantly altered public services or facilities including, but not limited to, fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks. Service availability forms will be provided during the building permit process which will indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Alpine Fire Protection District, water and sewer. 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. Therefore, the project would 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. RECREATION

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

XVII. TRANSPORTATION -- Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Project trips, or average daily trips (ADTs), associated with grading is estimated to include between 8 and 44 ADT for workers depending on the construction phase. Given that construction worker trips would be temporary and would be dispersed along different routes based on the origin of the trips, construction worker commuting is not expected to have a significant effect on the capacity of the transportation system. The project will not have a direct impact related to a conflict with any performance measures establishing measures of effectiveness of the circulation system because the project trips do not exceed any of the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for direct impacts related to Traffic and Transportation. As identified in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation, the project trips would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not have a direct impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation: The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) of which the Congestion Management Program (CMP) is an element to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced CEQA review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project's impacts on CMP system roadways, their associated costs, and identify appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on CMP transit performance measures are identified.

Less Than Significant Impact: As discussed above, traffic associated with project would only be during the grading phase. CEQA Section 15064.3, Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts, states that for many projects, a qualitative analysis of construction traffic may be appropriate. Since construction traffic is temporary and workers are either travelling to the project jobsite or another jobsite elsewhere, the impact on VMT is considered less than significant. In addition, the project ADT during grading activities would consist of 8 to 44 ADT. The Technical Advisory of the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) recommends that projects that generate less than 110 ADT be considered small projects that have a less than significant impact for Transportation under CEQA. Therefore, the project would not conflict with, and is consistent with, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts would be less than significant.

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 With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impedes adequate site distance on a road. The project is a grading plan to rectify a grading violation. No structure or use will occur on the project site. Any future use would require a building permit or discretionary action that would evaluate the future operations to ensure it complies with all codes, regulations, and ordinances.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

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

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ 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.

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project consists of rectifying a grading violation case and does not support the construction of any structures, or new types, that facilitate the need for new facilities. The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project is served by the Padre Dam Municipal Water District and no new or expanded water or wastewater facilities are required for the grading operations. A Standard SWQMP has been prepared for the project which would not result in the relocation or alteration of any onsite stormwater drainage facilities and the onsite water flow would discharge to the same outlet. Lastly, no natural gas or telecommunications facilities would be required. Therefore, because the project would not require the construction of new or expanded facilities that could cause significant environmental effects, no impacts would occur.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires water service from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District. Minimal water would be required for the project for dust control and suppression. The grading activities and associated water use can occur up to approximately 12 weeks and stabilizing/landscaping can take up to 4 months to complete. The project would not result in any new construction or additional use types, and grading activities would be temporary. Therefore, the project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is served by the Padre Dam Municipal Water District for onsite sewer facilities. The project includes a major grading permit to rectify a

grading code violation case, and no new structures or use types are proposed. No new or increased wastewater treatment would be required by the grading project. Therefore, the project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers service capacity, and impacts would be less than significant.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project includes a major grading permit to rectify a grading code violation case and does not propose any new structures or use types that would result in long-term operational solid waste generation. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are four, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and the project would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: The project would be served by the Alpine Fire Protection District Station 48, approximately 2.5 miles southeast of the project site. As described in response IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, e), the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project would rectify a grading code violation case, and no additional use types or structures are proposed. Therefore, no additional demand beyond current conditions is required for emergency response. In addition, project access has been designed in conformance with state law and local regulations. Per Alpine Fire Protection District emergency vehicle requirements, the width of the project access road would total 24 feet. Therefore, the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: The project is listed as a high FHSZ and is located within the Urban-Wildland Interface Zone. The majority of the County is in the high and very high FHSZ. Accordingly, the County has implemented fire safety measures depending on specific factors, such as location, vegetation, etc. The project does not propose any vegetation that would be considered flammable, and is required to meet applicable fire measures, such as fire apparatus access and access road requirements. Additionally, the project would rectify a grading code violation case and does not propose any additional uses or structures. Therefore, the project would not expose project occupants, such as residents, to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, and impacts would be less than significant.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: As discussed above, the project would rectify a grading code violation case. All infrastructure associated with the project has been incorporated within this analysis. The project site consists of an existing 60-foot-wide private road easement. The improvement would aide in an emergency situation by providing an additional access point for wildfire responders, as well as provide the adequate width for the fire apparatus. In addition, the project has been designed to avoid flammable vegetation. Therefore, based on project coordination with County staff, compliance with the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code, and compliance with the North County Fire Protection District's requirements, impacts associated with fire risk would be less than significant.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: As stated in response X. Hydrology and Water Quality, e(ii), the Hydrology Memorandum analyzed drainage before and after proposed development of the project site, including BMPs required to control runoff rate and water quality to ensure that no adverse effects would occur to downgradient neighboring properties. The Hydrology Memorandum found that since the project site is not currently prone to flooding and future site grading would not substantially alter the drainage patterns, the project site would not be prone to onsite flooding under design peak flow conditions. In addition, the Geotechnical evaluation prepared by Martin R. Owen found no soil or geologic conditions existing on and supporting the site that are unstable, susceptible to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. The Geotechnical evaluation also found no evidence of ancient landslide deposits encountered onsite. The investigation demonstrated that the site would be suitable for development and in compliance with the Grading Ordinance. Further, because the grading permit is to rectify a grading code violation case including stabilizing the onsite slopes, the project would incorporate geotechnical recommendations to ensure soil and slope stability. The project also does not propose any additional use types or structures. Due to the aforementioned factors, the project site 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. Impacts are less than significant.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ 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. As a result of this evaluation, the project was determined to have potential significant effects related to biological resources, cultural resources, and geology and soils. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes:

- Biological Resources: The proposed mitigation consists of the purchase of 1.68 acres (0.5:1 ratio) of granitic southern mixed chaparral (tier III) or higher tier habitat within a County approved mitigation bank within a BRCA in the MSCP. Therefore, the impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
- Cultural Resources: This Grading Permit was submitted to authorize grading that has occurred without permit. Because of the potential for the presence of resources, and because the analysis that should have taken place prior to the unpermitted grading, a cultural impact fee will be required to be paid to the Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee.
- Geology and Soils: Fossil recovery program required with monitoring by the excavation/grading contractor and a Qualified Paleontologist retained by the applicant shall inspect any fossil or fossil assemblage found.

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
SHADOW RUN RANCH	PDS2001-3100-5223 PDS2000-3300-00-030 PDS2000-3710-00-0205
CANYON CREEK COUNTRY CLUB	PDS2001-3100-4569
ALPINE HIGHLANDS MHP	PDS2000-3300-84-023
D.G.J.M SELF STORAGE	PDS2003-3500-03-073
CRONIN, SITE PLAN B DESIGNATOR	PDS2010-3500-10-005
CRONIN LIGHT INDUSTRIAL	PDS2005-3500-05-040
SDGE, MINOR USE PERMIT	PDS2012-3400-12-003
TAVERN ROAD GAS STATION	PDS2018-STP-18-012
ALPINE CONDOS	PDS2014-TM-5580
ALPINE BRANCH LIBRARY	PDS2014-STP-14-031
ALPINE YOUTH CENTER	PDS2002-3300-77-140

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 XX of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Geology and Soils. However, mitigation has been included that reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance, as detailed in response XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance, b).

As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ 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, VII. Geology and Soils, IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, X Hydrology and Water Quality, XIII. Noise, XIV. Population and Housing, and XVII. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be no potentially significant effects to human beings.

As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there would be adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Nguyen, Son P.; Snipes-Dye Associates Civil Engineers and Land Surveyor (September 16, 2021), Hydrology/Hydraulic Analysis, Dyke Major Grading Plan, PDS2016-LDGRMJ-30079

Nguyen, Son P.; Snipes-Dye Associates Civil Engineers and Land Surveyor (September 16, 2021), Standard Stormwater Quality Management Plan

Owen, Martin R.; (September 14, 2021), Geotechnical Investigation

Beauchamp, Mitchel R.; Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc., (January 11, 2023), Biological Resource Letter Report and Forensic Assessment for Dyke Major Grading Plan (Project #: PDS2016-LDGRMJ-30079)

White, Kendalyn; County of San Diego (April 7, 2023), Dyke Major Grading Plan; PDS2016-LDGRMJ-30079; Multiple Species Conservation Project Conformance Statement

AESTHETICS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

BIOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

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

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

NOISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POPULATION & HOUSING

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

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

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

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

RECREATION

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (http://www.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)

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

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

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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