County of San Diego

BRIAN ALBRIGHT
DIRECTOR

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

December 18, 2019

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

1. Project Title:

   Lemon Crest Drive Drainage Facility Extension Improvements Project

2. Lead agency name and address:
   County of San Diego, Department of Public Works
   5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
   San Diego, CA 92123-1239

   a. Contact: Cynthia Curtis, Land Use/Environmental Planning Manager
   b. Phone number: (858) 694-3906
   c. E-mail: Cynthia.Curtis@sdcounty.ca.gov

3. Project location:

   The Lemon Crest Drive Drainage Facility Extension Improvements Project is located within the unincorporated community of Lakeside in eastern San Diego County. The project limits extend south of Lemon Crest Drive between Winter Gardens Blvd and Riverview Avenue on APN 382-290-09-00.

4. Project Applicant name and address:

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

5. Description of project:

   The Lemon Crest Drive Drainage Facility Extension Improvements Project (proposed project) consists of an extension and undergrounding of an existing flood control channel inlet approximately 175 feet upstream within the existing drainage alignment. The project is an extension of the existing Municipal Separate Stormwater System (MS4) drain at the edge of Lemon Crest Drive and will capture flows to alleviate localized flooding on private residential lots on the roadway. The newly-located MS4 inlet will connect to the existing upstream channel with an angled concrete apron to quickly convey stormwater flows into

the 175-foot double 6' X 5' box culvert system. Between the roadway and the newly-located MS4 inlet, the box culvert system will be undergrounded, and concrete block will be placed along the center line, to allow maintenance trucks to reach the new inlet location. An adjustable grate will be installed at the inlet to prevent the movement of trash and debris into the channel. Existing utilities within the project site may be relocated during project construction, including water lines, power, and telecommunication poles. The temporarily disturbed areas will be recompacted and revegetated.

The project site is surrounded by urban residential uses. The project's existing flood control channel is a human-made and tightly constrained between adjacent residents' fencing. The channel is ephemeral, as it only flows during storm events to convey stormwater away from structures and property. The channel flows are conveyed into an existing MS4 system to the San Diego River, which is located approximately one mile downstream.

6. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project is located within the Metro/Lakeside/Jamul Segment of the Multiple Species Conservation Program.

The SanGIS mapping application identifies the project area as Current Urban/Developed. The surrounding area is developed with rural residential, village residential and commercial uses.

There are five schools located less than one mile from the project site. The four closest schools are: Innovation High School San Diego, Riverview Elementary, Lakeside Middle School and River Valley Charter School of the Lakeside Union Elementary School District. Innovation High School San Diego is located within one-quarter mile southeast of the proposed project site, Riverview Elementary is situated about one-quarter mile from the proposed project site to the south; and the latter two schools are located approximately one mile to the northwest.

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

Permit Type/Action	**Agency**
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
1602 Permit- Fish & Game Code	California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW)

8. 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, is

there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

YES	NO
☒	☐

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

Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally-affiliated Native American tribes. County DPW submitted consultation letters on December 17, 2019 to 8 (eight) tribes, including Barona Group of the Capitan Grande, Campo Kumeyaay Nation, Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, Jamul Indian Village, Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation, Sycuan Band of Kumeyaay Nation, and Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians.

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

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

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

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

Signature	Date
Printed Name	Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

No Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. The proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and would not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. The project site is located in a rural residential, village residential and commercial land uses area, with the closest land uses being single-home residences and a commercial shipping center. The proposed project would provide flooding relief for the road and surrounding properties during stormwater events along the Lemon Crest Drive. The proposed project would extend current drainage facilities approximately 175 feet upstream, placing them underground, reducing the visual impact. Any areas temporarily disturbed during the construction would be restored through recompacting and revegetation. The extension of the drainage facility would be underground and would not be visible from or substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista tp adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view, the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

No Impact: The proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and would not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality surrounding the proposed project area can be characterized as consisting of rural residential, village residential and commercial development.

The proposed project does not propose discernable changes to the visual environment. Proposed improvements would extend existing drainage facilities approximately 175 feet upstream and placing them underground, thus reducing the visual impact. Proposed improvements would reduce the flooding impact to properties along both sides of the channel and improve existing road conditions along the Lemon Crest Drive, by eliminating flooding during stormwater events. Any areas temporarily disturbed during construction would be restored through recompacting and revegetation. Additionally, because the extension facility would be undergrounded, it would not substantially degrade existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties, such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Based on this, the project would not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The proposed project site is currently designated as a flood control channel, thus, precluding agricultural uses. There are no agricultural uses in the project vicinity. The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program identifies the project site and surrounding land as Urban Builtup Land. While the proposed project site is located on Prime Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance, the primary objective of the project is to alleviate flooding during heavy rain events and improve existing flood control channel. Additionally, the project site does not contain any agricultural resources or lands designated as Unique Farmland, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, because the project involves improvement of an existing flood control channel, no agricultural resources including Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and surrounding area within a radius of 0.25 mile does not contain any active agricultural operations, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Although the project is situated on or lands designated as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance, the proposed project site is currently designated as a flood control facility, thus, precluding agricultural uses. Therefore, because the project involves improvement of an existing flood control channel, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes flood control facility improvements that would not affect SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project does not propose a change in land use designation or development that would result in operational emissions. Therefore, the project would not conflict or obstruct with the implementation of the RAQS nor the SIP on a project or cumulative level.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining

significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

The proposed project is located within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). Under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS), the SDAB is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour and 8-hour concentrations for Ozone (O_3). SDAB is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) and 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$). O_3 is formed when VOCs and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures.

No operational source of emissions are proposed as part of the project. However, short term air quality emissions associated with construction of the proposed project include emissions of PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_x, SO_x, CO, and VOCs. Grading activities associated with the construction would be subject to the San Diego County Grading, Clearing and Watercourses Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from construction would be limited to the duration of construction earthwork, localized, and temporary resulting in PM_{10} and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

As stated above, the objective of the project is to improve an existing drainage channel to alleviate flooding of properties and roads along the existing drainage channel. The project would not increase vehicle trips, vehicles miles travelled, or roadway capacity. Therefore, potential operation emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact, nor a considerable net increase in criteria pollutants. As such, the proposed project's potential impacts due to cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants would be less than significant.

The construction-related emissions of the criteria pollutants would not exceed the County's significance level thresholds for construction and, therefore, would not cause a significant direct impact. These thresholds were developed based on the CAA de minimis level, which are designed to provide limits below which project emissions from an individual project would not significantly affect regional air quality or the timely attainment of the NAAQS and CAAQS. The construction contractor is required to incorporate standard County-required dust control

measures, and construction is expected to be short-term (4 months), and the project would not result in operational emissions. Upon review of cumulative projects in the vicinity of the County's proposed project, none were identified that would contribute to a significant air quality impact in combination with the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions of ozone, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$, and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to improve the existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project is located in a residential area of single-home residences, in rural village and rural residential land uses. The closest receptor (APN 382-290-39-00) is located less than 10 feet from the construction activity. Other residential uses and receptors are located within 50 feet and surround the project site to the north, south, east and west. However, due to construction methods to reduce particulate matter and the limited duration of earthwork, this project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and would not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. In addition, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project, as well as the listed projects, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance**.** Therefore, the potential for the proposed project to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations due to temporary construction or operational impacts of the proposed project would be considered less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project does not include the construction or operation of heavy industrial or agricultural uses that are typically associated with odor complaints. During construction, diesel equipment may generate some temporary nuisance odors. However, exposure to odors associated with project construction would be short-term and temporary in nature. There would be no permanent or operational source of odors associated with the project. Therefore, the project would not result in in the creation of objectionable odors or other emissions that may affect a substantial number of people.

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/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Section IV of the IS/MND is based on the Biological Letter Report and Jurisdictional Delineation Report prepared by RECON dated December 16, 2019.

Plant Species

No sensitive plant species were observed or expected to be present onsite.

Wildlife Species

Due to the high level of disturbance, the project site supports a low diversity of wildlife species. No special status wildlife species were detected on-site and none are expected to occur. The project site is not located within or adjacent to any U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) designated critical habitat. There is a low potential that project construction could affect nesting birds using the site for foraging and/or nesting habitat, therefore per the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), clearing and grubbing and/or removal of potential nesting sites during the nesting season (September 15 and February 15), would require:

- Pre-construction surveys would be conducted by a qualified biologist in appropriate habitat to inspect for the presence of nesting birds no more than ten days prior to construction.
- If nests of listed birds, migratory birds, raptors, or other sensitive species are located, they would be flagged and a protective buffer would be established by the monitoring biologist. All construction activity would be prohibited within this area until the biologist has

determined that the nesting young have fledged or the nest has been abandoned, whichever occurs first.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The Biological Letter Report dated December 16, 2019 prepared by RECON determined that the proposed project site does not contain riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, as defined by the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations. Urban/Developed land and Non-Vegetated Channel are not considered sensitive natural communities.

Vegetation Communities/Land Cover Types

The Biological Letter Report dated December 16, 2019, prepared by RECON, mapped three vegetation/land cover types occur in the survey area: disturbed habitat, urban/developed areas, and non-vegetated channel. The acreages of vegetation communities and land cover types are listed in Table 1.

Table 1
Vegetation Communities within the Project Survey Area

Vegetation Community	Holland Code	Acreage
Non-Vegetated Channel	64200	0.02
Urban/Developed	12000	0.19
Total		**0.21**

Non-Vegetated Channel (64200) includes the sandy, gravelly, or rocky fringe or waterways or flood channels. These areas are unvegetated on a relatively permanent basis. Vegetation may exist but is usually less than 10 percent total cover.

Non-Vegetated Channel is mapped along the natural-bottom of the unnamed drainage that crosses through the PIA. The channel bottom is largely non-vegetated because of the scouring effect of moving water.

Urban/Developed (12000) areas have been constructed upon or otherwise physically altered to an extent that native vegetation is no longer supported. Developed land is characterized by permanent or semi-permanent structures, pavement or hardscape, and landscaped areas that often require irrigation. All roads and paved areas in the survey area were mapped as

Urban/Developed lands. These areas are part of the airport infrastructure and include runways, taxiways, or access roads that contain no vegetation.

Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The USFWS has developed a series of maps, known as the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) to illustrate wetlands and deepwater habitat across the country. After conducting a review of this database, there are no NWI features within the project site. The field investigation confirmed the project site lacks hydric soil indicators necessary to be classified as a wetland. Therefore, no wetlands exist within the project site. However, the Non-Vegetated Channel on-site that would be impacted by undergrounding the flood control facility does qualify as a non-wetland Waters of the U.S., which would be considered a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure M-BIO-1 would reduce impacts to non-wetland Waters of the U.S to a level less than significant.

M-BIO-1: Impacts to 0.02 acre of non-wetland Waters of the U.S. and state would require review and consultation from the USACE and RWQCB under Sections 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act, respectively. Mitigation would be analyzed as part of the consultation process. If mitigation is required by jurisdictional agencies, measures would be implemented as conditions of the project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The Biological Letter Report dated December 16, 2019 prepared by RECON determined that the site has limited biological value and impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the proposed project for the following reasons. No special status

plant or wildlife species or potentially suitable habitat was identified in the project survey area during the field visit. The project site is not located within or adjacent to any USFWS-designated critical habitat. Furthermore, permanent impact within the project site is limited to 0.02 acre of Non-Vegetated Channel in an area of very low biological value. Therefore, the project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and impacts would be less than significant.

e) Conflict with any local policy or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project proposes facility improvements to an existing flood control channel. The proposed project site has very low biological value and the improvements would not conflict with policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

f) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project proposes facility improvements to an existing flood control channel. The proposed project is exempt from the County's RPO, which regulates land within unincorporated San Diego County, because the project is an essential public facility pursuant to Article 5 (Exemptions), No. 3. The site has very low biological value and the improvements would not conflict with the provisions of adopted Plans, policies, or ordinances that protect biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Section V of the IS/MND is based on the Cultural Resources Inventory Report prepared by Keshia Montifolca, County of San Diego Archaeologist, Department of Public Works (DPW) on May 2, 2017.

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by DPW on May 2, 2017, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in a cultural resources report titled "The Lemon Crest Drive Drainage Project Cultural Resources Survey Negative Findings," prepared by DPW, dated May 2, 2017.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by DPW on May 2, 2017, it has been determined that there are no impacts to archaeological resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in a cultural resources report titled "The Lemon Crest Drive Drainage Project Cultural Resources Survey Negative Findings," prepared by DPW, dated May 2, 2017.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by DPW on May 2, 2017, it has been determined that the project would not disturb human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey for the project area are provided in a cultural survey report titled "The Lemon Crest Drive Drainage Project Cultural Resources Survey Negative Findings," prepared by DPW, dated May 2, 2017.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project does not involve or introduce ongoing operational uses that would create a new source of energy consumption. During construction, temporary consumption of energy resources would occur for the purpose of equipment and materials, but the duration and area of construction are limited. Compliance with local, state, and federal regulations, which limit engine idling times and require recycling construction debris, would reduce short-term energy demand during the proposed project's construction to the extent feasible, and project construction would not result in a wasteful or inefficient use of energy. There are no unusual project characteristics or construction processes that would require the use of equipment that would be more energy intensive than is used for comparable activities or use of equipment that would not conform to current emissions standards and related fuel efficiencies. Furthermore, individual project elements are required to be consistent with County policies and emissions reductions strategies, and therefore, would not consume energy resources in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

State and local authorities regulate energy use and consumption through various means and programs. These regulations at the state level intended to reduce energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. These include, among others, Assembly Bill (AB) 1493–Light-duty Vehicle Standards, California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6–Energy Efficiency Standards, California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11–California Green Building Standards.

No Impact: On February 14, 2018, the County Board of Supervisors adopted the Climate Action Plan (CAP), which identifies specific strategies and measures to reduce GHG emissions in the largely rural, unincorporated areas of San Diego County as well as County government operations. The CAP updates and implements the County's 2011 General Plan Update goals, policies, and mitigation measures to meet the state's 2020 and 2030 GHG reduction targets,

and demonstrate progress towards a 2050 GHG reduction goal (County 2018). The CAP contains 11 strategies, 26 GHG reduction measures, and supporting efforts organized under five GHG emissions categories: Built Environment and Transportation, Energy, Solid Waste, Water and Wastewater, and Agriculture and Conservation. Although the County's CAP is currently in litigation, the proposed project's construction methods are consistent with the County's General Plan. Additionally, the project is consistent with the County plans, including the Strategic Energy Plan, Renewable Energy Plan, Comprehensive Strategic Plan to Reduce Waste, and is consistent with the SDG&E Long-term Resource Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California

Building Code and the County Code ensures the project would not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No 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 would be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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.

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area, Area 3, Subarea 3-1, categorized as Generally Susceptible, as identified by the California Department of Conservation Geological Survey Landslide Inventory Maps. Slopes within this area are at or near their stability limits due to a combination of weak materials and steep slopes (many slope angles exceed 15 degrees). Although most slopes within Subarea 3-1 do not currently contain landslide deposits, they can be expected to fail, locally, when adversely modified. Since the project is located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area, the geologic environment has a slight to moderate probability to become unstable, the proposed improvements would stabilize the banks of the existing drainage channel, thus reducing

possibility of landslides. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the geology of the site consists of Cretaceous Plutonic formation, which is fractured crystalline rock formations and not suitable for creation of fossils. Project area contains soils identified as Visalia sandy loam (5 to 9 percent slopes), which have a low shrink/swell potential and a severe erosion index of 16 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service, 1973). The project would not result in unprotected erodible soils; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and would not develop steep slopes. The project would result in site disturbance and grading activity within the proposed project site. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (Drainage - Erosion Prevention) and 87.417 (Planting). A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and a Stormwater Quality Management Plan will be prepared for the project. Finally, the plan would include the Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: installation of gravel bags, silt fencing, and fiber rolls and revegetation, as applicable. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. Although the project is located on unstable soils, proposed improvements would stabilize the banks of the existing drainage channel and result in soil stabilization. The project site is not located in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the County of San Diego's 100-year floodplain. Additionally, the proposed project involves grading that would result in the creation of areas underlain by fill; however no buildings are being proposed and the project site is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone. Therefore, the stability of the geologic conditions of the project area would be less than significant as a result of the proposed drainage facilities improvements. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VII Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The soil on site is identified as Visalia sandy loam with a thick surface at 5 to 9 percent slopes. No buildings are proposed to be constructed as part of the project. The project is not located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils onsite are Visalia sandy loam (5 to 9 percent slopes), which have a low shrink/swell potential and represent no substantial risks to life or property because of the implementation of this project. This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. Therefore, these soils would not create substantial risks to life or property.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project does not propose septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater would be generated.

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:

No Impact: The site does not contain 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. According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the geology of the site consists of Cretaceous Plutonic formation, which is fractured crystalline rock formations and not suitable for creation of fossils. Impacts to paleontological resources typically occur during grading activities (excavation) associated with project construction on previously undisturbed land, or redevelopment where much deeper grading in native soil is proposed. The project site is not located within an area likely to contain paleontological resources. Furthermore, it is not anticipated that project construction would require depths of excavation that would reach previously undisturbed soil. Therefore, no impact would occur.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Background of County Climate Action Plan (CAP)

On February 14, 2018, the County Board of Supervisors adopted a CAP, which identifies specific strategies and measures to reduce GHG emissions in the largely rural, unincorporated areas of San Diego County as well as County government operations. The CAP aims to meet the State's 2020 and 2030 GHG reduction targets (AB 32 and SB 32, respectively), and demonstrate progress towards the 2050 GHG reduction goal. Concurrent with adoption of the CAP, the County adopted new Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change (County of San Diego 2018a), which identifies that a proposed project would have a less Than significant cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change if it is consistent with the County's CAP (County of San Diego 2018b). As defined in these Guidelines, consistency with the CAP is determined through the CAP Consistency Review Checklist (Checklist; County of San Diego 2018b). The Checklist follows a two-step process to determine if projects are consistent with the CAP and whether they may have a significant cumulative impact under the County's adopted GHG thresholds of significance. The Checklist first assesses a project's

consistency with the growth projections and land use assumptions that formed the basis of CAP emissions projections. The second step of the CAP Checklist is to review and evaluate a project's consistency with the applicable measures of the CAP. If a project is consistent with the projections and land use assumptions in the CAP, its associated growth in terms of GHG emissions would have been accounted for in the CAP's projections, and project implementation of the CAP reduction measures would contribute towards reducing the County's emissions and meeting the County's reduction targets.

However, the proposed project consists of improvements to an existing public works flood control facility, so the project site does not have a County-designated zone or land use to compare against the assumed designations used in the CAP. As noted in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance, projects that may intensify GHG emissions over existing designations (or would result in greater GHG emissions than assessed in the CAP) are required to (1) prepare a separate, project-level GHG analysis, (2) explain how the Proposed Project is consistent with the CAP, and (3) demonstrate that the Proposed Project would not prevent the County from meeting its share of emissions reductions. Because the CAP and the County Guidelines are based upon land use assumptions of the 2011 General Plan, this means the CAP cannot be used to streamline the review of GHG emissions resulting from the proposed flood control facility improvement project. Also, the proposed project would not amend the General Plan. As such, the project is not required to use the "no net increase" or "net zero" thresholds of significance prescribed by the County's Climate Change Significance Guidelines, which anticipate a "no net increase" or "net zero" threshold for projects that amend the General Plan. As such, although the CAP cannot be used to streamline the review of GHG emissions from the project, a project-specific climate change analysis was completed in compliance with the CAP to analyze potential project-related emissions and to show consistency with the CAP. Therefore, following rationale presented in the CAPCOA Guidance, the aggregate emissions from all projects with individual annual emissions that are equal to or less Than 900 MT CO_2E would not impede achievement of the state GHG emissions reduction targets codified by AB 32 (2006) and SB 32 (2016), and impacts under CEQA would therefore be less Than cumulatively considerable.

Lastly, it should be noted that a ruling by the Superior Court of California dated December 24, 2018 ordered the County to set aside its February 14, 2018 approval of the CAP and the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report. In January 2019, the County appealed the San Diego Superior Court ruling which stayed the above described writ. As such, the CAP and its EIR are still in place during the appeal. Given the current legal instability concerning the County's CAP, and given the above explanation of the proposed project, the analysis prepared for the proposed project did not rely on the CAP to streamline the project's environmental analysis.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 and the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change, projects that can demonstrate consistency with the adopted CAP, as demonstrated through completion of the CAP Consistency Review Checklist, would have a less than significant impact to climate change. However, as noted above, the project consists of improvements to an existing drainage facility, and it does not have an unincorporated County-designated zone or land use to compare against the designations used in the County's CAP. Furthermore, because the project is limited to temporary construction activities and would not generate operational emissions, the CAP Checklist is not applicable. The CAP projections and Checklist focus primarily on typical land use development with

operational components and do not capture emissions sources such as construction. As such, the CAP cannot be used to streamline the review of GHG emissions associated with the project. The project would apply the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Environmental Checklist.

Less Than Significant Impact: Development projects typically result in GHG emissions from both construction and long-term operational activities. Operational activities are consistent sources of GHG emissions that continue for the entire lifespan of a project. Comparatively, construction emissions are often intensive and vary substantially between phases of construction, but they are emitted over a finite time and end at the termination of construction activities. Thus, construction emissions are considered short-term sources of GHG emissions. The annual emissions screening level of 900 MT CO_2E was originally developed to address operational impact of GHG emissions from land use development. Since the introduction of the CAPCOA guidance, several air districts in the state have issued additional guidance that construction emissions should be included in assessment of operational GHG emissions by amortizing the total GHG construction emissions over the lifespan of a project, and then adding that amortized total to the operational emissions. This approach ensures all GHG emissions that occur from a project are included in the assessment. While similar to land use developments, different improvements or maintenance activities can vary depending on the improvement, unlike typical land use developments where an average lifespan is used, infrastructure projects should be assessed based on the specific improvement life span (e.g., 21-year lifespan on asphalt-concrete resurfacing).

Industry standard practice has been to amortize construction over the life of the project and evaluate the emissions using the 900 MT CO_2E screening level. Comparing the summation of amortized construction emissions against a threshold intended to assess operational-related impacts is considered an appropriate approach for assessment of construction-related emissions due to the short-term nature of the emissions source.

With respect to the proposed project, activities emit GHGs primarily through the combustion of fuels in the engines of off-road construction equipment (primarily diesel) and in the engines of on-road vehicles used for the delivery of materials and the commute vehicles of the construction workers. Every phase of the construction process, including grading, paving, and building, emits GHGs in volumes proportional to the quantity and type of construction equipment used.

The project would result in negligible emissions over the 4-month construction period. Annual emissions would not exceed 900 MT CO_2E per year. As discussed earlier, the annual 900 MT CO_2E screening level corresponds to the most ambitious state reduction target and is highly conservative. Projects with individual annual emissions that are equal to or less than 900 MT CO_2E would not impede achievement of the state GHG emissions reduction targets codified by AB 32 (2006) and SB 32 (2016), and impacts under CEQA would, therefore, be less than cumulatively considerable. As the project would not exceed the 900 MT CO_2E screening threshold for GHG emissions, GHG impacts associated with the project would be less than significant. Further, once project construction is complete, because the project does not generate operational GHG emissions. Therefore, it is determined that the project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, at a level that may have a significant impact on the environment.

The project's GHG emissions are found to result in a less than cumulatively-considerable contribution to GHG emissions because the project would not create a new source of operational emissions. Therefore, the project would result in less than cumulatively-considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

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

To implement State mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The County of San Diego General Plan incorporates various climate change goals and policies. These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets. A set of project-specific implementing thresholds are included in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance and are used to ensure project consistency with the GHG emission reduction target, and the various General Plan goals and policies related to GHG emissions that support CAP goals.

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The proposed improvements would provide flooding relief for the road and surrounding properties during stormwater events.

As discussed in VIII (a) above, the proposed project would emit negligible GHG emissions, which is below the 900 MT CO_2E screening threshold for GHG emissions and does not involve new land use development that would generate long-term operational impacts. Once construction activities are complete, GHG emissions would cease and the project would not be an operational source of emissions. Thus, the project would not interfere with post-2020 GHG reduction goals. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the long-term GHG policy goals of the state. As such, the project's impacts with respect to the County and State's GHG emissions goals 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, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of hazardous substances, nor are hazardous substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and, therefore, would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead-based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. Appropriate Best Management Practices would be implemented during construction to prevent effluents from leaving the project site. There are no Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST), military or other hazardous material cleanup sites in the project area per the GEOTRACKER listing, EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database, and CalSites EnviroStar database.

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances and the fact that the project is not located in the vicinity of a known hazardous waste site and would occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: As discussed above, the project is located within one-quarter mile of several schools, however the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project would not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit and regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to any recent release of hazardous substances. Three sites located within the project area are included in 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). Of the three sites, all three are closed cleanup cases.

The project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation, 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.

The County of San Diego DEH maintains the Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) list of contaminated sites that have previously or are currently undergoing environmental investigations and/or remedial actions. Three sites are listed in the DEH SAM Case Listing in the project area; however, all three cleanup cases have been closed by DEH and no further action is required.

The proposed project site is not on or within 2,000 feet of any properties listed in DTSC's Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database). It is, therefore, not considered a contaminated property, and no precautions need to be taken by the proposed project as a result of this listing.

In conclusion, although three sites in the vicinity of the proposed project are listed in the DEH SAM listing and/or Geotracker database, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because all site remediation and clean up has occurred and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located within Airport Influence Area 2 of Gillespie Field, which is a general aviation airport. However, the project involves the improvement of an existing drainage channel and does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is limited to drainage improvements and would not affect the surrounding circulation network utilized for emergency access in accordance with County standards. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located in an area designated as in the Lakeside Wildland Urban Interface. However, the project involves the improvement of existing drainage facility. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project would comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Fire Code. Moreover, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the County Fire Code.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future residents' exposure to vectors. The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. This change is not expected to substantially increase current or future residents' exposure to vectors. The proposed project includes installation of an underground storm drain, which is intended to efficiently convey stormwater and is not designed to allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project would be required to implement applicable site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs during construction to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering stormwater runoff. These measures may include inlet filter rolls, silt fencing, gravel bags, and erosion control recompacting and revegetation post-construction. These measures would enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes extension of existing drainage facilities approximately 175 feet upstream of the Lemon Crest Drive, to alleviate flooding of the properties and roadway along the drainage channel within the unincorporated community of Lakeside in eastern San Diego County. The proposed improvements would eliminate flooding for properties and roadways along the existing drainage channel during heavy rain events.

The project does not propose the use of 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 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. These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, the project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The proposed improvements would underground the existing unvegetated earthen channel, which currently erodes the banks of the channel, into a formalized MS4 storm drain facility. The project footprint is the minimum necessary to complete the work and would not include substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area including through the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

As part of the project's design and construction, the County would implement site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering stormwater runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts from erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The channel currently discharges into an MS4 system, and the proposed project would move the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream in its current location and alignment. The MS4 facility was designed to accommodate a volume consistent with downstream capacity. Since the project removes surface runoff and directs the flows into the MS4 system, it will decrease the local flood risk.

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The channel currently discharges into an MS4 system, and the proposed project would move the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream in its current location and alignment. The MS4 facility was designed to accommodate a volume consistent with downstream capacity. Since the project removes surface runoff and directs the flows into the MS4 system, it will decrease the local flood risk. The proposed project would not result in an increase of impervious surfaces that would exceed the capacity of the MS4 system. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, the project site would not be inundated. The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, the project site could not be inundated by a seiche. The project is not located within a local and FEMA-designated flood hazard zone. Therefore, there is no risk of the release of pollutants due to project inundation in a flood hazard area. The project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would not create new sources of pollution that would obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan. Also, the project does not propose the use of 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes improvement to an existing flood control channel and does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes improvement to an existing flood control channel and is consistent with the County General Plan, and Lakeside Community Plan which perpetuates Lakeside's rural atmosphere. The project is consistent with the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) as it does not propose impacts to sensitive vegetation communities or fauna. Therefore, the project does not 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.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No 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 private residences. This land use is incompatible with future extraction of mineral resources. Furthermore, the project is limited to improving an existing drainage facility; therefore, implementation of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value, since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not located in an area or within 1,300 feet of lands designated as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resources.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures.

There will be short term noise associated with construction activities. Construction noise will be intermittent over the 4-month construction period, and comply with Section 36.409 of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance both in time of day and type of machinery.

County Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409
The project would not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations 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.

With respect to construction noise, the proposed project would include a variety of construction activities, including: grading and clearing, demolition of existing box culvert, trenching, saw cutting for culverts, placement of subgrade material, and paving. A temporary construction easement will be negotiated with affected adjacent parcel owners to acknowledge the proximity of construction activities. Construction noise levels are not anticipated to exceed 75 dB(A) at adjacent property lines. Therefore, noise levels from construction activities would not exceed the County threshold for construction, and would be less than significant.

The proposed project would 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 construction activities. Post-construction, the project would not generate new sources of operational noise in the vicinity.

To ensure construction noise is reduced to the extent feasible, the following design considerations are proposed:

- All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with

manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation.

- Whenever feasible, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.

- Equipment staging areas should be located as far as feasible from occupied residences.

General Plan – Noise Element
The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas. Project implementation would not 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. Therefore, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

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 would not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project would not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project would 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 would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose construction of any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels:

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

The goals of the proposed project to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project is not designed to increase capacity of the roadway. Therefore, the project does not propose any major, new, or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways, or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located within Airport Influence Area 2 of Gillespie Field, which is a general aviation airport. However, the localized construction would not affect aviation activity in the area. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project includes improvements to an existing drainage channel. The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth 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: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel and would not displace any existing housing since no existing residential structures will be directly impacted by the project.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
   i. Fire protection?
   ii. Police protection?
   iii. Schools?
   iv. Parks?
   v. Other public facilities?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures.

Existing utilities within the project site include potable water lines, power and communication poles. These utilities would be relocated during project construction to accommodate the new drainage system. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically-altered governmental facilities, including but not limited to: fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly-altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XVI. RECREATION

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures.

The project does not involve construction of new residences or in any way promote residential development. Therefore, the project would not 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The proposed project would improve current drainage channel and road conditions during heavy rain events. The project does not include direct improvement of recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

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

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project would not result in increased vehicle trips, vehicles miles travelled, or roadway capacity. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system.

If construction detours or temporary road closures are required on Lemon Crest Drive during temporary construction activities, the instances would be limited in time and scope as minimally necessary to mobilize equipment or materials. For most of the 4-month construction duration, the road would remain open to traffic. Therefore, access to residences along the Lemon Crest Drive would remain available.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project involves drainage improvements. The goals of the project are to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. As the proposed project would not change the traffic patterns or capacity, or result in increased vehicles miles travelled, the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b).

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project involves improvements to an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. Accordingly, the project would improve the existing drainage system, halt soil erosion, and would not increase hazards, alter traffic patterns, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment), or create or place curves, slopes, or walls which impedes adequate site distance on a road.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project involves drainage improvements. The goal of the project is to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. As discussed above, access along the Lemon Crest Drive roadway would be provided at all times for emergency access. Periodic and temporary detours may be needed during equipment or materials mobilization, but the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Pursuant to AB-52, consultation was initiated with culturally-affiliated Native American tribes. County DPW submitted consultation letters on December 17, 2019 to 8 (eight) tribes, including Barona Group of the Capitan Grande, Campo Kumeyaay Nation, Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, Jamul Indian Village, Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation, Sycuan Band of Kumeyaay Nation, and Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. In accordance with the project-specific archaeological survey, no cultural resources

were encountered during the field review, and due to the nature of the site, no resources are expected during construction and monitoring was not required.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No tribal cultural resources, 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 were identified. Therefore, there is no impact to a tribal cultural resource associated with the project.

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 storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures by conveying the flows to the existing MS4 system. Existing utilities within the project site include potable water lines, power and communication poles. These utilities may be relocated during project construction to accommodate the drainage improvements but would not increase capacity or change alignment. Therefore, there would be no significant environmental effects caused by the construction or relocation of above-listed utilities associated with the project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The proposed project does not involve or require services from a water provider. Therefore, the project would not affect existing or future water supplies.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The proposed project would improve current drainage channel and road conditions during heavy rain events. The project would not generate wastewater and therefore would not require a determination by a wastewater treatment provider regarding 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. As part of the drainage improvements, the project may generate a negligible amount of solid waste or export material. 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.). If the export of solid waste or other materials is needed, 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.

Therefore, the project would not 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. As part of the drainage improvements, the project may generate a negligible amount of solid waste or export material. 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.). If the export of solid waste or other materials is needed, 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. Therefore, the project would not 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.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is limited to improving an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. Therefore, the project would not result an impact to emergency plans.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is limited to improving an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. Therefore, the proposed project would not add or increase occupants, or exacerbate wildfire risks thereby exposing occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is limited to improving an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. As such, the project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve an existing flood control channel by extending the inlet approximately 175 feet upstream, to alleviate localized flooding at adjacent property and structures. The project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including

downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ 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 applicable question of this form. In addition to project-specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly biological resources. However, mitigation has been included that reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes the following: Impacts to jurisdictional resources will require mitigation through habitat creation or enhancement to achieve no-net-loss of jurisdictional resources. Such mitigation would be determined by a qualified restoration specialist in consultation with the regulatory agencies during the permitting process. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would occur. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant: Cumulative impacts evaluation includes review and analysis of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions and their impact on environmental resources in the context of the proposed project. A list of the projects considered in the cumulative impact analysis is presented in Table 1. These projects are located within the unincorporated County of San Diego.

Table 1. Cumulative Projects

	Project Name	Description
1.	2015 Riverway Specific Plan Amendment and Rezone	Rezoning / Specific Plan Amendment
2.	Marilla Drive TM for 7 Lots	Tentative Map
3.	Land Jaegger, Inc.	Site Plan
4.	Riverview Courts	Tentative Map
5.	FLOIT, GPA, REZ, TM, STP	Site Plan
6.	California Investment Bankers	Tentative Map
7.	Single Oak Estates, Single Oak at Rockcrest, Lakeside	Major Subdivision Improvement Plan
8.	TPM 21195	Minor Subdivision Improvement Plan
9.	TPM Orlando	Minor Subdivision Improvement Plan
10.	TPM 20978 Emerald Grove Ave (Public)	Minor Subdivision Improvement Plan

Impacts associated with the proposed project would affect the existing unvegetated earthen drainage channel considered a biological resource. This impact would be mitigated to a level less than significant level. All other project impacts to environmental resources would be less than significant without mitigation. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VII. Geology and Soils,

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, X. Hydrology and Water Quality XIII. Noise, XIV. Population and Housing, XVII. Transportation and Traffic and XX. Wildfire. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

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

PROJECT-SPECIFIC REFERENCES

County of San Diego, Department of Public Works. Lemon Crest Drive Drainage Project Cultural Resource Survey Negative Findings. May 2, 2017.

RECON. Biological and Jurisdictional Resources Impacts Memorandum for the Lemon Crest Drive Drainage Facility Extension Improvements Project. December 16, 2019.

AESTHETICS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

BIOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

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

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LAND USE & PLANNING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

NOISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POPULATION & HOUSING

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

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

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

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

RECREATION

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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