



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

June 20, 2024

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

1. Title: Honarvar Major Grading Plan
Project Number(s): PDS2019-LDGRMJ-301214; PDS2015-ER-15-00-015
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, Souphie Sakdarak Project Manager
b. Phone number: (619) 323-4869
c. E-mail: Souphalak.Sakdarak@sdcounty.ca.gov
4. Project location:
On the east side of Via De Las Flores in the San Dieguito Community Plan area in the unincorporated County of San Diego.

Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1310, Grid C/2
5. Project Applicant name and address:
John Honarvar
1621 Mountain Pass Cir
Vista, CA 92081
6. General Plan:
Community Plan: San Dieguito
Land Use Designation: Semi Rural Residential (Sr-2)
Density: 1du/2acre
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) -
7. Zoning
Use Regulation: Rural Residential (Rr)

Minimum Lot Size: 2 acre
Special Area Regulation: None

8. Description of project:
The project is a major grading plan for the future development of a single-family residential unit and horse paddock. The access would be provided by a driveway connecting to Via de Las Flores. The project would include 38,500 cubic yards (cy) of excavation, 35,500 cy of fill, and 3,000 cy of export. (APN 264-110-30-00).

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

Lands surrounding the project site are predominately rural residential with estate homes and a golf course located immediately to the west of the site. The topography of the project site is relatively flat along the project frontage which substantially increases in elevation farther to the east. To the west, the golf course is at a lower elevation in relation to the project site and is partially screened by intermittent trees and shrubs. The site is located within 0.2 miles north of Aliso Canyon Road.

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	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Fire District Approval	Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District

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

YES

NO

Note: Conducting consultation early in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process allows tribal governments, public lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of

environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and to reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code §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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Geology & Soils</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Hazards & Haz. Materials</u> | <input 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.

HONARVAR MAJOR GRADING
PDS2019-LDGRMJ-30214;
PDS2015-ER-15-00-015

- 4 -

June 20, 2024

Signature

Date

Souphalak Sakdarak

Planner

Printed Name

Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 project site is within the San Dieguito Community Planning Area. The project site is located on Via Los Flores, north of the Aliso Canyon Road intersection. The closest identified RCA (Escondido Creek) is located approximately 0.3 miles to the north 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. 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. 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 |
|---|---|

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated 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.

The proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite view shed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The project site is located more than 14 miles from the nearest eligible State scenic highway (State Route 76) and more than 15 miles from the nearest official designated State scenic highway (State Route 52). The project site is located on Via Los Flores, north of the Aliso Canyon Road intersection, approximately 1 mile from Del Dios Highway which is considered a County Second Priority Scenic Routes. Due to intervening topography and distance separation, the project site is not visible from this roadway segment. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated 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 single-family residential project. The project involves the excavation of 38,500 cy, 35,500 cy of fill, and 3,000 cy of export. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as Rural Residential with neighboring properties being developed with residential uses, the Bridges golf course immediately to the west and scattered vacant lands to the east. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: The site is currently vacant and the project is a grading plan to create pads and install swales to ensure proper drainage on site.

The project would 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 would 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. 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 rural residential (RR), which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project would not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use because the project is a grading plan which does not identify a proposed use and will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no 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 contain any active agricultural operations or lands including nurseries. The project is for a grading permit and does not propose any uses that would be related to agricultural operations. Active agricultural operations are separated from proposed land uses on the project site by 350 feet and by other developed parcels. In addition, active agricultural operations in the surrounding area are already interspersed with single-family residential uses and the proposed use would not significantly change the existing land uses in the area, resulting in a change that could convert agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use. Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. 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 the future development of a single-family residential unit and horse paddock. 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 38,500 cy of excavation, 35,500 cy of fill, and 3,000 cy of export. Once grading operations is completed, a single-family residential unit would occur on the project site, which is consistent with the zoning and General Plan. 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:

Less than Significant Impact: San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 8-hour concentrations for Ozone (O₃) under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). San Diego County is also in non-attainment for 1-hour concentrations for O₃ under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Additionally, San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter (PM) less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) and PM less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}) under the CAAQS. Sources of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} in both urban and rural areas include motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

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

The County has identified SLTs which incorporate the San Diego Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD's) established air quality impact analysis trigger levels for all new source review in

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

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

Pollutant	Total Emissions		
	Lbs. per Hour	Lbs. per Day	Tons per Year
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM 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.

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 5.69 acres, with 3,000 cy of export 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 Construction-Related Air Emissions

Pollutant	Maximum Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day)	Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day)	Above Threshold?

Respirable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	9.41	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	5.45	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	36	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO _x)	0.05	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	33.8	550	No
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	3.72	75	No

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

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 single-family residential unit will be processed with the building division through a ministerial process. Because the single-family residential units is 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 single-family residence was completed using SCAQMD's California Emissions Estimator Model and provided in Table 3 below as reference only.

Table 3. Estimated Project Operational Air Emissions

Pollutant	Maximum Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day)	Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day)	Above Threshold?
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	0.34	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	0.28	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	0.08	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO _x)	< 0.005	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	2.51	550	No
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	1.88	75	No

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

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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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: 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: single-family residences as near as approximately 60 feet from the project site. 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 residences living in the house to the north and south of the project. In addition, the emissions from any other emissions sources (such as mobile sources) on sensitive receptors would be negligible. Therefore, the project 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 single 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 November 2021, prepared by Everett and Associates, it has been determined that the site, and/or surrounding area, supports native vegetation, namely, Diegan coastal sage scrub (DCSS). Sensitive species observed on the project site include the coastal California gnatcatcher (Group 1), turkey vulture (Group 1), southern mule deer (Group 2), San Diego goldenstar (List A), and Nuttall's scrub oak (List A). The project would result in impacts to 50 individual San Diego Goldenstar, 1 individual Nuttall's scrub oak, and the sensitive wildlife species observed onsite. Impacts to these species would be significant. The project would also result in the impact to 6.36 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub that is considered a sensitive vegetation community. Impacts to these sensitive species and vegetation communities would be significant without the implementation of mitigation measures.

To reduce significant direct impacts to sensitive species and sensitive vegetation community, the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3 and BIO-4 would be required prior to approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance of this permit. With implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3 and BIO-4**, impacts to sensitive plant and vegetation communities would be less than significant.

BIO-1 Onsite Biological Easement. The applicant shall grant to the County of San Diego an open space easement, as shown on the approved Grading Plan. This easement is for the protection of biological resources and prohibits all of the following on any portion of the land subject to said easement: grading; excavation; placement of soil, sand, rock, gravel, or other material; clearing of vegetation; construction, erection, or placement of any building or structure; vehicular activities; trash dumping; or use for any purpose other than as open space. Granting of this open space authorizes the County and its agents to periodically access the land to perform management and monitoring activities for the purposes of species and habitat conservation. The only exception(s) to this prohibition are:

1. Selective clearing of vegetation by hand to the extent required by written order of the fire authorities for the express purpose of reducing an identified fire hazard. While clearing for fire management is not anticipated with the creation of this easement, such clearing may be deemed necessary in the future for the safety of lives and property. All fire clearing shall be pursuant to the applicable fire code of the Fire Authority Having Jurisdiction and the Memorandum of Understanding dated February 26, 1997, (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/docs/MemoofUnder.pdf>) between the wildlife agencies and the fire districts and any subsequent amendments thereto. Activities conducted pursuant to a revegetation, habitat management, or landscape plan approved by the Director of PDS, DPW or DPR.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall prepare the draft plats and legal descriptions of the easements, then submit them for preparation and recordation with the *[DGS, RP]*, and pay all applicable fees associated with preparation of the documents. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance of this permit the easements shall be recorded. **MONITORING:** The *[DGS, RP]* shall prepare and approve the easement documents and send them to *[PDS, PCC]* for pre-approval. The *[PDS, PCC]* shall pre-approve the language and estimated location of the easements before they are released to the applicant for signature and subsequent recordation. Upon Recordation of the easements *[DGS, RP]* shall forward a copy of the recorded documents to *[PDS, PCC]* *[DPR, TC]* for satisfaction of the condition.

BIO-2 HABITAT PRESERVATION. The applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat, in permanent open space, as described below and in accordance with Mitigation Measure #2 of the Biological Resource Letter Report (Everett and Associates, November 2021). If it is determined that this mitigation is not feasible, the project applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat generally consistent with the assemblage of vegetation communities impacted by the project and receive concurrence from the Wildlife Agencies and County.

1. Onsite open space shall include 1.99 acres (0.27 acres at the eastern end of the project site and 1.72 acres of SDG&E utility easement on the project site). See condition BIO-1.
2. Offsite open space shall include 30.75 acres of existing open space (APNs 264-660-06-00 and 264-660-01-00) located adjacent to the project site and donated by Omni Financial LLC to Endangered Habitat Conservation (EHC).

3. The project applicant will provide \$598,150 to EHC for the management of the entire 32.74 acres of onsite and offsite open space. Funds will be held by the San Diego Foundation, or similar entity, to be distributed solely for the purpose of management.
4. Impacts to 50 San Diego Goldenstar individuals will be mitigated by protecting a significant population (over 5,000 individuals) of the plants on the 303 acre Endangered Habitats Conservancy Crestlake property adjacent to Crestridge Ecological Reserve east of El Cajon. The project will fund a five-year effort to control and eradicate the South African long-flowered veldtgrass *Ehrharta longiflora*, a highly invasive non-native weed species that is threatening the goldenstar population on the property.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall provide the evidence of completion of the mitigation to the [PDS, PCC] for review and approval. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the mitigation shall occur. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the mitigation evidence for compliance with this condition.

OCCUPANCY: *(Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit).*

BIO-3 OPEN SPACE SIGNAGE Open space signs shall be placed along the biological open space boundary as indicated on the approved Grading Plan. The signs must be corrosion resistant, a minimum of 6" x 9" in size, on posts not less than three (3) feet in height from the ground surface, and must state the following:

**Sensitive Environmental Resources
Area Restricted by Easement**

Entry without express written permission from the County of San Diego is prohibited. To report a violation or for more information about easement restrictions and exceptions contact the County of San Diego,
Planning & Development Services
Reference: PDS2019-LDGRMJ-30214

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall install the signs as indicated above and provide site photos and a statement from a California Registered Engineer, or licensed surveyor, that the open space signs have been installed at the boundary of the open space easment. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the open space signs shall be installed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the photos and statement for compliance with this condition.

BIO-4 Breeding Season Avoidance. No brushing, clearing and/or grading shall be allowed within 300 feet of migratory bird nesting habitat and 500 feet of raptor nesting habitat during the breeding season of the migratory bird and raptor within RAA as indicated on these plans. The breeding season is defined as occurring between February 1 and August 31. The Director of

PDS [PDS, PCC] may waive this condition, through written concurrence from the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, provided that no migratory birds or raptors are present in the vicinity of the brushing, clearing, or grading as demonstrated by a survey completed no more than 72-hours prior to the start of brushing, clearing, or grading. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall provide a letter of agreement with this condition; alternatively, the applicant may submit a written request for waiver of this condition. Although, no grading shall occur within the RAA until concurrence is received from the County and the Wildlife Agencies. **TIMING:** Prior to preconstruction conference and prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances and throughout the duration of the grading and construction, compliance with this condition is mandatory unless the requirement is waived by the County upon receipt of concurrence from the Wildlife Agencies. **MONITORING:** The [DPW, PDC] shall not allow any grading in the RAA during the specified dates, unless a concurrence from the [PDS, PCC] is received. The [PDS, PCC] shall review the concurrence letter.

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 GIS records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated November 2021, prepared by Everett and Associates, it has been determined that the proposed project site contains DCSS habitat. The project will result in impacts to 6.36 acres of DCSS. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3 would reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, project impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations, are considered less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation.

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 GIS records, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated November 2021, prepared by Everett and Associates, 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 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 Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County’s GIS records, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report dated November 2021, prepared by Everett and Associates, it has been determined that the project site is located adjacent to a regional wildlife corridor. As the project proposes impacts to 6.36 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat, as well as the special status plant and wildlife species observed onsite, impacts could occur to the existing wildlife corridor. Mitigation for this potential impact will occur through the preservation of 1.99 acres onsite and 30.75 acres adjacent to the project site. The 32.74 acres of onsite and offsite mitigation will be funded by the project applicant and managed by the Endangered Habitat Conservation (EHC). This mitigation would increase the wildlife corridor and reduce impacts to less than significant.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input 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 July 22, 2022 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 it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to historical resources.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego senior adjunct archaeologist, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources; however, resources are present in the surrounding area. As such, subsurface, unidentified resources may be present. Therefore, a Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan, and an archaeological and tribal monitoring program will be required. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

CUL-1 Archaeological Monitoring Program

- 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 Luiseño Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.

- Construction
 - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseño 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 Luiseño Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseño 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 Luiseño 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, and culturally-affiliated tribes as identified in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan at the time of discovery.
 - All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the project archaeologist, tribal monitor(s), and the tribal representative(s) to discuss the significance of the find. Optionally, the County Archaeologist may attend the meeting to discuss the significance of the find.
 - Construction activities shall not resume in the area of discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to appropriate mitigation. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area and shall be monitored.
 - Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. The isolates and/or non-significant deposits shall be reburied onsite as identified in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan.
 - Treatment and avoidance of the newly discovered resources shall be consistent with the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan entered into with the appropriate tribes. This may include avoidance of the cultural resources through project design, in-place preservation of cultural resources located in native soils and/or re-burial on the Project property so they are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity.
 - If cultural resources are identified, one or more of the following treatments, in order of preference, shall be employed:
 - Preservation in place of the Cultural Resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in place where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources.
 - Reburial of the resources on the project property. The measures for reburial shall include, at least, the following:
 - Measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any impacts in perpetuity.
 - Reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed, with the

- exception that sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains are excluded.
- Any reburial process shall be culturally appropriate.
- Listing of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the confidential appendix of the Monitoring Report.
- The Monitoring Report shall be filed with the County under a confidential cover and is not subject to Public Records requests.
- If preservation in place or reburial is not feasible, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program (Program) shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Tribe, and the Luiseño Native American Monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist prior to implementation. There shall be no destructive or invasive testing on sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains. Results concerning finds of any inadvertent discoveries shall be included in the Monitoring Report.

Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code § 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological resources and cultural resources. If the landowner and the Tribe(s) cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for the archaeological or cultural resources, these issues will be presented to the Planning & Development Services Director for decision. The Planning & Development Services Director shall make the determination based on the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act with respect to archaeological resources, recommendations of the project archeologist and shall take into account the cultural and religious principles and practices of the Tribe.

- 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 Luiseño Native American monitor.
 - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the NAHC shall immediately contact the Most Likely Descendant (MLD).
 - 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.
 - The MLD may with the permission of the landowner, or their authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American

human remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site.

- 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.
 - Tribal Cultural Resources
 - If tribal cultural resources are discovered, the Project Archaeologist shall conduct consultation with culturally-affiliated tribes to determine the most appropriate mitigation. Should the two parties not be able to reach consensus, then the County Archaeologist shall consider the concerns of the culturally-affiliated tribe and the Project Archaeologist, and the Director of Planning & Development Services shall make a final decision regarding appropriate mitigation.
 - Fill Soils
 - The Project Archaeologist and Luiseño Native American monitor shall evaluate fill soils to determine that they are clean of cultural resources.
 - 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.
 - Cultural Material Conveyance
 - The final report shall include evidence that all Native American cultural materials in order of preference have been conveyed as follows:
 - Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the archaeological monitoring program have been reburied.
- or
- Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the grading monitoring program have been repatriated to a Native American group of appropriate tribal affinity. Evidence shall be in

the form of a letter from the Native American tribe to whom the cultural resources have been repatriated identifying that the archaeological materials have been received.

- The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility and shall not be curated at a Tribal curation facility or repatriated. The collections and associated records, including title, shall be transferred to the San Diego curation facility and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that the historic materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.

c) 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 County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego senior adjunct archaeologist, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

VI. ENERGY. 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. 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 single-family unit will be processed with the building division through a ministerial process. Because the single-family unit is allowed by right and would only require a ministerial building permit, the approval of that unit 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 and cultural impacts from the grading activities. Any future residential development on the project site would be designed according to the most recent 2022 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 single-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 | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated | |

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

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is a major grading plan for the future development of a single-family residential unit and horse paddock. The project involves the

excavation of 38,500 cy, fill of 35,500 cy and export of 3,000 cy 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 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be there will be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 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 GeoSoils Inc. dated April 18, 2023 has determined that the area does not show evidence of either pre-existing or potential conditions that could become unstable and result in landslides. The grading to be performed would not result in any slopes being steeper than 2:1 in grade in accordance with the Grading Ordinance requirements for minor and major slopes. 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 consisted of undocumented artificial fill, Quaternary-age colluvium (topsoil), sedimentary bedrock belonging to the Tertiary-age Friars Formation, and Mesozoic-age metavolcanics. 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 prepared by Snipes-Dye Associates dated November 3, 2023. The plan identifies the following construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure sediment is not discharged from the project site during the construction phase: silt fence, fiber rolls, gravel and sand bags, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance, street sweeping, hydroseeding, and bonded fiber mix. 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.

- 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 excavation of 38,500 cy, fill of 35,500 cy, and export of 3,000 cy of materials that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. In order to assure that any proposed buildings (including those proposed on the project site) are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above.

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

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

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Geotechnical Investigation prepared by GeoSoils Inc. for this project determined that onsite soils exhibit very low to medium expansion potential. However, soils with high expansion potential may also exist locally. Implementation of earthwork or structural recommendation would be required to temper distortions to the proposed improvements from shrinking and swelling soils. Implementation of the recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation Report would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a major grading plan for the future development of a single-family residential unit and horse paddock. The grading activities would not require any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impacts would occur.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **PALEO-1**, detailed below, would reduce potentially significant impacts to below a level of significance.

PALEO-1 PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING

In order to comply with the [San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources](#), a Paleontological Monitoring Program shall be implemented throughout grading activities. The project site has marginal levels of sensitive Paleontological resources. All grading activities are subject to the [County of San Diego Grading Ordinance Section 87.430](#), if any significant resources (Fossils) are encountered during grading activities.

- a. The grading contractor is responsible to monitor for paleontological resources during all grading activities. If any fossils are found greater than 12 inches in any dimension, stop all grading activities and contact PDS before continuing grading operations.
- b. If any paleontological resources are discovered and salvaged, the monitoring, recovery, and subsequent work determined necessary shall be completed by or under the supervision of a Qualified Paleontologist pursuant to the [San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources](#).

Upon completion of all grading activities, and prior to Rough Grading Final Inspection ([Grading Ordinance SEC 87.421.a.2](#)), a letter report shall be completed as follows:

- a. If no paleontological resources were discovered, submit a "No Fossils Found" letter from the grading contractor to PDS stating that the monitoring has been completed and that no fossils were discovered, and including the names and signatures from the fossil monitors. The letter shall be in the format of Attachment E of the [County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources](#).
- b. If paleontological resources were encountered during grading, a letter shall be prepared stating that the field grading monitoring activities have been completed, and that resources have been encountered. The letter shall detail the anticipated time schedule for completion of the curation phase of the monitoring.

The applicant shall submit the letter report to PDS for review and approval upon completion of all grading activities, and prior to Rough Grading Final Inspection.

With the implementation of **PALEO-1**, 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. See Section XXI.b) for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. 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. Individual project compliance with the County Grading Ordinance would ensure that potential significant impacts to paleontological resources resulting from future development would not rise to the level of significance. As such, the project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and cumulative impacts to paleontology would be less than significant.

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.

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is a grading plan for future development of a single-family residential unit and horse haddock 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 modeling conducted for the project determined that the project is estimated to generate a total of 339 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) 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 RR land use regulation allows for single-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.

Operation

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 single-family residential unit will be processed with the building division through a ministerial process. Because the single-family residential unit is 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 building, 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 and cultural impacts from the grading activities. The future single-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. As the proposed project is a grading permit for future development of single-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.

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

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

The project was also evaluated for consistency with the San Diego Forward, which is the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that demonstrates how the region would meet its transportation related GHG reduction goals. The project would be consistent with San Diego Forward as it would not conflict with implementation of its key goals. San Diego Forward goals include (1) the efficient movement of people and goods, (2) access to affordable, reliable, and safe mobility options for everyone, and (3) healthier air and reduced GHG emissions regionwide.

The County of San Diego’s General Plan contains various goals, policies, and objectives related to the reduction of GHG emissions and global climate change. Because the project would be consistent with the land use designation and therefore, would generate similar emissions to what

was estimated in the General Plan, it would be consistent with these General Plan goals, policies, and objectives related to the reduction of GHG emissions and global climate change.

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- 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 is a major grading plan for the future development of single-family residential unit and future horse haddock, 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 Rancho Santa Fe 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 |
|---|--|

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is not located in proximity of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. The proposed project is a major grading permit for future development of a single-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 single family dwelling unit. 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 proposed project is 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. The project has been designed to develop within the central and western portion of the site and preserve the habitat on the eastern portion of the site. 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 grading plan process. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff and through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code.

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: Projects have the potential to generate pollutants during both the construction and post-construction phases. In order for the project to avoid potential violations of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, storm water management plans were prepared for the project.

The project would greatly increase the amount of impervious area on the project site. Potential sources of water pollution would include construction phase disturbance of the soils through grading, materials delivery, and waste generation, landscaped areas (fertilizers/pesticides), trash storage, and motor vehicles. A SWQMP was prepared by Snipes-Dye Associates dated November 3, 2023, consistent with the requirements of the County BMP Design Manual. The BMP Design Manual is a design manual for compliance with local County Watershed Protection Ordinance (Sections 67.801 et seq.) and regional Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems Permit (California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region Order No. R9-2013-0001, as amended by Order No. R9-2015-0001 and Order No. R9-2015-0100) requirements for storm water management. The SWQMP includes a list of required construction BMPs that would be implemented by the project. Such BMPs include hydraulic stabilization hydroseeding, bonded fiber matrix, silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel and sandbags, storm drain and inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance, street sweeping, material delivery and storage, waste

management, and spill prevention/control measures that would preserve water quality. Operational BMPs include site design (landscaping), source control (storm drain stenciling/signage,), and structural controls including biofiltration and hydromodification control basins and tree wells.

Compliance with the required NPDES permit would reduce stormwater runoff from the project site by promoting infiltration, minimizing impervious surfaces, and require a no net increase in flows over the existing condition through hydromodification processes. The project would introduce landscaping, which would preserve and stabilize soils in the post-project condition. In addition, the project would continue to implement existing pollution prevention measures, such as pesticide control and proper trash and recycling disposal, in order to preserve water quality in the post-project condition. Therefore, the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

i. Result in substantial erosion or siltration on- or off-site;

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is a major grading permit for a single-family residential unit and horse haddock. The proposed project involves excavation of 38,500 cy, fill of 35,500 cy, and export of 3,000 cy of materials that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. A Drainage Report was prepared by Snipes-Dye Associates in November 2023. The 10.62-acre project site is currently vacant and undeveloped.

The project has prepared a SWQMP prepared by Snipes-Dye Associates dated November 3, 2023. The SWQMP (specifies and describes the implementation process of all required BMPs that would address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any on-site and downstream drainage swales. The plan identifies the following construction BMPs to ensure sediment is not discharged from the project site during the construction phase: silt fence, fiber rolls, gravel and sand bags, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance, street sweeping, hydroseeding, and bonded fiber mix. Therefore, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, and impacts would be less than significant. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation would be controlled within the boundaries of the project site, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to Section VI.b). Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Drainage 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:

The project would not alter existing drainage patterns on site. Site drainage would remain the same post-construction within the three major drainage basins. Drainage in Subbasin I would remain the same. The proposed drainage from Subbasin II and III would be directed into the proposed biofiltration basins. These BMPs would be designed to meet hydromodification requirements and mitigate the 100-year storm flows to maintain existing drainage patterns. As shown in Table 4, the project would not increase runoff at peak runoff flows.

Table 4 Pre- and Post-Construction 100-Year Storm Flows

Basin	Area (acres)	Pre (cfs)	Post (cfs)
I	2.66	5.76	5.76
II	3.16	5.74	4.75
III	7.09	14.48	11.85

Source: Drainage Study (Appendix D).

Notes: cfs=cubic feet per second

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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: As discussed above in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, e(ii), the project would not result in increased peak runoff flows. The project will 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 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is a major grading for a single-family residential project. The proposed project does not place housing or structures within 100-year flood area in which would impede or redirect flows. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- c) 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, no impact would occur.

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

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- 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 project is a major grading for future development of a single-family residential unit and a horse paddock. The proposed project does not introduce either new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. 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 are other residential developments 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 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 subject to the General Plan Semi-Rural Regional Category and contains lands with the Semi-Rural 2 (SR-2) Land Use Designation. The maximum density allowed by the SR-2 designation is 1 unit per 2, 4, or 8 gross acres depending on slope. The proposed project is also subject to the policies of the San Dieguito Community Plan. The current zone is (RR) Rural Residential, which permits major grading plans pursuant to the grading ordinance.

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 a major grading for the future development of single-family residential unit and horse paddock. 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 RR that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA daytime and 45 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 single-family residential unit and future horse paddock, 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 proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; largescale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

The project proposes a major grading for a single-family residential unit and future horse paddock and would not result in substantial unplanned population growth. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes a major grading for single-family residential unit and future horse paddock. The project site is currently vacant. The project would not displace any amount of existing housing or existing people. No impact would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a major 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 the future development of a single-family residential unit and horse paddock. However, given the small scope of the future residential development, it would not result 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. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur from the project.

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 major grading plan for the development to for a single-family residential unit and horse paddock. 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 project is a major grading plan for the future development of a single-family residential unit and horse paddock. 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 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. The project is a major grading plan for the future development of a single-family residential unit and horse paddock. Traffic associated with project would only be during the grading phase. 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 single-family residential unit will be processed with the building division through a ministerial process. Because the unit is allowed by right and would only require a ministerial building permit, the approval of this unit would be exempt from any discretionary reviews and CEQA. Therefore, this analysis does not include the single-family residential unit since it falls 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 impacts from the grading activities.

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 project is a major grading plan for the future development of single-family residential unit and future horse paddock. The project would include a private driveway off of Via De Las Flores. All other road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. 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 single-family residential unit and horse paddock.

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 Assembly Bill (AB) 52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes on July 16, 2015 and January 5, 2016. No responses were received requesting consultation; therefore, consultation was concluded due to no response. As such, there are no impacts to tribal cultural resources. An archaeological and tribal monitoring program is required during construction. 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. 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 development of a single-family residential unit and horse paddock, which is an allowed use in a Rural 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 will obtain its water supply from the Olivenhain Municipal Water District. The project is a major grading plan for the future development of a single-family residential unit and horse haddock. The increase in water demand as result of the project would be negligible. 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:

No Impact: The project would be on private septic. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider’s service capacity.

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

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

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 Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District. As described in Section IX(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. 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 single-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. 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. The proposed project is a major grading for the future development of a single-family residential unit and horse paddock 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. 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 6.36 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat. Mitigation will occur through onsite and offsite preservation and management of habitat. 0.27 acres will be preserve onsite in open space. Credit will also be given for the 1.72 acres SDG&E utility easement located on the property. The offsite mitigation includes 30.75 acres of existing open space (APNs 264-660-06-00 and 264-660-01-00) located adjacent to the project site and donated by Omni Financial LLC to Endangered Habitat Conservation (EHC).
- **Cultural Resources:** The potential impact to archaeological resources would be mitigated through the monitoring of all ground disturbing activities by a qualified archaeologist and Tribal monitor and through the implementation of a Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan.
- **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:

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
Brutten Family Trust, Ad 2nd Dwelling Ad	18411 Via De Las Flores, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067	PDS2010-3000-10-028	264-110-29-00
Lindsey TPM	Camino De Arriba, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067	PDS2003-3200-20746	264-110-54-00
AJ Pacific Homes LLC, Certificate Of Com	0 Via De Las Flores, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067	PDS2011-3720-11- 0042	264-110-30-00
Rancho Cielo Tm4753	Aliso Canyon Road, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92091	PDS2011-3100-4753	264-110-24-00 264-110-30 thru 36 264-1210-29-00 264-110-54-00
Portion Of Rancho Cielo	Aliso Canyon Road, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92091	PDS2010-3100-4226	264-110-54-00
Guy Ward Horse Boarding M1	18457 Via De Las Flores, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067	PDS2011-3301-82- 046-01	264-110-18-00
Tomin TPM	18457 VIA DE LAS FLORES, RANCHO SANTA FE, CA 92067	PDS2006-3281-19997	264-110-18-00
Don Reniers	18411 Via De Las Flores, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067	PDS2012-3300-73-258	264-110-29-00
Ward Variance	18457 Via De Las Flores, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067	PDS2009-3970-92-010	264-110-18-00

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 single-family residential unit and horse haddock. 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?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <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 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 IV. Biological Resources, V. Cultural Resources, and VII. Geology and Soils. 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 single-family residential project and horse haddock.

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

Appendices

- Appendix A CalEEMod Results
- Appendix B Biological Resources Report
- Appendix C Geotechnical Report
- Appendix D Drainage Study
- Appendix E Stormwater Quality Management Plan

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 (NLPPI), 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.sdcounty.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)

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

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

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

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

NOISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POPULATION & HOUSING

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

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

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

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

RECREATION

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

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

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

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

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