



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 10, 2023

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

1. Title: Ridgeway Drive Major Grading Plan
Project Number(s): PDS2020-LDGRMJ-30273; PDS2023-ER-23-18-004
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 Angela Armstrong, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (619) 214-1641
c. E-mail: Angela.Armstong@sdcounty.ca.gov.
4. Project location:
2542 Ridgeway Drive
National City, CA 91950
APNs 564-040-03-00, 563-184-44-00, 564-040-21-00, 564-040-23-00

Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1310, Grid C/2
5. Project Applicant name and address:
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Road, Suite 112
San Diego, CA 92126
6. General Plan
Community Plan: County Islands Subregional Plan Area
Land Use Designation: Village Residential 24 (VR-24)/ Village Residential 4.3 (VR-4.3)

Density: 24 du/acre & 4.3 du/acre
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) -

- 7. Zoning
Use Regulation: Urban Residential (RU)
Minimum Lot Size: 6,000 acre(s)/10,000 acres
Special Area Regulation: None

- 8. Description of project:
The project is a major grading plan for the future development of a multi-family residential development project. The project involves the excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, a fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards of materials. The project site would require a formal annexation process with the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to annex a small portion (approximately 16,552 square feet) of the project site to the SDCSD (San Diego County Sanitation District) Spring Valley service area for the provision of wastewater service. The Access would be provided by a driveway connecting to Ridgeway Drive.

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

Lands surrounding the project site are predominately residential uses and a cemetery located to the south of the site. The topography of the project site and adjacent land is relatively flat. The site is located within one mile of Interstate 805.

- 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
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit Grading Permit Plan Change	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	South Bay Irrigation Land Water District
Sewer District Approval	San Diego County Sanitation District L&I Sewer District

Fire District Approval	Lower Sweetwater Fire Protection 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 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process allows tribal governments, public lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and to reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code §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.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

Souphalak Sakdarak
Printed Name

Date

Land Use/Environmental Planner
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

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

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

The proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and will not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. The project site is within the County Islands Subregional Community Planning Area, approximately 0.2 miles from I-805. This area is not within the viewshed of a County General Plan Designated Scenic Corridor. Additionally, the County has not designated any RCAs for the purpose of conserving visual or aesthetic resources within the vicinity of the Project site. The closest identified RCA is located at approximately 1.4 miles to the southeast of the project site. There are various developments and topography between the project site and the RCA, which obstruct any views of the project site and visual impacts to the RCA. In addition, the project site and surrounding areas are fully developed with residential uses and interspersed uses such as schools, church, and a cemetery. Refer to Section XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist’s line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

Based on a review by County staff, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The nearest officially designated State scenic highway is Route 75, which is approximately 4.5 miles west of the project site. The project is a discretionary grading plan and therefore subject to CEQA review under state law. After the approval and completion of the proposed grading and necessary CEQA review, a building permit for the 76 apartment units will be processed with the building division through a ministerial process. Because the 76 units are allowed by right and would only require a ministerial building permit, the approval of those units would be exempt from any discretionary reviews and CEQA. Therefore, this analysis does not include the buildings, since they fall under the ministerial projects and would not be subject to the CEQA pursuant to Section 15286 of the 2023 CEQA Statutes and Guidelines if not for the application and review of an ancillary discretionary grading permit. The discretionary action that triggered CEQA for this project is the grading permit only, and focuses on the biological impacts from the grading activities. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. As mentioned above, the project site is located away from the composite viewshed and state highway. The distance, topography, and various developments ensure that the project site remains out of sight and not impact the visual aesthetics of any identified scenic highways. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The project is a major grading plan for the future development of a multi-family residential project. The project involves the excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards of materials. The project site is identified to be within an urbanized area, which is surrounded by areas that are developed mainly with residential uses. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings can be described as a mix of developed areas with primarily residential uses including multi-family residences, landscaping, fencing, driveways, and other improvements. Additionally, there is a cemetery and schools in the vicinity, contributing to the overall landscape.

Furthermore, grading of the land is and has been required on nearly every residential, commercial and industrial development, including the existing residential developments that surround this project. The purposes of grading are to alter the land so that the inconsistencies of the topography are removed, to make the site accessible to its proposed users, to control drainage, and support the uses that the occupiers ultimately need to support their desired use. This includes having a level pad area that allows for the footprint of the residences, useable front, side and rear yards and a driveway. Most of the lots have constraints related to drainages, roadways, open space and steep slopes. The site designs provide avoidance to these resources, while balancing useable area.

Implementation of the project would include treatment of on-site stormwater and allows drainages to naturally flow through the property. Grading focuses on created level pads and includes sensitive design such as on-site treatment of stormwater run-off with the use of bio-swales and detention basins, which avoid impacts to land use and community character. With employment of sensitive site design and thorough environmental analysis, no new adverse impacts to community character are found. Future proposed development on the project site would not adversely impact existing uses within the project area, as the design of the future multi-family residences are intended to be compatible with existing and planned uses. The proposed project is a grading plan, which would not lead to a design that creates development

that is foreign to surrounding sites given that the future development on-site would be required to comply with all applicable Ordinances and Regulations. The surrounding area is comprised of homes that have been permitted over time with various architectural styles, pad sizes, building orientations, fencing and landscaping that are allowed with acquisition of a building permit. The grading is consistent with the ultimate use of multi-family residential use.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. In addition, as mentioned above, the project site is identified as being within an urbanized area, the proposed grading would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Grading of the land is and has been required on nearly every residential, commercial and industrial development, including the existing residential developments that surround this project. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a major grading plan and will not use outdoor lighting. The proposed grading 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. 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. 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).

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain any 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. In addition, the project site is identified to be within an urbanized area and is surrounded by parcels that are developed moderately of single and multi-family residential land uses and interspersed with specialized land uses including a junior high school and a cemetery. The nearest area with potential agricultural operations is located at approximately 12 miles west of the project site. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned Urban Residential (RU), which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. The proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because single-family and multi-family dwelling units are permitted use in Urban Residential (RU) zones, therefore, will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. The project is a grading plan for future development of multi-family residential project. The project site is identified to be within an urbanized area and is surrounded by parcels that are developed moderately of single and multi-family residential land uses and interspersed with specialized land uses including a junior high school and a cemetery. The nearest area with potential agricultural operations is located at approximately 12 miles west of the project site. Furthermore, the project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract, nor is surrounded by any such land. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and surrounding area 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)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is a major grading permit for future development of multi-family residential project. The project proposes development that was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. The project would produce emissions during the grading operations. Equipment use required for grading activities include tractors, loaders, backhoes, dozers, excavators, blades, and concrete trucks. Operation of the project will result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. The emissions from the proposed grading are below the screening levels, and subsequently will not violate ambient air quality standards.

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. 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. As such, projects that are consistent with the growth anticipated in the General Plan would be considered consistent with the RAQS. The grading requires excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards of materials. Once grading operations is completed, multi-family residential development will occur on the project site, which is consistent with the zoning and General Plan. The project site is zoned RU and has a land use designation of VR 24 and 4.3, which allows for multi-family development. The project is consistent with the intended use of the site and, therefore, 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) does not provide quantitative thresholds for determining the significance of construction or mobile source-related impacts. However, the APCD does specify screening level thresholds (SLTs) for new or modified stationary sources to determine if an Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA) is required (APCD Rules 20.2 and 20.3). If these SLTs for stationary sources are exceeded, an AQIA must be performed for the proposed new or modified source. Although these SLTs do not generally apply to mobile sources or general land development projects, for comparative purposes these SLTs may be 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 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).

San Diego APCD Rules 20.2 and 20.3 do not have SLTs for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}). Therefore, the analysis uses the SLT for VOCs specified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which generally has stricter emissions thresholds than the San Diego APCD. 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 SLT 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). O3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM10 in both urban and rural areas include the following: 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 would include particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and VOCs from the grading activities. The project would grade approximately 2.75 acres, with 11,600 cubic yards of import of material required. Site preparation and grading would involve the greatest concentration of heavy equipment use and the highest potential for fugitive dust emissions. 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 identifies fugitive dust standards. Rule 55 also required standards to be implemented at all construction sites located within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), as well as applicable mitigation measures. An analysis of estimated construction emissions from project grading was completed using SCAQMD’s California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod; see Appendix A). As shown in Table 2 below, project construction-related air emissions are not anticipated to reach SLTs identified in Table 1 as established by the SDAPCD. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial emissions such that any criteria pollutant air quality standard would be violated. 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 Grading-Related Air Emissions

Pollutant	Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day)	Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day)	Above Threshold?
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	10.67	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	4.2	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	39.24	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO _x)	0.13	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	15.74	550	No
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	41.8	75	No

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

The project is a discretionary grading plan and therefore subject to CEQA review under state law. After the approval and completion of the proposed grading and necessary CEQA review, a building permit for the 76 apartment units will be processed with the building division through a ministerial process. Because the 76 units are allowed by right and would only require a

ministerial building permit, the approval of those units would be exempt from any discretionary reviews and CEQA. Therefore, this analysis does not include the buildings, since they fall under the ministerial projects and would not be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15286 of the 2023 CEQA Statutes and Guidelines if not for the application and review of an ancillary discretionary grading permit. The discretionary action that triggered CEQA for this project is the grading permit only and focuses on the biological impacts from the grading activities. However, an analysis of estimated operation emissions from the 76 units was completed using SCAQMD’s California Emissions Estimator Model and provided in Table 3 below as reference only.

Table 3. Estimated Project-Related Air Emissions

Pollutant	Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day)	Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day)	Above Threshold?
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	20.2	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	0.66	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	3.62	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO _x)	0.2	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	160.13	550	No
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	21.71	75	No

As shown in Table 3 above, future operation-related air emissions are not anticipated to reach SLTs identified in Table 1 as established by the SDAPCD. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial emissions such that any criteria pollutant air quality standard would be violated.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to 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 O₃ precursors.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: 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. The two primary emissions of concern regarding health effects on sensitive receptors for land development projects are diesel-fired particulates and carbon monoxide.

The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: residences and school. Due to the short-term construction duration and the limited construction emissions, there is very low potential for fugitive dust or diesel particulate matter (DPM) to impact sensitive receptors during construction. The total construction DPM emissions are not of a magnitude and duration that could create significant air toxic risks to the nearest receptors during construction. The project would also be required to comply with the County Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55, which would reduce the fugitive dust emissions during construction and associated impacts to sensitive receptors. Thus, the emissions from grading would be negligible and would not have the potential to significantly impact the nearby school or residences living in the house to the north, west, and east of the project.

As mentioned above in Section III. Air Quality (b), the project is a grading plan for future development of multi-family residential project. After the approval and completion of the proposed grading, a building permit for the 76 apartment units will be processed with the building division through a ministerial process. Although the buildings fall under the ministerial projects and would not be subject to the CEQA pursuant to Section 15286 of the 2023 CEQA Statutes and Guidelines, the following information is provided for reference only. If the apartments install any back up diesel generator, the emissions from that source would be subject to obtaining an air permit from SDAPCD and is subject to health risk review under SDAPCD 1200. The emissions from any other emissions sources (such as mobile sources) on sensitive receptors would be negligible.

Therefore, the grading activity would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and would result in a less than significant impact.

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

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

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 is a major grading for future multi-family residential project, 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated August 2023, prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, it has been determined that the site does not contain any special status plant or wildlife species. The site support Diegan coastal sage scrub and maritime succulent scrub. The project will result in impacts to 0.166 acre of maritime succulent scrub and the Diegan coastal sage scrub will be protected within an open space easement. Mitigation for project impacts to maritime succulent scrub habitat will include purchase of 0.166 acres of maritime succulent scrub habitat at the Furby North County Preserve, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies, in accordance with Board of Supervisor Policy I-138. Therefore, the impact is less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated August 2023, prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, it has been determined that the proposed project site contains Diegan coastal sage scrub and maritime succulent scrub habitats within the project boundaries. The project will result in impacts to 0.166 acre of maritime succulent scrub and the Diegan coastal sage scrub will be protected within an open space easement. Mitigation measures have been incorporated as described in part (a).

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated August 2023, prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, it has been determined that the proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated August 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. This is due to the lack of significant areas of native habitats, surrounding development, and lack of resources that would constitute a native nursery site.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated August 10, 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved historian, Brian F. Smith, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in an historical resources report titled, *Cultural Resources Study for the Ridgeway Apartments Project* (November 18, 2022), prepared by Andrew J. Garrison and Brian F. Smith.

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

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: The project site has been surveyed by County approved archaeologist, Brian F. Smith, and it has been determined that there is one (or more) archaeological resources present. These resources include one site (CA-SDI-23366/P-37-040303) that consists of marine shell fragments and one lithic tool. An archaeological technical study entitled, *Cultural Resources Study for the Ridgeway Apartments Project* (November 18, 2022), prepared by Andrew J. Garrison and Brian F. Smith evaluated the significance of the archaeological resources based on subsurface testing, analysis of recovered artifacts, and other investigations and has determined that the archaeological resource(s) are not significant pursuant to the State of CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Because the resources are not considered significant archaeological resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5, the loss of these resources would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. However, there is the potential for undiscovered subsurface resources; therefore, an Archaeological and Tribal Monitoring Program will be required as outlined below:

Archaeological Monitoring Program (include in responses above, as appropriate).

- Pre-Construction
 - Contract with a County approved archaeologist to perform archaeological monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all earth-disturbing activities. The Project Archaeologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, during and after construction.
 - Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.
- Construction
 - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor are to be onsite during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor will evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources
 - If cultural resources are identified:
 - Both the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
 - The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of discovery.

- The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
- Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation.
- Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Kumeyaay Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.
- If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).
- Human Remains.
 - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
 - Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. If the human remains are to be taken offsite for evaluation, they shall be accompanied by the Kumeyaay Native American monitor.
 - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
 - The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
 - Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.
- Rough Grading
 - Monitoring Report. Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to the South Coastal Information Center and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
- Final Grading
 - Final Report. A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. A copy of the final

report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center, and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.

- o Cultural Material Conveyance
 - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Brian F. Smith, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, *Cultural Resources Study for the Ridgeway Apartments Project* (November 18, 2022), prepared by Andrew J. Garrison and Brian F. Smith.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Brian F. Smith, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, *Cultural Resources Study for the Ridgeway Apartments Project* (November 18, 2022), prepared by Andrew J. Garrison and Brian F. Smith.

VI. ENERGY. Would the project:

- a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less than Significant Impact: The project would result in the use 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 24 months). 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. Construction equipment use and associated energy consumptions would be typical of that associated with the construction of residential projects of this size in a semi-rural setting. During project construction, energy would be consumed in the form of electricity associated with the conveyance of water used for dust control and, on a limited basis, powering lights, electronic equipment, or other construction activities necessitating electrical power. As such, the project's energy consumption during the grading and construction phase would not be considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. In addition, natural gas is not anticipated to be required during construction of the Project. Any minor amounts of natural gas that may be consumed as a result of the grading and construction would be temporary and negligible and would not have an adverse effect. Therefore, no significant impact to energy resources would result.

The project is a discretionary grading plan and therefore subject to CEQA review under state law. After the approval and completion of the proposed grading and necessary CEQA review, a building permit for the 76 apartment units will be processed with the building division through a ministerial process. Because the 76 units are allowed by right and would only require a ministerial building permit, the approval of those units would be exempt from any discretionary reviews and CEQA. Therefore, this analysis does not include the buildings, since they fall under the ministerial projects and would not be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15286 of the 2023 CEQA Statutes and Guidelines if not for the application and review of an ancillary discretionary grading permit. The discretionary action that triggered CEQA for this project is the grading permit only and focuses on the biological impacts from the grading activities. Any future residential development on the project site would be designed according to the most recent 2019 Title 24 or future, more stringent versions of Title 24 that are applicable as the project is built out. Part 6 of Title 24 specifically establishes energy

efficiency standards for residential buildings constructed in the State of California to reduce energy demand and consumption. In addition, any future residential developments would be in compliance with the California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), which includes mandatory measures for both residential and nonresidential site development, energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material conservation and resource efficiency, and environmental quality (CDHCD, 2021).

Therefore, the construction and future multi-family residential development is not expected to result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy and the Project would result in a less than significant impact to energy resources with the incorporation of Project design features and required as Project conditions of approval.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is a California state law that was developed to regulate development near active faults in order to reduce losses from surface fault

rupture and other hazards. 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 active fault zones to the site, the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault is located at approximately 4.7 miles from the project site. To ensure the structural integrity of the slope, a Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Christian Wheeler Engineering dated December 17, 2021 was prepared with site grading recommendations, including removal of any undocumented fill encountered during grading and replaced with Engineered Fill. All earthworks will be verified in the field by County Engineers and a licensed or registered civil engineer in the State of California. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is a major grading plan for the future development of a multi-family residential project. The project involves the excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards of materials. To ensure the structural integrity of the site slopes, a Grading Plan and a Geotechnical Investigation have been prepared by a registered Civil Engineer and reviewed for approval by County Engineers. The report would review the qualities of the soil, its expansive characteristics, relative compaction and any soil problem which if not corrected may lead to structural defects of buildings or structures constructed or to be constructed on the site. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. The project grading 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. To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. 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.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: 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 located within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. A Geotechnical Report prepared by Christian Wheeler Engineering dated December 17, 2021 on file with Planning & Development Services as Environmental Review Number PDS2023-ER-23-18-004, has determined that the project on-site conditions do not have susceptibility to settlement and liquefaction. The subsurface conditions encountered at the site consisted of medium dense to very dense silty sand. Based on site subsurface conditions and the moderate to high seismicity of the region, any loose fill materials at the site could be vulnerable to this potential hazard. However, this hazard can be mitigated by following the design and construction recommendations of the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation (over-excavation and rework of the loose soils and/or fill). Based on the moderate penetration resistance measured, the native deposits underlying the surface materials do not appear to be subject to significant seismic settlement. Based on the encountered conditions, liquefaction is not considered to be a concern at the subject site. Therefore, there will be there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is considered low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Less Than Significant Impact: The site is located within a “Landslide Susceptibility Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper

than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. A Geotechnical Report prepared by Christian Wheeler Engineering dated December 17, 2021 on file with Planning & Development Services as Environmental Review Number PDS2023-ER-23-18-004 has determined that the area does not show evidence of either pre-existing or potential conditions that could become unstable and result in landslides. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from adverse effects of landslides.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Geological Report prepared the project site indicated that the subsurface soil conditions encountered at the boring locations consisted of interbedded layers of medium dense to very dense silty sand with varying gravel content to depths of up to 47 feet below existing site grades. Very dense gravelly sand was encountered from a depth of approximately 47 feet to the maximum depth explored, 50 feet below existing site grade. Field and laboratory tests suggest that these soils are moderately strong and slightly compressible. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Storm Water Quality Management Plan dated June 23, 2022, prepared by Lundstrom Engineering & Surveying, Inc. The plan identifies the following construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure sediment is not discharged from the project site during the construction phase. The construction contractor will be required to implement the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the project prior to and during grading operations. The SWPPP identifies site-specific BMPs to control erosion, sediment, and other potential construction-related pollutants. By keeping soil stabilized using BMPs and with effective site management minimizing soil erosion the SWPPP specifications and guidelines demonstrates minimal to less than significant soil erosion shall occur during project grading.
- A Landscape and Irrigation Plan has been prepared by a Licensed Landscape Architect under County Record ID PDS2022-LP-22-024, by Howard Associates, Inc., and was approved on April 7, 2022. The Landscape and Irrigation plan identifies site-specific

planting to be implemented in the post-construction phase to stabilize slopes and minimize soil erosion consistent with County landscape ordinance requirements.

- The project would be required to comply with the County’s Grading Ordinance [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 would minimize the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE – EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project involves the excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards of materials on approximately 2.75 acres. In order to ensure that project components are adequately supported, a Geotechnical Investigation was prepared for the project. The Geotechnical Investigation determined that no soils supporting the project site are unstable or susceptible to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. According to the Geotechnical Investigation, liquefaction potential is considered “very low.” The Geotechnical Investigation concluded that the site would be suitable for development, in compliance with the Grading Ordinance, and provides grading and compaction recommendations to be followed during the construction operations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to response VII. Geology and Soils, a), iii) through 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on-site are predominately silty sands. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property. In addition, the project will require approximately 11,600 cubic yards of non-expansive granular imported fill material. This is documented in the project's geotechnical investigation report prepared by Christian Wheeler Engineering dated December 17, 2021.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site would require a formal annexation process with the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to annex for a small portion (approximately 16,552 sqft) of the project site to the SDCSD Spring Valley service area for the provision of wastewater service. Majority of the project is within the Spring Valley service area and will obtain services from that area. The Geotechnical Investigation determined that no soils supporting the project site are unstable or susceptible to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. The Geotechnical Investigation concluded that the site would be suitable for development, in compliance with the Grading Ordinance, and provides grading and compaction recommendations to be followed during the construction operations. In addition, discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code.

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

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

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.

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

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

The project is in an area having moderate potential for containing unique paleontological resources and will excavate 2,500 cubic yards or more of undisturbed material below the soil horizons. To mitigate for potential project impacts to paleontological resources, the project will be conditioned to require implementation of a mitigation program by a Qualified Paleontologist. A Qualified Paleontologist is a person who has, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Development Services:

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

The Qualified Paleontologist will conduct or supervise the following mitigation tasks:

1. Monitoring of excavation operations (e.g., sheet grading pads, cutting slopes and roadways, basement and foundation excavations, and trenching) to discover unearthed fossil remains. The Paleontological Resources Monitor must have at least one year of experience in field identification and collection of fossil materials.

2. Salvaging of unearthed fossil remains, typically involving simple excavation of the exposed specimens, but possibly also plaster-jacketing of individual large and/or fragile specimens, or more elaborate quarry excavation of richly fossiliferous deposits.
3. Recording of stratigraphic, geologic and geographic data to provide a context for the recovered fossil remains, including:
 - a. Accurate plotting (mapping) on grading plans and standard topographic maps of all fossil localities.
 - b. Description of lithologies of fossil-bearing strata.
 - c. Measurement and description of the overall stratigraphic section (unless considered by the project paleontologist to be infeasible).
 - d. Photographic documentation of the geologic setting.
4. Laboratory preparation (cleaning and repair) of collected fossil remains to the point of identification (not exhibition), generally involving removal of enclosing sedimentary rock material, stabilization of fragile specimens (using glues and other hardeners), and repair of broken specimens.
5. Curation of prepared fossil remains, typically involving scientific identification and cataloguing of specimens, and entry of data into one or more accredited institutional (museum or university) collection (specimen/species lot and/or locality) databases. Curation is necessary so that the specimens are available for scientific research.
6. Submittal of the collection for archival storage that will include cataloged fossil remains and copies of relevant field notes, maps, stratigraphic sections and photographs to an accredited institution (museum or university) in California that maintains paleontological collections, preferably:
 - a. San Diego Natural History Museum
 - b. Los Angeles County Museum
 - c. San Bernardino Museum of Natural History
 - d. University of California Museum of Paleontology, Berkeley
 - e. Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (if the fossils were salvaged in the desert).
7. Preparation of a final report summarizing the results of the field investigation, laboratory methods, stratigraphic information, types and importance of collected fossils, and any necessary graphics to document the stratigraphy and precise fossil collecting localities.

With the implementation of the above project requirements during project grading operations, potential impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant. Furthermore, the project would not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that require grading in sensitive paleontological resource areas would be required to have the appropriate level of paleontological monitoring and resource recovery. In addition, other

projects that propose any amount of significant grading would be subject to the requirements for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

VIII GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: 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 Region¹ identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

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

An individual project's GHG emissions would 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 GHG emissions resulting from a proposed project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

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.

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is a grading plan for future development of a multi-family residential project and does not propose any structure at this phase.

Construction

Construction of the future development on the project site 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 construction period were estimated based on the projected maximum amount of equipment that would be used on-site at one time. Equipment use required for grading activities include tractors, loaders, backhoes, dozers, excavators, blades, and concrete trucks.

The CalEEMod air quality modeling conducted for the project determined that the project is estimated to generate a total of 83.84 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) per year during grading activities, which represents a minimal amount of GHG emissions comparative to standard construction projects. 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 RU land use regulation allows for multi-family residential use types. Given the project would be consistent with the zoning and allowed uses on the property, it can be assumed that limited grading activities were assumed for the property in the General Plan.

Given the project size and the timeframe, temporary emissions that would occur from grading operations, 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.

Operations

The project is a discretionary grading plan and therefore subject to CEQA review under state law. After the approval and completion of the proposed grading and necessary CEQA review, a building permit for the 76 apartment units will be processed with the building division through a ministerial process. Because the 76 units are allowed by right and would only require a ministerial building permit, the approval of those units would be exempt from any discretionary reviews and CEQA. Therefore, this analysis does not include the buildings, since they fall under the ministerial projects and would not be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15286 of the 2023 CEQA Statutes and Guidelines if not for the application and review of an ancillary discretionary grading permit. The discretionary action that triggered CEQA for this project is the grading permit only and focuses on the biological impacts from the grading activities. The future multi-family development on the project site would be required to comply with Title 24 Building Standards Codes. California's energy code is designed to reduce wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption in newly constructed and existing

buildings. Every three years, the new building code implements and promotes more energy efficient homes and buildings using the latest research and design criteria for systems like lighting, HVAC systems, duct sealing and insulation, thermostat features, water-efficient plumbing fixtures, and preparation for solar power. By continually requiring more energy efficient building practices, GHG emissions from electricity and natural gas have been incrementally reduced. By implementing the latest building standards, a building constructed in 2023 would yield less energy-related emissions than a building constructed in 1996. As the proposed project is a grading permit for future development of multi-family residences, no structures will be constructed during the grading phase.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: In 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.

SB 32 (enacted in 2016) set a new statewide GHG reduction target. More specifically, SB 32 codified a 2030 emissions reduction target that requires CARB to ensure that statewide GHG emissions are reduced to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

EO B-55-18 (September 2018) establishes a new statewide goal “to achieve carbon neutrality as soon as possible, and no later than 2045, and achieve and maintain net negative emissions thereafter.” This executive order directs CARB to “work with relevant state agencies to ensure future Scoping Plans identify and recommend measures to achieve the carbon neutrality goal.”

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 September 2022, Governor Newsom signed AB 1279, which codifies a statewide target to achieve carbon neutrality by no later than 2045.

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. 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. To help plan and design projects consistent with the CAP, and to assist County staff in implementing the CAP and determining the consistency of proposed projects with the CAP during development review, the County has prepared a CAP Consistency Review Checklist (Checklist). This Checklist only applies to development projects that require discretionary review and are subject to environmental review (i.e., not statutorily or categorically exempt projects) pursuant to CEQA. Projects that are limited to ministerial review and approval (e.g., only building permits) would not be subject to the Checklist. Therefore, review of the Checklist for the project analyzes only the project grading operations and does not include future development of multi-family residential units. The project is a grading plan for future development of multi-family residences on a parcel that is zoned Village Residential 24 and 4.3. Therefore, the grading activities associated with the proposed project are consistent with the existing land use designation and zoning of the property. The RU land use regulation allows for multi-family residential use types. Given the project would be consistent with the zoning and allowed uses on the property, the project would comply with the Checklist measures that apply to the project grading (all other Checklist measures are related to project operations). Additionally, the building decarbonized priority area does not apply to the project. As previously described, the project would be required to comply with applicable Title 24 and CalGreen Code Standards.

As discussed in response VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions, a), the project's emissions would generate less than cumulatively considerable 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 impact.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a major grading plan for the future development of multi-family residential project, which involves 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. In addition, once construction is complete and the project site is occupied, the site would be expected to store and use small, containerized quantities of hazardous household products of a wide variety. This type of usage is typical of all residential and would not constitute a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing school (Granger Junior High School) and proposes a major grading for future multi-family residential project, which will involve the transport and handling of hazardous materials. 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. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing school. 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.

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 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

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. The proposed project is a major grading permit for future development of a multi-family residential project. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. The project is a grading plan for future development of a multi-family project. Short-term construction activities are not expected to cause any lane closure in, or around the parcel. In the event of lane closures, sufficient alternative routes exists near the project site and would not interfere or result in inadequate emergency access.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

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

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

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

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Project is located within a County identified Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) zone. A WUI is defined as an area where development is in proximity to open space or lands with native vegetation and habitat that are prone to brush fires. Most of the unincorporated County is within the WUI. Although the project site is located with the WUI, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because 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. The proposed project is a major grading to prepare the site for future multi-family residential project. Additionally, CAL FIRE has mapped areas of significant fire hazards throughout the state and classifies lands different Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) based upon fuels, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors. The FHSZ are divided into three levels of fire hazard severity: Moderate, High and Very High. The majority of the County is in the High and Very High FHSZ. The Project site is located within the Urban Unzoned FHSZ, which is defined to have lower risk fire hazards severity. Further, the Project site is surrounded by parcels that are moderately developed with residential land uses and is within 0.2 miles of I-805. Furthermore, the proposed grading plan requires review and approval from the National City Fire District. This will also ensure that all activities associated with the proposed grading would comply with all requirements in order to reduce significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The following technical studies have been prepared for the project:

- Drainage Study dated November 7, 2022, and PDP SWQMP dated June 23, 2022

The project would be required to obtain a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. Minimum required construction BMPs would include vegetation stabilization planting, fiber rolls (straw wattles), stabilized construction entrance, materials management, and waste management. In addition, a Drainage Study dated November 7, 2022, and PDP SWQMP dated June 23, 2022 have been prepared. The project proposes and would be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or permanent structural post-construction pollutant and hydromodification control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering stormwater runoff: hydraulic stabilization and hydroseeding, and Bonded fiber Matrix or Stabilized Fiber Matrix on disturbed slopes and/or disturbed flat areas; energy dissipater outlet protection for erosion protection; silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel and sand bags, and storm drain inlet protection for sediment control; stabilized construction entrance, street sweeping and vacuuming to prevent offsite tracking of sediment; and measures to control materials management and waste

management. The project is utilizing self-mitigation drainage management areas by following the 'Self-mitigating' criteria required by the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual (2020).

The project would be consistent with requirements of the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual, which is a design manual for compliance with local County of San Diego Watershed Protection Ordinance (Sections 67.801 et seq.) and regional Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB], San Diego Region Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100) requirements for stormwater management.

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

Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body,

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the National City area of the Lower Sweetwater River hydrologic unit in the San in the San Diego Region. As discussed in the Stormwater Management Plan dated according to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, this watershed is impaired for *Mercury*, PAHs (Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons), PCBs (Polychlorinated biphenyls), and heavy metals.

The Priority Development Project SWQMP prepared for the project includes the following design measures and source control BMPs such that potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of pollutants in receiving waters and reduce impacts on stormwater quality and hydromodification to less than significant levels: vegetation stabilization planting, fiber rolls (straw wattles), stabilized construction entrance, materials and waste management, permeable surfaces, and biofiltration basins.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already

impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego includes the following: San Diego Region, Order No. R9-2007-0001, (NPDES No. CAS 0108758); County Watershed Protection Ordinance; Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO); County Stormwater Standards Manual. The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. The Watershed Protection Ordinance has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit. The project lies in the Lower Sweetwater River hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: Temporary grading activities resulting in exposed soil areas, temporary on-site storage of construction materials, generation of trash or solid water, temporary construction equipment storage, and portable sanitary services. 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: Vegetation stabilization planting, bonded fiber matrix, energy dissipater outlet protection, silt fence, fiber rolls, gravel & sand bags, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance, material delivery & storage, spill prevention and control, waste management concrete waste management, solid waste management, sanitary waste management.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Limited water will be required during the construction phase. The project site obtains its water supply from the Sweetwater Authority Water Utility District. The project is a major grading plan for the future development of a multi-family residential project. The project involves the excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards of materials. No groundwater would be used for any purposes during construction phases of the project. The project would not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin, or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g., 0.25-mile). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a major grading plan for the future development of a multi-family residential project. The project involves the excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards of materials. As outlined in the Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) dated June 23, 2022 and prepared by Lundstrom Engineering & Surveying, Inc., the project will implement the following site design

measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: hydraulic stabilization and hydroseeding, Bonded fiber Matrix or Stabilized Fiber Matrix; energy dissipater outlet protection; silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel and sand bags, materials and waste management, permeable surfaces, and biofiltration basins. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWQMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact: The Hydrology Report prepared 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 Report 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
- The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns on the site; and
- The proposed project does not place housing or structures within 100-year flood area in which would impede or redirect flows; and
- The proposed storm drain detention system will mitigate peak flows below pre-project conditions.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact: As discussed above in response X. Hydrology and Water Quality, e(ii), the project would not result in increased peak runoff flows. The proposed measures will manage the 85th percentile storm runoff volume, as required by the RWQCB MS4 permit. The project will also manage the peak flows associated with the 100-year design storm to not exceed pre-project levels. 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?

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

No Impacts: The proposed project does not place housing or structures within 100-year flood area in which would impede or redirect flows. The proposed project is a major grading for a future multi-family residential project.

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

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

No Impact: The project site is also not located within Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), County Floodplain, or County Floodway flood zones, or located within a tsunami or seiche inundation zone. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

No Impact: The project site 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is a major grading for future development of a multi-family residential project. The proposed project does not introduce either new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Although, the project site would require a formal annexation process with the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to annex a small portion (approximately 16,552 square feet) of the project site to the SDCSD (San Diego County Sanitation District) Spring Valley service area for the provision of wastewater service, but majority of the project is already within the Spring Valley service area. The extension of the wastewater district boundary and sphere of influence determination by LAFCO would address currently unserved areas but would not have a growth-induced impact because the areas being considered for service are wholly located with the Ridgeway project boundaries. Furthermore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community for the following reasons: The proposed project is a major grading for future multi-family residential development project, which is an allowed use in an Urban Residential zone. Although LAFCO's approval is needed to annex a small portion of project site into the service area, however, majority of the project site is already in the Spring Valley service area and the surrounding areas are fully developed with primarily residences. 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. Furthermore, the future development on the project site would be compatible with the surrounding uses as there is also another multi-family residential development directly to the east of 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed project is subject to the General Plan Village Regional Category and contains lands with the Village Residential 24 (VR-24) Land Use Designation and Village Residential 4.3 (VR-4.3) on Parcel 563-184-44-00. The maximum density allowed by the VR-24 and 4.3 designation is 24 units per gross acre and 4.3 units per gross acre, respectively. The project is subject to the policies of the National City.

The proposed project is a major grading plan for future multi-family residential use. The current zone is Urban Residential (RU), which permits multi-family residential uses and grading permit pursuant to the Grading Ordinance. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning and Grading Ordinance requirements.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by residential developed land uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future

mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact:

The project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands or is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. The project site is currently surrounded by densely developed land uses including residential uses and cemetery, which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. The proposed project 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.

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

XIII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is major grading for future multi-family residential project. The surrounding area supports residential uses and cemetery and is occupied by residences and 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. 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 project site as well as surrounding parcels are zoned Urban Residential (RU) that has a one-hour average sound limit of 55 dBA daytime and 50 dBA nighttime. Based on review by staff, the project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards, which is 50 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that propagate through the ground and diminish in intensity with distance from the source. Vibration impacts can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibration at moderate levels, to slight damage of buildings at the highest levels. The construction activities associated with the project could have an adverse impact on both sensitive structures (i.e., building damage) and populations (i.e., annoyance). The proposed project is a major grading for multi-family residential project, which could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during the grading activities. However, the proposed grading does not anticipate utilizing adverse equipment such as a rock crusher, pile driving or blasting during the any phase of the grading activities. 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 and impact vibration sensitive uses on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a major grading for future multi-family residential development project. Potentially a total of 76 units of which 5 units will be affordable housing, will exist when the lots are developed. The development will constitute infill development as there are developed land uses to the north, west and east of the site. The project site would require a formal annexation process with the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to annex a small portion of the project site to the SDCSD Spring Valley service area for the provision of wastewater service. The extension of the wastewater district boundary and sphere of influence determination by LAFCO would address currently unserved areas but would not have a growth-induced impact because the areas being considered for service are wholly located with the Ridgeway project boundaries. Although LAFCO's approval is needed to annex the project site into the service area, however, the project site is determined to be within an urbanized area and is surrounded by areas that are fully developed with primarily residences. As mentioned in Section XI. Land Use and Planning, the current zone for the project site is Urban Residential (RU), which permits multi-family residential uses and grading permit pursuant to the Grading Ordinance. This physical and regulatory change will not induce substantial population growth in an area, because the extension of infrastructure and public facilities such as water, sewer or roadways into previously unserved areas is consistent with the County General Plan and project will be consistent with the County planning goals.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has existing single family dwelling units, which was demolished. This grading plan would not displace any amount of existing housing, the project is a major grading is for future multi-family residential development project. Potentially a total of 76 units of which 5 units will be affordable housing, will exist when the lots are developed.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant

environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a grading plan and does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Any future development will comply with all regulations and requirements. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XVI. RECREATION

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is a major grading for future multi-family residential project. Potentially a total of 76 units of which 5 units will be affordable housing, will exist when the lots are developed. This may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities, the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) during the building permit process. The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the

dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication and thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a grading plan for future multi-family residential development project. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The County of San Diego 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 Impact: The proposed project a major grading plan for the future development of a multi-family residential project. The project involves the excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards of materials. 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 significant 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 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 from the construction activities. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and no mitigation is required.

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is a grading plan for future development of multi-family residential project and proposes an increase of less than 200 ADTs. The additional from the proposed grading do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program. 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. The project is a discretionary grading plan and therefore subject to CEQA review under state law. After the approval and completion of the proposed grading and necessary CEQA review, a building permit for the 76 apartment units will be processed with the building division through a ministerial process. Because the 76 units are allowed by right and would only require a ministerial building permit, the approval of those units would be exempt from any discretionary reviews and CEQA. Therefore, this analysis does not include the buildings since they fall under the ministerial projects and would not be subject to the CEQA pursuant to Section 15286 of the 2023 CEQA Statutes and Guidelines if not for the application and review of an ancillary discretionary grading permit. The discretionary action that triggered CEQA for this project is the grading permit only and focuses on the biological impacts from the grading activities. Furthermore, the project site is identified to be with a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) efficient area. With the adoption of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the State of California changed the method of traffic analysis required through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for publicly and privately initiated projects. The law changed the way local jurisdictions, like the County of San Diego (County), analyze transportation impacts from development projects and identify mitigation measures to reduce those impacts. SB 743 became effective on July 1, 2020. Therefore, the project will not conflict with travel demand measures or other standards of the congestion management agency.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter roadway geometry on Ridgeway Drive. A Design Exemption Request submitted for the project site. As part of the Sight Distance evaluation and Certification, a request for an exception was documented based on corner sight distance standards not being met. However, the sight distance can be attained by removing on-street parking and painting the subject parcel frontage curb red plus 26 feet past the easterly property line. This will limit parking and allow proper corner sight distance and safer intersection movement for drivers exiting the project driveway. There is also an existing warning sign (20 MPH) approximately 200 feet to the east from where the speed survey was done. Efforts were made by the property developer to work with the adjacent property owner to prohibit parking along their frontage, and agreement between property owners could

not be reached. With the implementation of the designs mentioned above, a safe and adequate sight distance of at least 200 feet shall be required at all driveways and intersections to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. All other road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. In addition, the proposed project is a major grading for a future multi-family residential project. Additional trips would be sources from grading activities, and the onsite access driveway would be used during grading activities for worker trips. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. The project does not propose any changes to roadways, nor does it propose the construction of any new roadways and therefore, would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, as the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project 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 adequate to the County's standards. The project would not generate any traffic volumes that would impede emergency access. The project is a major grading plan for the future development of a multi-family residential project. The project involves the excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. An AB-52 information letter was provided to nine tribes (Barona, Campo, Jamul, Kwaaymii, Manzanita, San Pasqual, Santa Ysabel, Sycuan, and Viejas) requesting whether they would like to formally consult on the project pursuant to AB-52. Five tribes (Barona, Jamul, San Pasqual, Sycuan, and Viejas) responded.

Barona did not request consultation but requested to be notified if significant resources are identified, and Jamul declined consultation. Sycuan requested information prior to deciding whether they would want to consult on the project. The requested information was provided to Sycuan; however, they did not request to consult on the project. San Pasqual and Viejas requested formal consultation. No tribal cultural resources were identified during consultation. As such, there are no impacts to tribal cultural resources. However, it was agreed during consultation to require an archaeological and tribal monitoring program. See section V. Cultural Resources for details of the monitoring program.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project does not 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. However, the project site would require a formal

annexation process with the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to annex a small portion of the project site to the SDCSD (San Diego County Sanitation District) Spring Valley service area for the provision of wastewater service. The extension of the wastewater district boundary and sphere of influence determination by LAFCO would address currently unserved areas. The project would not 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 proposed project is a major grading for future multi-family residential project, which is an allowed use in an Urban Residential zone. Future development on the project site would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan Designations. In addition, prior to any development on the site, evidence of service availabilities must be provided, this will be required during the building permit process.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires water service from the South Bay Irrigation Water District. The proposed grading will be in compliance with any statutes or regulations. In addition, prior to any development on the site, verification of adequate water supplies for the site is required. This verification is required to be submitted for review during the building permit process. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires wastewater service from the Spring Valley Wastewater District. The project site would require a formal annexation process with the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to annex a small portion of the project site to the SDCSD Spring Valley service area for the provision of wastewater service. The extension of the wastewater district boundary and sphere of influence determination by LAFCO would address currently unserved areas. Furthermore, the proposed project is a major grading for future multi-

family residential project, which is an allowed use in an Urban Residential zone. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project may 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?

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

Less than Significant Impact: The project would be served by the Lower Sweetwater Fire Protection District Station #31, 0.2 miles north 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 parcels are adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project site is within an urbanized area and surrounded by parcels that are fully developed mainly with single-family residences. The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because 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 within San Diego County. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the building permit process. 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 Lower Sweetwater 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?

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

Less than Significant Impact: The parcels are adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because 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 within San Diego County. Based on County's resources, the project site is not identified to be within a Fire Severity zone. The surrounding areas are fully developed with mainly single-family residences and interspersed with other uses such as schools and a cemetery. The proposed project is a grading plan for future multi-family residential development project. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the building permit process. 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 Lower Sweetwater 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.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact: The project does not propose to introduce either new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. However, the project site is required to get approval from Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for wastewater connection on a small portion of the project site. The approval will ensure that future development on the project site incorporates the information from the Municipal Service Review, addressing the infrastructure needs of the identified communities. The proposed project is a major grading for future multi-family residential project in an area that is developed primarily of residential developments. In addition, 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 within San Diego County. The proposed grading will be reviewed and must be approved by the National City Fire District. Furthermore, the implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the building permit process. Therefore, the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts 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?

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

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed grading 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. In addition, 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 within San Diego County. Implementation of the fire safety standards will also occur during the building permit process.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation: **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. 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 project will result in impacts to 0.166 acre of maritime succulent scrub and the Diegan coastal sage scrub will be protected within an open space easement. Mitigation for project impacts to maritime succulent scrub habitat will include purchase of 0.166 acres of maritime succulent scrub habitat at the Furby North County Preserve, or other location deemed acceptable by the County and Wildlife Agencies, in accordance with Board of Supervisor Policy I-138.
- Cultural Resources: Payment of a cultural impact fee for the potential impact to archaeological resources paid to Barona Band of Mission Indians, San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, as well as monitoring of all ground disturbing activities by a qualified archaeologist, implemented with a Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan; and
- 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.

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:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:

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

PROJECT NAME	ADDRESS	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER	APN
Euclid Apartments-Density Bonus	2532 Ridgeway Drive, National City	PDS2021-DB-21-002	564-040-02-00

DB = Density Bonus

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVIII of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there 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. The proposed project is a major grading plan for the future development of a multi-family residential project. The project involves the excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards of materials. The future development on the site will be consistent with all applicable zoning requirements and General Plan.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

certain questions in Sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VII. Geology and Soils, IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, X Hydrology and Water Quality, XIII. Noise, XIV. Population and Housing, and XVII. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, it was determined to be no potentially significant effects to human beings. All potential impacts associated with the proposed project would be mitigated to less than significant levels. The project is a major grading plan for the future development of a multi-family residential project. The project involves the excavation of 2,700 cubic yards, fill of 14,300 cubic yards and import of 11,600 cubic yards of materials.

APPENDICES

- Appendix A Biological Resources Report
- Appendix B Cultural Resources Report
- Appendix C Drainage Study
- Appendix D Geological Report
- Appendix E Stormwater Quality Management Plan

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

Lundstrom, William; Lundstrom Engineering & Surveying. (November 7, 2022) Drainage Study, Ridgeway Apartments Major Grading Plan, PDS2020-LDGRMJ-30273; PDS2023-ER-23-18-004

Lundstrom, William, Lundstrom Engineering & Surveying. (June 23, 2022) Stormwater Quality Management Plan for Priority Development Projects

Christian Wheeler Engineering, (December 17, 2021), Geotechnical Report

Smith, Brian D. and Associates, Inc. (November 28, 2022), Cultural Resources Study, PDS2020-LDGRMJ-30273; PDS2023-ER-23-18-004

Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc. (August 2023), Biological Resource Letter Report, PDS2020-LDGRMJ-32073; PDS2023-ER-23-18-004

White, Kendalyn; County of San Diego (August 4, 2023), Ridgeway Dr Major Grading Plan; PDS2020-LDGRMJ-23073; PDS2023-ER-23-18-004; Multiple Species Conservation Program Conformance Statement

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.

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 (NLPPIP), 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.sdcountry.ca.gov)

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

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

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.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/attach.pdf>)

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

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

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

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

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.