



CITY OF ESCONDIDO
PLANNING DIVISION
201 NORTH BROADWAY
ESCONDIDO, CA 92025-2798
(760) 839-4671

FILED
David Butler, Recorder/County Clerk

MAR 24 2010
BY L. Kesian
DEPUTY

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

CASE NO.: SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041

DATE ISSUED: March 23, 2010

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: March 26, 2010-April 15, 2010

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide a vacant parcel 14.37-acre in size into 4-lots with lot sizes of 25,264 SF (Parcel 1), 21,344 SF (Parcel 2), 31,759 SF (Parcel 3), 541,015 SF (Parcel 4), Grading Exemptions and for the removal of 0.50-acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub and the establishment of a Fuel Management Area, including off-site areas and an on-site 20,000 gallon water tank for parcel 4. The Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub will be mitigated on-site by preserving 8.478-acres of Coastal Sage Scrub through the establishment of a conservation easement on site (the remaining portion of Parcel 4). The proposed grading exemptions are one fill slope and one cut slope, both 2:1, up to 30' high on Parcel 4. The proposed 20,000 gallon water tank would provide adequate fire protection. Said project is located in the RE-20 zone (Residential Estates, 20,000 SF minimum lot size) and RE-80 zone (Residential Estates, 80,000 SF minimum lot size), and the Estate II (E2) General Plan Land Use designation, East Grove/Tier 2A

LOCATION: Located at the south side of Reed Road, just east of Citrus Avenue and east of Bear Valley Parkway, addressed as 3200 Reed Road (APN 240-190-61 & 64)

APPLICANT: Mr. Francis W. Fitzpatrick

An Initial Study has been prepared to assess this project as required by the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines, Ordinance and Regulations of the City of Escondido. The Initial Study is on file in the City of Escondido Planning Division.

Findings: The findings of this review are that the project with mitigation measures will not have a significant effect on the environment since there is no substantial evidence in the record to indicate project related impacts are potentially significant.


Darren Parker, Assistant Planner II

SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY CLERK
San Diego County on MAR 24 2010
Posted MAR 24 2010 Removed _____
Returned to agency on _____
Deputy L. Kesian



March 23, 2010

Mr. Francis W. Fitzpatrick
Manitou Engineering Company
350 West 9th Avenue
Escondido, CA92025

Subject: Environmental Review Determination, Case No. SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041

Dear Mr. Fitzpatrick:

An analysis of your Environmental Review application has resulted in the enclosed "Notice of Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration," issued in draft form. Issuance of this document indicates the City determined the following finding applies to the proposed project:

There is no substantial evidence that the project with mitigation measures may have a significant effect on the environment.

Public notice of the Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration has been distributed for a public review period, ending April 15, 2010. Depending on the relevance of any public comments received during the public review period, staff reserves the right to change the terms and conclusions of the "Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration."

If you have any questions regarding this environmental review, please call me at (760) 839-4553.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Darren Parker".

Darren Parker
Assistant Planner II

Cc: Mr. Paul Myer, 3271 White Hawk Road, Escondido, CA 92027



CITY OF ESCONDIDO
PLANNING DIVISION
201 NORTH BROADWAY
ESCONDIDO, CA 92025-2798
(760) 839-4671

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

CASE NO.: SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041

DATE ISSUED: March 23, 2010

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: March 26, 2010-April 15, 2010

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A request to subdivide a vacant parcel 14.37-acre in size into 4-lots with lot sizes of 25,264 SF (Parcel 1), 21,344 SF (Parcel 2), 31,759 SF (Parcel 3), 541,015 SF (Parcel 4), Grading Exemptions and for the removal of 0.50-acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub and the establishment of a Fuel Management Area, including off-site areas and an on-site 20,000 gallon water tank for parcel 4. The Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub will be mitigated on-site by preserving 8.478-acres of Coastal Sage Scrub through the establishment of a conservation easement on site (the remaining portion of Parcel 4). The proposed grading exemptions are one fill slope and one cut slope, both 2:1, up to 30' high on Parcel 4. The proposed 20,000 gallon water tank would provide adequate fire protection. Said project is located in the RE-20 zone (Residential Estates, 20,000 SF minimum lot size) and RE-80 zone (Residential Estates, 80,000 SF minimum lot size), and the Estate II (E2) General Plan Land Use designation, East Grove/Tier 2A

LOCATION: Located at the south side of Reed Road, just east of Citrus Avenue and east of Bear Valley Parkway, addressed as 3200 Reed Road (APN 240-190-61 & 64)

APPLICANT: Mr. Francis W. Fitzpatrick

An Initial Study has been prepared to assess this project as required by the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines, Ordinance and Regulations of the City of Escondido. The Initial Study is on file in the City of Escondido Planning Division.

Findings: The findings of this review are that the project with mitigation measures will not have a significant effect on the environment since there is no substantial evidence in the record to indicate project related impacts are potentially significant.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Darren Parker", written over a horizontal line.

Darren Parker, Assistant Planner II

SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041



CITY OF ESCONDIDO
PLANNING DIVISION
201 NORTH BROADWAY
ESCONDIDO, CA 92025-2798
(760) 839-4671

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
(Case No.: SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041)
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS

INTRODUCTION

This Mitigated Negative Declaration assesses the environmental effects of the proposed project involving the request to subdivide a vacant parcel 14.37-acres in size into 4-lots, a grading exemption for a fill slope and a cut slope, both 2:1, up to 30 feet high slopes that exceed the height requirements established by the City's Grading Ordinance, the removal of 0.50-acres of unoccupied Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub and the establishment of a Fuel Management Area including off-site areas and an onsite 20,000 gallon water tank for parcel 4, addressed as 3200 Reed Road. An Initial Study Environmental Checklist was prepared for this project and is included as a separate attachment to the Supplemental Comments within this report. The information contained in the Initial Study Environmental Checklist and the Supplemental Comments will be used by the City of Escondido to determine potential impacts associated with the proposed development.

The detailed Supplemental Comments included in this document identifies and evaluates physical impacts to the environment associated with developing or implementing the proposed project based on preliminary review of a variety of environmental factors identified in the attached Environmental Checklist. In analyzing the project it has been determined that impacts related to the removal of 0.50-acres of unoccupied Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub would occur. Based on information and documentation incorporated in the analysis, it has been concluded that this Initial Study warrants issuing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). The MND acknowledges that certain aspects of the project would cause significant impact(s) on the environment but those impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level by incorporating Mitigation Measures. As provided by CEQA, the City of Escondido will act as a responsible agency because of its role in reviewing and potentially approving or issuing permits for the project.

As mandated by CEQA Guidelines Section 15105, affected public agencies and the interested public may submit comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration in writing before the end of the 20-day public review period starting on March 26, 2010 and ending on April 15, 2010. Written comments on the Negative Declaration should be submitted to the following address by 5:00 p.m. (**April 14, 2010**). Following the close of the public comment review period, the City of Escondido will consider this Mitigated Negative Declaration and all received comments in determining the approval of this project.

City of Escondido
Planning Division
201 North Broadway
Escondido, CA 92025-2798

Contact: Darren Parker, Assistant Planner II
Telephone: (760) 839-4553
Fax: (760) 839-4313
E-mail: Dparker@ci.escondido.org

A hard copy of this document and any associated plans and/or documentation are available for review during normal operation hours for the duration of the public review period at the City of Escondido Planning Division.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project consists of a request to subdivide a vacant parcel 14.37-acre in size into 4-lots with lot sizes of 25,264 SF (Parcel 1), 21,344 SF (Parcel 2), 31,759 SF (Parcel 3), 541,015 SF (Parcel 4), Grading Exemptions and for the removal of 0.50-acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub and the establishment of a Fuel Management Area, including off-site areas and an on-site 20,000 gallon water tank. The Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub will be mitigated on-site by preserving 8.478-acres of Coastal Sage Scrub through the establishment of a conservation easement on site (the remaining portion of Parcel 4). The proposed grading exemptions are one fill slope and one cut slope, both 2:1, up to 30' high on Parcel 4. The proposed 20,000 gallon water tank would provide adequate fire protection for parcel 4. Said project is located in the RE-20 zone (Residential Estates, 20,000 SF minimum lot size) and RE-80 zone (Residential Estates, 80,000 SF minimum lot size), and the Estate II (E2) General Plan Land Use designation, East Grove/Tier 2A

PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The subject site is located on approximately 14.37-acres (APN 240-190-61 & 64) located at the south side of Reed Road, just east of Citrus Avenue and east of Bear Valley Parkway, addressed as 3200 Reed Road (APN 240-190-61 & 64). A portion of the 14.37-acre site is situated along a knoll/ridge with an elevation of 1005 feet extending through the southern portion of the site in a north-south direction. This ridge is identified as an Intermediate Ridgeline of the City's Hillside and Ridgeline Map. The center/top terrain of the knoll generally is level with the eastern and western portions of the site dropping rapidly in elevation to approximately 930 feet on the west and approximately 900 to the east. Much of the knoll is proposed for development and has been disturbed by agricultural activities and contains the remnants of an avocado grove that is still in operation, as well as dirt paths. Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 are proposed on the north facing slope and are surrounded by existing single-family residences with irrigated and maintained landscaping. Parcel 3 is also situated on the north facing slope south of Parcel 1 and adjacent to an existing residential development on the east, west and an irrigated avocado orchard to the south. Parcel 4 is the largest parcel proposed and is located on top of the ridge surrounded by an existing avocado orchard to the west and north. An existing cemetery is directly located to the south of the subject site and directly to the east of the subject is an undeveloped parcel (28.7-acres) with an existing avocado grove and natural vegetation that are to remain.

Surrounding zoning and land use are as follows:

North: SP zone (Specific Planning Area) immediately to the north of the subject site across Reed Road is an existing single-family housing development, consisting of smaller sized lots approximately 20,400 SF+/-.

South: RA-5 zone (Residential Agricultural, 5-acre minimum lot size) immediately to the south and southwest of the subject site is an existing cemetery (North County Cemetery). The cemetery is at a lower elevation than the subject site.

East: SP zone (Specific Planning Area) to the east and to the northeast RA-5 (Residential Agricultural, 5-acre minimum lot size) directly to the east of the subject site is an undeveloped parcel (28.7-acres) with an existing avocado grove. The property to the east of the subject site is at a lower elevation than the subject site. To the northeast of the subject site is a single-family residence on a 4.45-acre parcel.

West: RE-20 zone (Residential Estates, 20,000 SF minimum lot size) directly to the west of the subject site are several existing single-family residences on 1+acre lots. The majority of the subject site, parcels 1, 2 and 3, will be at the same elevation as the adjacent property, parcel 4 will be located at a higher elevation, approximately 70 feet higher.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on existing or planned land uses are considered significant if the proposed project would:

- a. *Physically divide an established community;*
- b. *Conflict with any applicable land-use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;.*

The subject site is zoned RE-20 (Residential Estates, 20,000 SF minimum lot size) and RE-80 (Residential Estates, 80,000 SF minimum lot size) which is consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation of Estate II (E2). The proposed lot sizes of 25,264 SF (Parcel 1), 21,344 SF (Parcel 2), and 31,759 SF (Parcel 3) are consistent with the minimum 20,000 SF lot size required by the Estate II (E2) General Plan Land Use designation and the RE-20 zoning. However, the 541,015 SF parcel 4 is split zoned RE-20 and RE-80, meets the minimum lot size, and is relatively too steep to build, with slopes over 35% and sensitive habitat. The applicant proposes to place this southeastern portion of the site within an open space conservation easement. The General Plan designation of Estate II (E2) permits up to 2 du/acre dependent on slope. The subject site is relatively flat adjacent to Reed Road (Parcel 1 & 2) and gets steeper south on the subject site (Parcel 3 & 4). The maximum yield allowed for this proposed four lot tentative parcel map on 14.37-acres is 8.22 units based on the slope categories present on site. The four (4) proposed lots result in a density for this project of 0.57 du/acre. The project meets the General Plan and Zoning criteria since the zoning and lot sizes are consistent with the General Plan, the lot sizes are compatible with the established lot sizes in the neighborhood, which range in size from 20,000 SF to 5+ acres. The removal of sensitive habitat (0.50-acre) will be mitigated on-site by preserving 8.478-acres of unoccupied Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub within an established conservation easement, which would reduce the amount of impact to less than significant as addressed in Section V of this report, "Biological Resources". The site is also surrounded by existing single-family residential development on three sides (north, east and west).

The subdivision of one lot into four legal lots would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the area because the existing area is already established with single-family residences on three sides and an existing cemetery to the south and southeast. Access to the subject site would be provided off of Reed Road. The subdivision of one lot into four lots would not adversely alter or impact the existing circulation pattern throughout the surrounding neighborhood, nor preclude the development of surrounding parcels. Therefore the proposed subdivision would not create any new land use barriers, or otherwise divide or disrupt the physical arrangement of the surrounding community. Therefore the project would have a less than significant impact.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan;

The proposed grading for the construction of four residences and the establishment of a fire management area shall require the removal of sensitive habitat, un-occupied Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub (0.50-acres). To compensate for the loss of the un-occupied Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub, the owner shall mitigate on-site with the preservation of 8.478-acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub through an open space conservation easement, which shall be maintained by the owner.

The proposed creation of four graded lots for the construction of four single-family residences would not conflict with any applicable environmental plans since the subject development area does not contain any sensitive species. However, the southeastern portion of the site has been identified on the draft MHCP map as an area designated for 75% preservation. The loss of un-occupied Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub (0.50) can be mitigated for on-site. The eastern portion of the site (8.47-acres) will be placed within a biological conservation easement, which would meet the 75% preservation requirement since 95% of the remaining sensitive habitat would be preserved on site. Therefore the project would not interfere with the preservation of high quality habitat or biological corridors and linkage area identified by the MHCP (Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan).

The project site is not listed as Prime Agricultural Lands as identified in the Final Environmental Impact Report (Figure II-2), which was prepared for the City's General Plan. Therefore, the proposed construction of four single-family residences, driveways, and fire protection areas will not create any planning or land use impacts. The removal of any mature trees on-site would be required to be replaced in conformance with the City's Grading Ordinance with specimen sized trees at a minimum 1:1 ratio.

d. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;

e. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;

f. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings;

The project is located on the top and sides of an identified Intermediate Ridgeline that is depicted on the City's Hillside and Ridgeline Map. Intermediate Ridgelines are described in the City's Ordinance, which are landforms that are between 500 and 900 feet in elevation in the southern portion of the City. This is an undeveloped remnant portion of the ridgeline since residential development has occurred on the ridgeline further north within the county, and to the south within the City of Escondido. Primary views of the project site and ridgeline are from adjacent residential properties to the north and west. General Plan Ridgeline/Hillside Policy D1.3 (page V-18) states that Intermediate Ridges and Hilltops shall be preserved in a natural state to the maximum extent possible.

The Escondido Zoning Code (Grading Ordinance) recommends avoiding development in proximity to Intermediate Ridgelines, but provides the following design guidelines for development on intermediate ridgelines, which would be incorporated into the project conditions.

- 1) Only single-story structures or multiple single-story-stepped structures designed to conform to the site shall be permitted to project above the ridgeline.
- 2) The minimum width of a lot measured parallel to the protected ridge at the proposed building site is not less than two hundred (200);
- 3) Grading should conform to the natural terrain to the extent possible. Extensive manufactured slopes and retaining walls should be avoided. In no case should the top of a ridge be graded to provide a large building pad;
- 4) Any building or structure in proximity to an intermediate ridge should be located and designed to minimize its impact upon the ridgeline. Techniques such as the use of subordinate or hidden location, split foundations adjusted to the slope, single-story structures, roofline following the slope, and colors and materials that blend with the natural environment should be used; and
- 5) Landscaping should be utilized to recreate the linear silhouette and to act as a backdrop for structures. Trees that grow to at least one and a half times the height of the structure should be planted between buildings to eliminate the open gap and blend the rooflines into one continuous silhouette (Sec. 33-1067.F. (d)).

The proposed development proposes lot size of approximately 25,264, 21,344, 31,759, and 541,015 SF, with lot widths of 210' and is consistent with the findings for developing residences adjacent to intermediate ridgelines. In addition parcel 4 would be restricted to building only a single story structure with proposed grading sensitive to the top of the ridge. Landscaping will also be in conformance with the city's landscape ordinance and fire protection plan. Therefore the project would be in conformance with the city grading ordinance and design guidelines for development next to an intermediate ridgeline.

The construction of residential development on the subject site would alter the undeveloped character of the subject site. Existing vegetation would be permanently replaced by residential development and associated infrastructure. Views on-site from surrounding properties would most likely consist of building pads, and one and two-story structures. Conceptual grading includes approximately 4,700 cubic yards of fill and 18,500 cubic yards of cut. Grading Exemptions are requested for fills slopes up to 30' in height, where the city's grading criteria limits the height to 10 feet and for cut slopes up to 30' in height where the city's grading criteria limits the height of cut slopes to 20 feet. The proposed cut slopes are generally interior to the project and primarily would be screened by the future home. Potential impacts would be reduced through implementation of well designed landscaped buffers, preservation of existing native habitat areas on site, and replacement of mature trees in conformance with the City's Landscape and Grading Ordinance and the project's Fire Management Plan. All manufactured slopes would be required to be landscaped in conformance with the City's Landscape Ordinance to screen and soften visual impacts, as well as views from surrounding properties. In addition any grading and subsequent compaction of the site, as necessary, will be per the City of Escondido standards (Article 55, Escondido Zoning Code) and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Also the project would not damage any significant scenic resources within a designated State scenic highway or create an aesthetically offensive site open to the public since the site is not located along a State scenic highway.

- g. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.*

The subdivision of one lot into four lots for the construction of four single-family residences would create a new source of light and glare in the area. The majority of the light will come from the inside of the residences. Any outdoor lighting will be consistent with the City's Outdoor Lighting Ordinance (Article 35 of the Escondido Zoning Code). Therefore, no lighting impacts are anticipated.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, the City has referred to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. The effects of a project on agricultural resources are considered significant if the proposed project would:

- a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use;*
- b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; or,*
- c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?*

The subject site is not listed as Prime Agricultural Lands as identified in the General Plan Final EIR, which was prepared for the City's most recent General Plan revisions in 2000. The surrounding area has changed over the years from agricultural uses to residential development on most sides of the subject site. Although the site has been used for agricultural purposes, the agricultural operations on the subject site ceased long ago, and only remnants of the existing grove still remain on the site. The property is not involved in any Williamson Act Contract or other agricultural land contract. Therefore, the proposed creation of four legal graded lots for the construction of four single-family residences would not result in any significant individual or cumulative impacts to agricultural resources.

III. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

According to the City of Escondido Environmental Quality Regulation (Article 47, Sec. 33-924), impacts are considered significant if the project:

- 1. Causes the level of service (LOS) of a circulation element street to fall below a mid-range of LOS "D" and /or adds more than 200 ADT to a circulation element street with a LOS below the mid-range "D" yet above LOS "F". According to the Escondido General Plan, the minimum acceptable LOS is "C";*
- 2. Exceeds, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads and highways;*
- 3. Results in a change of air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or in a location that results in substantial safety risks or increased hazards due to a design feature; or,*
- 4. Results in inadequate emergency access or parking capacity, or conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).*

5. *General Plan Circulation Policy D2.3 states that: "...Due to the physical design characteristics, environmental resource considerations, existing development, freeway interchange impacts and incomplete system improvements, level of service "C" may not be feasible in all areas at all times. However, level of service "C" should be pursued in the ultimate implementation of the circulation system."*

The Engineering Division has indicated that the creation of four legal pads for the purpose of constructing four single-family residences would add an additional forty-eight trips (48) and would not materially degrade the level of service on the adjacent street (Reed Road) and intersection (Falconer Road & Reed Road) since all street improvements are currently constructed. Reed Road is classified as a Local Collector Street with a 66-foot right of way. A public street will be constructed off of Reed Road for parcel 1, 2 and 3 and a private driveway shall be provided for Parcel 4 in-conformance with the City's design standards. Therefore, the project will not have a significant impact on transportation circulation.

IV. AIR QUALITY

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

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

- a. *Conflicts with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;*
- b. *Violates any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;*
- c. *Results 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors;*
- d. *Exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or,*
- e. *Creates objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.*

City of Escondido Significance Criteria:

Project related impacts exceeding any of the following South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) daily emissions criteria can be considered significant:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| • Carbon Monoxide (CO) | 550 lbs |
| • Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) | 55 lbs |
| • Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) | 55 lbs |
| • Fine Particulate Matter (PM) | 150 lbs |

The project area is within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). Air quality at a particular location is a function of the kinds and amounts of pollutants being emitted into the air locally, and throughout the basin, and the dispersal rates of pollutants within the region. The major factors affecting pollutant dispersion are wind, speed and direction, the vertical dispersion of pollutants (which is affected by inversions) and the local topography. The air basin currently is designated a state and federal non-attainment area for ozone and particulate matter. However, in the SDAB, part of the ozone contamination is derived from the South Coast Air Basin (located in the Los Angeles area). This occurs during periods of westerly winds (Santa Ana condition) when air pollutants are windborne over the ocean, drift to the south and then, when the westerly winds cease, are blown easterly into the SDAB. Local agencies can control neither the source nor transportation of pollutants from outside the basin.

The Air Pollution Control District (APCD) policy therefore, has been to control local sources effectively enough to reduce locally produced contamination to clean air standards. The proposed creation of four legal graded lots for the construction of four single-family residences is not anticipated to significantly deteriorate air quality although it would generate short-term emission of air-pollutants during construction. Dust or particulate matter emission would be generated by the grading needed for the structures. With the appropriate use of best management practices for standard grading procedures, the project would not generate significant emissions of particulate matter or dust.

Construction-Related Emissions

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

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

Typical earthwork operations would include clearing, grubbing, and general pad and road alignment formation. Proposed on site grading anticipates approximately 4,700 cubic yards of fill material, 18,500 cubic yards of cut, with a total export of approximately 13,800 cubic yards. Construction equipment primarily would be utilized in an incremental fashion over the course of the construction of the project. The volume of export would result in approximately 2,400 two-way truck trips. Since the duration of the grading for the project is estimated to be completed in three months, the average number of truck trips per day would be 40. That equals to 80 passenger cars. Truck trips would be coordinated to avoid conflict with the peak hours of school traffic. All roadway segments and intersections are currently operating at an acceptable level of service. The temporary traffic impact resulted from the project grading will not materially degrade the level of service of the surrounding intersections and roadway segments. Due to the amount of site preparation needed for construction and grading of four single-family residences, roads and driveways, the air quality impact is anticipated to be well below the annual thresholds of significance. Maximum daily emissions of NOx during construction periods are not projected to exceed City thresholds or APCD standards based on similar studies performed for similar size grading operations. Construction activities also are a source of fugitive dust emissions that may be a substantial, but temporary impact on local air quality. Dust from grading and other site preparation would generate particulate matter emission. Due to the appropriate use of grading and operation procedures (in conformance with Best Management Practice for dust control), the project would not generate significant particulate matter or dust. The City of Escondido Grading Ordinance and Erosion Control requirements include provisions for dust control to reduce impacts to air quality during grading and construction activities. At a minimum, these ordinances and provisions require projects to perform regular watering and timely revegetation of disturbed areas to minimize the dust and airborne nuisance impacts to off-site receptors. Emissions from construction equipment, worker and delivery and material-hauling trucks, and construction-related power consumption would be temporary and would result in an extremely small contribution to the SDAB and therefore would not result in a significant impact.

Odors

During construction, diesel equipment operating at the site may generate some nuisance odors. However, due to the temporary nature of construction, odors associated with the project construction would not be considered significant.

Global Climate Change

Global climate change alleged to be caused by greenhouse gases (GHG) is currently one of the important and widely debated scientific, economic, and political issues in the United States. Global climate change is a change in the average weather of the earth, which can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. With the adoption of AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, the State of California has determined that global warming proposes a serious threat to the State's economy, public health and environment.

As such, actions which may contribute to global warming are beginning to be addressed in CEQA documents. The adopted legislation defines the greenhouse gasses to be considered and regulated as follows: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride.

An individual project of this scale and minor nature would not generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Greenhouse gas emissions occur in a worldwide system and the project does participate in this potential impact through its incremental contribution, which is combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases. There currently are no published thresholds for measuring the significance of a project's cumulative contribution to global climate change. The State of California currently is working to define the greenhouse gas inventory which existed in 1990 to provide a statewide benchmark against which to measure progress. Once that inventory is determined, AB 32 measures future acceptable emissions against that standard over a period of several years. Although the incremental contribution to greenhouse gases (GHG) is not considered significant due to the relatively small size and potential impact from the project, newer projects throughout the City of Escondido continue to implement certain California Air Resources Board Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies.

V. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on biological resources are considered to be significant if the proposed project would:

- 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;*
- 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;*
- c. *Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means;*
- 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;*
- e. *Conflict with any local policies/ ordinance that protect biological resources (e.g. tree preservation policy or ordinance); or,*

- f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.*

The project includes a request for the removal of sensitive habitat from the project's site for the construction of four single-family residences and a fire management area. A biological report was prepared for the project by Vincent N. Scheidt, Biological Consultant; dated May 28, 2009 and revised on July 16, 2009. The purpose of the biological surveys was to document and map the size, location and the general quality of all habitat types and the potential presence of any sensitive resource (Plant or Wildlife) on site. Three types of habitat were documented on site: Disturbed Vegetation, Agriculture (avocado groves) and unoccupied Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub. The avocado groves that currently exist on site south and west of Parcel 3, east and north of parcel 4 are to remain.

The project requires the removal of 0.50-acres of unoccupied Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub for the development of a pad and fuel management area for parcel 4. Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub is considered sensitive by the City of Escondido, CDFG, USFWS, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub is known to be the habitat for the Coastal California Gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica*), a small resident bird dependent primarily on Sage Scrub. Surveys and site visits were conducted on the project site to determine the presence or absence of the species. Based on the surveys and field work conducted, no California Gnatcatchers were present or occupied the site. According to the biological report prepared for the project site the biologist determined the quality of Coastal Sage Scrub present is of "High Quality". In order to reduce the impact to Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub below a level of significance, the owner proposes to mitigate on-site with the preservation on 8.478-acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub through a conservation easement. The Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub presently identified on site is of high value, and connects to off-site areas to the south, east and west adjoining slopes. However, most of the Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub on site and adjoining the site was burned in the wildfires in October of 2007. The habitat is currently re-growing gradually and according to the Biological report dated July 16, 2009 it is anticipated that the Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub will fully re-grow. The southeastern portion of the project is a part of a biological corridor and linkage area as identified by the draft MHCP (Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan), which requires 75% of sensitive habitat to be preserved. Therefore, with the preservation of 8.478-acres (or 95% being preserved) on site in a conservation easement, the proposed creation of four lots for the construction of four single-family residences would not have any significant, adverse or cumulative impacts on the biological resources.

Mitigation Measures:

With the implementation of the following mitigation measures, the project impact will be reduced below the level of significance.

1. To compensate for the loss of 0.50-acres of unoccupied Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub, the owner shall establish an open space conservation easement on-site (Parcel 4) over the remaining 8.478-acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub, as shown on the graph (figure 2) in the biological report prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt, Biological Consultant, dated July 16, 2009. The easement shall be shown and established on the final parcel map to the satisfaction of the Planning and Engineering Divisions prior to issuance of grading permits. (Mitigation Measure).

2. Prior to issuance of grading permits, temporary protective fencing shall be installed around the conservation easement to prevent human and pet entrance, to the satisfaction of the Planning Division. The location and detail of the fence shall be shown on the final grading and landscaping plans to the satisfaction of the Planning Division (Mitigation Measure).
3. The clearing and grubbing of, and construction adjacent to, sensitive habitat shall occur outside of the gnatcatcher breeding season (February 15 to August 31). If the project construction, including clearing and grubbing of sensitive habitats is necessary on the project site or adjacent to sensitive habitat during the gnatcatcher breeding season, a qualified biologist shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Wildlife Agencies that all nesting is complete. The pre-construction survey shall begin not more than three (3) days prior to the beginning of construction activities (Mitigation Measure).
4. Protective barriers or fencing (temporary) shall be placed around the drip-line of any and all mature/protected trees that are designated to remain. The barricades or fencing are to remain in place until completion of all grading and construction and shall be shown on the final grading and landscape plans to the satisfaction of the Planning Division (Mitigation Measure).
5. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the location and details of permanent identification markers along the boundary of the conservation easement shall be shown on the final grading and landscape plans to the satisfaction of the Planning Division (Mitigation Measure).
6. Prior to final approval of the grading and removal of the temporary fencing, permanent identification markers shall be installed along the boundary between the development area and/or fuel management zones on Parcel 4 and the conservation area to delineate the edging of the conservation easement (Mitigation Measure).

VI. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on cultural resources are considered to be significant if the proposed project would:

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5;
- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5;
- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or,
- d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

The proposed development of four single-family residences would not result in the alteration of any significant archaeological or paleontological resources since there are no physical indications to conclude that any of these resources might exist on the subject site. The property also is not known for its archaeological/paleontological activity. No significant paleontological impact has been identified for the project site and no prehistoric resources have been previously recorded on the subject site. The City of Escondido General Plan EIR (1990a) does not include the project site in areas identified as having potential paleontological resources. The site does not appear to contain any indicators of significant cultural resources or geologic features. The site also does not contain any resources listed on the City's Historic Sites. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact to these resources and no mitigation is required. However, as a project conditions of approval, prior to

commencement of grading operations, the applicant would be required to provide evidence that the Native American tribes (in a list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission) have been contacted and given the opportunity to address any cultural issues or concerns by being allowed to observe or monitor grading activities. If any resources are discovered during construction activities, the tribes shall be notified.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on geology and soils are considered to be significant if the proposed project would:

- a. *Expose people or structures to potentially 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).*
 - ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking;*
 - iii. *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or,*
 - iv. *Landslides.*

Although Escondido is located within a Seismic Zone 4, the project site is not located within proximity to active faults as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. The closest known active faults are the Rose Canyon Fault and the Elsinore Fault. The Rose Canyon Fault is located 15.4 miles southwest of the project site. The Julian segment of the Elsinore Fault is approximately 17.8 miles northeast of the project site. Accordingly, fault surface rupture is not likely at this project. In the event of a major earthquake on these faults or other faults within the Southern California region, the site could be subjected to moderate to severe ground shaking. However, the site is not considered to possess a significantly greater seismic risk than that of the surrounding area in general.

- b. *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;*
- 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 on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; or,*
- d. *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.*

The current site slopes downward from the northwest towards the southeast corner of the site. The low point of the site is at the northwestern corner approximately 870 feet above mean sea level (MSL), while the high point is at the southeast approximately 1005 feet above mean sea level (MSL). There is an intermediate ridgeline on the subject site located to the southeast of parcel 3 that runs north and south direction intersecting parcel 4. Parcel 4 is currently surrounded by an avocado grove to the north, west and east. To the south of Parcel 4 at a lower elevation is an existing cemetery (North County Cemetery). The subject site (parcel 4) will be required to conform to the city's grading ordinance for developing on an intermediate ridgeline. As part of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map and Grading Exemptions, grading is proposed to create building pads for four single-family residences, which would include approximately 18,500 cubic yards of cut and 4,700 cubic yards of fill, for a total export of 13,800 cubic yards.

Much of the subject site is located in the 25-35% slope category. Conceptual grading is proposed for all four lots. However, one lot (Parcel 4) will not be consistent with the City's Grading Ordinance, since the proposed parcel proposes two grading exemptions with one fill slope in excess of 10 feet in height and within 50 feet of the property line and one cut slope in excess of 20 feet high and within 50 feet of the property line.

However, the proposed grading exemptions would not have any significant visual impact or damage any hillside or ridgeline. The 30' fill slope would be located to the east of the building pad area for parcel 4 and would be screened by the existing avocado groves. The 30' cut slope would be located to the west of the building pad area for parcel 4 and would be fully landscaped in accordance with the city's landscape ordinance for slope plant and in accordance with the approved fire protection plan. The proposed manufactured slopes would not block adjacent views due to the orientation of the slopes and the topography of the area. Appropriate slope landscaping also would be provided to screen and soften visual effects of the manufactured slopes as well as views from surrounding properties. Any grading and subsequent compaction of the site, as necessary, would be per City standards to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. All future grading or compaction of the site would be reviewed to ensure that it's consistent with the grading ordinance and City standards to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. No significant impacts are anticipated.

- 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.*

The project site would be served by an existing wastewater/sewer pipeline system within the City of Escondido. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system would be utilized as part of the project.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on hazards and hazardous materials are considered to be significant if the proposed project would:

- a. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;*
- 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;*
- c. *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or,*
- d. *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment*

Due to the residential nature of the development and the lack of hazardous materials associated with the proposed residential development, the project would not result in the creation of any health hazard, the release of any hazardous substance, or the exposure of people to potential health hazards. In addition, the project would comply with all applicable building and fire codes.

The project site is not located near an airport or private airstrip and the site has not been identified on the Hazardous Waste Sites List which is published by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CAL/EPA) through the County Health Department's HMM (Hazardous Material Management Division). Therefore, no significant hazards or hazardous material impacts would occur.

No significant odors, pools of liquid, significantly stained soils, indicators of underground storage tanks, pits or ponds were observed on the site. No evidence or indication of releases of petroleum hydrocarbons, heavy metals, hazardous chemicals, or other "recognized environmental conditions" have been revealed at the subject site in its present or previous conditions.

The project does not involve the use or storage of hazardous materials that would result in a reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions. The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school. Water for the site would be provided by the Escondido Municipal Water District from existing mains located within the adjacent streets/easements. No groundwater wells would be used to supply water for the site. Accordingly, the project will not create a significant risk of upset or hazard to human health and safety.

- 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, impacts would occur if the project results in safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; or,*
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, the project results in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; or,*
- g. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or,*
- h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.*

The project is not located within an airport land-use plan, an airport land-use plan that is to be adopted, or within 2 miles of a public airport. The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

Based on the comments from the Police and Fire Departments the project does not include activities or structures that would impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an emergency response plan. The project would be required to comply with all applicable Fire, Building, and Health and Safety Code, which would eliminate any potential risk of upset.

The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild fires since the site is located within a suburban setting and fire protection measures will be implemented. The current zoning is RE-20 (Residential Estates, 20,000 SF minimum lot sizes) and RE-80 (Residential Estates 80,000 SF minimum lot sizes) which promotes single-family urban development on larger estate sized lots. The project is surrounded by single-family residential development on the west, east and north side, with agricultural lands to the south/east and the cemetery located directly to the south. The site has been identified as being within a High Fire Severity Zone by the City's Fire Department. Properties located within a high fire severity zone are required to provide fire protection measures for each residence (example: fire sprinklers, enhanced construction etc...) and establish a fuel management area.

In addition to enhanced construction materials for future buildings the development is required to clear and trim vegetation off-site, which would require a small portion off-site in the southwestern area on the existing North County Cemetery site. With the consensus of the owner of the adjacent site (North County Cemetery) the proposed development has acquired the right to trim some of the natural vegetation within that area (outlined on the fire protection map), thus maintaining an adequate firebreak from the future residence to be constructed on parcel 4.

Parcel 4 shall also be required to provide a 20,000 gallon water tank on site, which will be supplied with water from the East Grove Reservoir. A pumping system would boost the pressure at the outlet point of the water tank to accomplish adequate pressure (20 pounds per square inch) for fire protection. Domestic water use and fire sprinklers would be supplied through a second pump placed on the private side of the water meter. Therefore, with a combination of fire protection construction used on all residences, a fuel management area established for each parcel and a 20,000 gallon water tank to serve parcel 4 due to the lack of water pressure from the street, the amount of risk and loss involving wildfires will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

With the implementation of the following mitigation measure, the project impact will be reduced below the level of significance.

1. To compensate for the loss of adequate water pressure to serve parcel 4, the owner shall construct a 20,000 gallon water tank (minimum 10,000 gal Fire suppression/10,000 gal Irrigation) as shown on the fire exhibit map in the fire protection plan prepared by Mr. David C. Bacon, dated May 5, 2009. The proposed water tank shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to issuance of grading permits. (Mitigation Measure).

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on hydrology and water quality are considered to be significant if the proposed project would:

- a. *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including but not limited to increasing pollutant discharges to receiving waters (Consider temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants);*
- b. *Have potentially significant adverse impacts on ground water quality, including but not limited to, substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted);*
- c. *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner which would result in substantial/increased erosion or siltation on- or off-site;*

- d. *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site and/or significant adverse environmental impacts;*
- e. *Cause significant alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction;*
- f. *Cause an increase of impervious surfaces and associated runoff;*
- g. *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;*
- h. *Cause potentially significant adverse impact on ground water quality;*
- i. *Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or ground water receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses;*
- j. *Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, can it result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired;*
- n. *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality;*
- k. *Create or exacerbate already existing environmentally sensitive areas;*
- l. *Create potentially significant environmental impact on surface water quality, to either marine, fresh, or wetland waters; or,*
- m. *Impact aquatic, wetland or riparian habitat.*

The subject site is undeveloped and relatively steep. The amount of run-off from the site would be expected to increase once the site is developed due to the amount of impervious surfaces associated with the proposed construction of four single-family residences (i.e. roofs, driveways, hardscape, etc.). The project would be required to comply with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) standards; consequently, the Engineering Department has determined that runoff from the project would not be considered significant and the project would not materially degrade the existing drainage facilities. The City would provide sewer and water service from mains located within the adjacent street (Reed Road); consequently, no significant impact is expected to occur to the groundwater. The project is outside the 100-year flood plain area as identified on current Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). Therefore, the project site is not subject to potential flooding, landslides or mudflows.

Typical urban pollutants associated with this type of project include oil, grease, solvents, antifreeze, cleaners, various fluids and fuels, trash/debris, fertilizers, and organic matter, which require proper use, storage, and disposal. Under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Permit issued in 1990 to the County of San Diego and to the City of Escondido, as one of the co-permittees, all development and significant redevelopment is obligated to implement structural and non-structural non-point source pollution control measures known as Best Management Practices (BMPs) to limit urban pollutants reaching the waters of the U.S. to the maximum extent practical. The NPDES permit requires the preparation of a site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The implementation of this permit system requires that specific management practices be implemented at the time of construction.

The project would not withdraw groundwater or interfere with groundwater recharge and groundwater table level. Grading operations associated with the project development are not expected to impact groundwater or be a factor during removal and any recompaction onsite. Water service to the site would be provided by the City of Escondido with nominal extensions of nearby facilities. Standard BMPs would be implemented during construction to adequately control erosion and siltation impacts to a less than significant level.

Proper use of erosion and sediment control measures as well as BMPs (which are standard requirements as part of the grading permit) would reduce potential water quality impacts to less than significant. The project does not include activities that would discharge pollutants into groundwater aquifers.

- o. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map;*
- p. Place project within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows;*
- q. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or,*
- r. Inundate the site by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.*

The project site is located outside the 100-year flood zone according to SanGIS. Therefore, no structures would impede or redirect flood flows. The project does not propose to construct a levee or dam and would not otherwise expose people or structures to a significant risk of flooding. The project does not include activities that would increase the risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on mineral resources are considered to be significant if the proposed project would:

- 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; or,*
- 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.*

No known locally important mineral resource recovery site is located on the project site or within the vicinity of the project site. The project would not change the existing availability of mineral resources that would be of value to the region and residents of the state. Therefore, no significant impact to mineral resources would occur as a result of the project.

XI. NOISE

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on noise are considered to be significant if the proposed project would result in:

- a. Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;*
- b. Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels;*
- c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; or,*
- d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.*

Noise generally is defined as loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or undesired sound that is typically associated with human activity and that interferes with or disrupts normal activities. The human environment is characterized by a certain consistent noise level which varies by location and is termed ambient noise. The City's General Plan Noise Element contains policies which outline acceptable noise levels associated with each type of land use. A 60 dBA CNEL exposure is considered normally acceptable for residential land uses. The City requires that noise levels be presented in terms of Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). CNEL is a weighted sound level during a 24-hour period.

The addition of 5 decibels (dB) to average sound levels at evening hours (7 PM to 10 PM) and 10dB to the average night hours (10 PM to 7AM) is applied to account for noise sensitivity during evening and nighttime hours. The grading, clearing and the construction of four single-family residences may generate some short-term noise, but adherence to the restrictions of the Noise Ordinance would result in no negative noise 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, significant impact would occur if the project exposed people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or ,*
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, if the project exposed people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.*

No private or public airstrips are located within 2 miles of the proposed project site; thus, people residing or working in the project area would not be exposed to excessive noise levels due to airport operations.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on population and housing are considered to be significant if the proposed project would:

- a. Induce substantial 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)?*
- b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*
- c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

Population within the surrounding area and city would incrementally increase with the construction of four single-family residences. The site is located within a developed residential area of the city. Therefore, the proposed construction of four single-family residences would not significantly alter the location, distribution or population density within the area, nor would it adversely impact the City's housing demand.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on public services are considered to be significant if the proposed project would:

- a. 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 objectives for any of the public services:

h. Fire protection

The proposed project would result in a minimal increase in demand for City Fire services. The City Fire Department has indicated their ability to adequately serve the proposed project and no significant impacts to fire services are anticipated (reference discussion section VIII). However, the project site will be required to install a 20,000 gallon water tank that will be supplied with water from the East Grove Reservoir.

A pumping system will boost the pressure at the outlet point of the water tank to accomplish adequate pressure (20 pounds per square inch) for fire protection (as discussed in section VIII). The area is currently served by Fire Station No 5, located at 2319 Felicita Rd.

ii. Police protection

Development of the site would result in an incremental increase in demand for Police Services. The Escondido Police Department indicated their ability to adequately serve the proposed project and no significant impacts to police services are anticipated.

iii. Schools

The site is within the Escondido Union School District and the Escondido Union High School District. School District boundaries are determined by the school districts. The Escondido Elementary School District and the Escondido High School District have indicated with past projects that due to the continuing growth throughout the area, they are unable to meet the Quality-of-Life Standards approved within the City of Escondido's General Plan without mitigation of student housing needs generated by new development. The incremental impact of proposed projects on the school system would be offset by the future impact fees collected upon issuance of building permits. These fees are set by the school district. The proposed subdivision of one lot into four lots and the construction of four single-family residences would have no significant impact on the school system.

iv. Parks

The project would not result in an incremental increase in demand on the City's recreational facilities. The project would not affect existing recreational opportunities since the site currently is not used for recreational activities and is not listed as a potential park site in the City's Master Plan of Parks, Trails and Open Space. Therefore, no significant impact to recreational resources would occur as a result of the project.

v. Libraries

The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities or staff, since the development of the four proposed residential lots would not result in a significant increase in demand on library services, or the development of additional library spaces, books or other related items.

vi. *Gas/Electric*

The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered SDG&E facilities. In addition current services are available within an adjacent street (Reed Road).

XIV RECREATION

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on public services are considered to be significant if the proposed project would:

- 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;*
- 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;*

The proposed subdivision of one lot into four lots for the construction of four single-family residences would not cause an incremental increase in demand on the City's recreational facilities. The proposal will not impact the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities since no recreational opportunities currently exist on the site. The project site is not listed as a potential park site in the City's Master Plan of Parks and Trails. However, the City Master Plan of Parks and Trails does indicate that this site is required to provide a 10' wide minimum spur trail across the frontage of the property along Reed Road (south side). According to the City's Master Plan of Parks and Trails a Spur Trail provides direct linage between Urban and Rural trails and they are to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists in the street, and may also be designed with an unpaved separate path for equestrians. The projects design does incorporate a 10' Spur Trail along the frontage of the project adjacent to Reed Road. Therefore, no significant impact to recreational resources would occur as a result of the project.

XV. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Significance Criteria and Impact Analysis

The effects of a project on utilities and service systems are considered to be significant if the proposed project would:

- a. *exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board;*
- b. *require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;*
- c. *require, or result in, the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;*
- d. *have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed;*
- e. *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;*

- f. *be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs;*
- g. *comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste;*

Solid Waste – Escondido Disposal, Inc. (EDI) currently provides solid waste removal service for the Escondido area. EDI also operates a solid waste transfer station at their Washington Avenue site where solid waste is consolidated into larger transfer trucks and taken to a Class III landfill for disposal. Solid waste pick-up will be available for the project by EDI for all phases of the project implementation.

Sewer/Water Service – Adequate public facilities are available. Sewer service can be provided to the project with nominal extensions of nearby facilities. The Engineering Division has indicated that city sewer is available off of Reed Road. Water service shall be provided by Escondido Municipal Water District from a main in Reed Road. In addition, parcel 4 shall be provided with a 20,000 gallon water tank for fire protection. Since the area surrounding the project site has been previously developed with, and the site can be served by public water, sewer and utility services, the proposed project would not result in a need for a new service.

Drainage Facilities – The Engineering Division has indicated that the construction of four single-family residences would not require the construction of new storm drains or adversely impact existing facilities. Drainage from the subject site shall be directed towards an existing drainage facility that runs northerly along the west property line and ties into an existing drainage facility. A drainage study would be required to determine the extent of drainage facilities necessary to control runoff. No significant drainage impacts are anticipated based upon the proposed grading plan and the anticipated residential use of the site.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

With the mitigation of the removal of CSS, the project is not expected to have any significant impacts, either long-term or short term, nor will it cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. With the establishment on-site of 8.4-acre open space, the project will not degrade the quality of the environment for plant or animal communities since the project will not cause fish and wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels nor reduce the number or restrict the range of endangered plants or animals. The project will not materially degrade levels of service of the adjacent streets, intersection or utilities. Therefore, in staff's opinion, the proposed project would not have a significant individual or cumulative impact to the environment.

Materials Use in Preparation of this Analysis

Escondido General Plan and Environmental Impact Report

Escondido General Plan Update and Environmental Impact Report, 2000

Escondido Zoning Code and Land Use Maps

SANDAG Summary of Trip Generation Rates

Escondido Historic Sites Survey

City of Escondido

Engineering Division

Building Division

Fire Department

Police Department

Planning Division

Utilities Division

Site Visits

FIRM maps (Flood Insurance Rate Maps)

Draft MHCP maps (Multiple Habitat Conservation Program)

USGS Map for San Diego (Escondido) area

County of San Diego Health Department, Hazardous Material Management Division (HMMD) Hazardous Sites List

Escondido Drainage Master Plan (1995)

Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP) on How to Analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents (Comment Draft, March 5, 2007).

Biological Assessment Report prepared in May 2009 by Vincent N. Scheidt, Biological Consultant & revised July 2009.

Fire Protection Plan prepared in May 2008 by David C. Bacon, Firewise 2000 Inc & revised May 2009.

Project Description and Preliminary Information



CITY OF ESCONDIDO
 PLANNING DIVISION
 201 NORTH BROADWAY
 ESCONDIDO, CA 92025-2798
 (760) 839-4671

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ENFORCEABLE COMMITMENT

Case No.: SUB08-0030 /PHG08-0041

The items listed on the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program/Report constitute an enforceable commitment in conformance with Section 21081.6(b) of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21178). The applicant shall be required to provide, and comply with, all of the mitigation measures listed herein. These mitigation measures also have been included as conditions of the project approval.

3-18-10 PAUL MAYER, LESLIE MAYER 
 Date Applicant's Name (printed) Applicant's Signature

**ATTACHMENT "A"
MITIGATION MONITORING REPORT**

PROJECT NAME: Mr. Paul Mayer and Leslie Mayer

CASE NO. SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Four lot Tentative Parcel Map, Grading Exemptions, removal of 0.50-acres of CSS, establishment of a Fuel Management Area, including off-site areas and an on-site 20,000 gallon water tank for Parcel 4.

PROJECT LOCATION: 3200 Reed Road

APPROVAL BODY/DATE:
PROJECT MANAGER: Darren Parker

CONTACT PERSON: Mr. Frank Fitzpatrick
PHONE NUMBER: (760) 741-9921

Phase at which the Mitigation Measures are to be implemented

NATURE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	IDENTIFICATION, NO. LOCATION IN DOC.	RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENT.	CERTIFIED INITIAL/DATE	COMMENTS
<p>PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF GRADING, BUILDING AND LANDSCAPING PLANS Removal of 0.50-acres of Coastal Sage Scrub</p>	<p>To compensate for the loss of 0.50-acres of unoccupied Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub, the owner shall establish a conservation easement on-site (Parcel 4) over the remaining 8.478-acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub, as shown on the graph (figure 2) in the biological report prepared by Mr. Vincent N. Scheidt, Biological Consultant, dated July 16, 2009. The easement shall be shown and established on the final parcel map to the satisfaction of the Planning and Engineering Divisions prior to issuance of grading permits.</p>	<p>Biological Resources (5). Mitigation Measure #1 (SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041)</p>	<p>Applicant</p>		
<p>Temporary Protective fencing to be installed</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permits, temporary protective fencing shall be installed around the conservation easement to prevent human and pet entrance, to the satisfaction of the Planning Division. The location and detail of the fence shall be shown on the final grading and landscaping plans to the satisfaction of the Planning Division.</p>	<p>Biological Resource (5). Mitigation Measure #2 (SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041)</p>	<p>Applicant</p>		

NATURE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	IDENTIFICATION, NO. LOCATION IN DOC.	RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENT.	CERTIFIED INITIAL/DATE	COMMENTS
Clearing & Grubbing of Sensitive Habitat	The clearing and grubbing of, and construction adjacent to, sensitive habitat shall occur outside of the gnatcatcher breeding season (February 15 to August 31). If the project construction, including clearing and grubbing of sensitive habitats is necessary on the project site or adjacent to sensitive habitat during the gnatcatcher breeding season, a qualified biologist shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Wildlife Agencies that all nesting is complete. The pre-construction survey shall begin not more than three (3) days prior to the beginning of construction activities	Biological Resources (5). Mitigation Measure #3 (SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041)	Applicant		
Temporary Protective fencing to be installed	Prior to issuance of grading permits, temporary protective fencing shall be installed around the drip-line of all mature/protected trees that are designated to remain. The barricades or fencing are to remain in place until completion of all grading and construction. The location and detail of the protective fencing shall be shown on the grading and landscaping plans.	Biological Resources (5). Mitigation Measure #4 (SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041)	Applicant		
Delineate Permanent Markers	Prior to issuance of grading permits, the location and details of permanent identification markers along the boundary of the conservation easement shall be shown on the final grading and landscape plans, to the satisfaction of the Planning Division.	Biological Resources (5). Mitigation Measure #5 (SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041)	Applicant		

Phase at which the Mitigation Measures are to be implemented

NATURE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	IDENTIFICATION, NO. LOCATION IN DOC.	RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENT.	CERTIFIED INITIAL/DATE	COMMENTS
<p>PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL OF GRADING, BUILDING AND LANDSCAPING plans</p> <p>Biological Resources (5)</p> <p>Permanent markers to be installed</p>	Prior to final approval of the grading and removal of the temporary fencing, permanent identification markers shall be installed along the boundary between the development area and/or fuel management zones on Parcel 4 and the conservation area to delineate the edge of the conservation easement.	Biological Resources (5). Mitigation Measure #6 (SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041)	Applicant		

Phase at which the Mitigation Measures are to be implemented

NATURE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	IDENTIFICATION NO. LOCATION IN DOC.	RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENT.	CERTIFIED INTIAL/DATE	COMMENTS
<p>PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF GRADING, BUILDING AND LANDSCAPING plans HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (8)</p> <p>Adequate Water Pressure</p>	<p>To compensate for the loss of adequate water pressure to serve Parcel 4, the owner shall construct a 20,000 gallon water tank (minimum 10,000 gal Fire suppression/10,000 gal Irrigation) as shown on the fire exhibit map in the fire protection plan prepared by Mr. David C. Bacon. The proposed water tank shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to issuance of grading permits.</p>	<p>Hazards and Hazardous Materials (8). Mitigation Measure #1 (SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041)</p>	<p>Applicant</p>		



Environmental Checklist Form

- 1. Project title: SUB08-0030 & PHG08-0041
2. Lead agency name and address: City of Escondido, 201 N. Broadway, Escondido, CA 92025
3. Contact person and phone number: Darren Parker, Assistant Planner II (760) 839-4553
4. Project location: On the south side of Reed Road, just east of Citrus Avenue and east of Bear Valley Parkway, addressed as 3200 Reed Road (APN 240-190-61 & 64)
5. Project sponsor's name and address: Paul Myer, 3271 White Hawk Road, Escondido, CA 92027
6. General Plan designation: E2 (Estate II)
7. Zoning: RE-20 (Residential Estates 20,000 SF minimum lot size) & RE-80 zone (Residential Estates 80,000 SF minimum lot size)
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
A request to subdivide a undeveloped parcel 14.37-acres in size into 4-lots with lot sizes of 25,264 SF (Parcel 1), 21,344 SF (Parcel 2), 31,759 SF (Parcel 3), and 541,015 SF (Parcel 4), Grading Exemptions and for the removal of 0.50-acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub and the establishment of a Fuel Management Area. The Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub will be mitigated on-site by preserving 8.478-acres of Coastal Sage Scrub through the establishment of an conservation easement. The proposed grading exemptions include one, 2:1 fill slope up to 30' high and a 2:1 cut slope up to 30' high on parcel 4.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting (briefly describe the project's surroundings):
North: SP zone (Specific Planning Area) immediately to the north of the subject site across Reed Road is an existing single-family housing development, consisting of smaller sized lots approximately 20,400 SF +/-
South: RA-5 zone (Residential Agricultural, 5-acre minimum lot size) immediately to the south and southwest of the subject site is an existing cemetery (North County Cemetery). The cemetery is at lower elevation than the subject site.
East: SP zone (Specific Planning Area) and RA-5 zone (Residential Agricultural, 5-acre minimum lot size), directly to the east and northeast of the subjects site is undeveloped parcel (28.7-acres in size) with an existing avocado, grove. The property located to the east is at a lower elevation than the subject site.
West: RE-20 (Residential Estates, 20,000 SF minimum lot size) directly to the west of the subject site are several existing single-family residences on 1+acre size lots. Parcels 1, 2 & 3 are approximately at the same elevation as the adjacent properties, parcel 4 will be at a higher elevation approximately 70 feet higher.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below potentially would be affected by this project involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Agriculture Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION shall be prepared.
- I find that, although the proposed project might have a significant effect on the environment, there would not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by, or agreed to, the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION shall be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project might have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT shall be required.
- I find that the proposed project might have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT shall be required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that, although the proposed project might have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further shall be required.



Signature

Darren Parker, Assistant Planner II

Printed Name

3/23/10

Date

For

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 would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including off-site, 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 might occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect might be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries once the determination is made, an EIR shall be required.
4. "Negative Declaration: 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 (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where it is available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of an adequately analyzed 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 Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which 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 references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist (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. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies normally should address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance of 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 significant

SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Physically divide an established community? (1,3,8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with any applicable land-use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (1,2,3,8,10,11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (1,2,3,5,8,11,12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (3,8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (3,7,8,9,10,12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (3,8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (1,2,8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (1,2,3,8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? (1,2,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

III. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (1,2,4,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (1,2,4,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (4,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (4,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? (3,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (4,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IV. AIR QUALITY

Where applicable, 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 applicable air quality plan? (1,2,3,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (1,2,3,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (1,2,3,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

V. 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (1,2,8,9,10,11,12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (3,8,9,10,11,12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally projected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (3,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (3,8,9,10,11,12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (3,8,9,10,11,12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (3,8,9,10,11,12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

VI. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (3,7,8,9,10)
- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (3,7,8,9,10,12)
- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (8,9,10,12)
- d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (8,9,10,12)

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- a. Expose people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: (3,8,9,10)
 - 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. (3,8,9,10)
 - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (8,9,10)
 - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (8,9,10)
 - iv. Landslides? (8,9,10)
- b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (8,9,10)
- 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 on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (8,9,10)
- d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (8,9,10)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VIII. 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? (3,6,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (3,6,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (3,6,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (3,6,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (3,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (3,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (8,9,10,12,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including but not limited to increasing pollutant discharges to receiving waters (Consider temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants)? (3,5,8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have potentially significant adverse impacts on ground water quality, including but not limited to, substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (5,8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner which would result in substantial/increased erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (8,9,10,11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site and/or significant adverse environmental impacts? (8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Cause significant alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction? (8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Cause an increase of impervious surfaces and associated run-off? (8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Cause potentially significant adverse impact on ground water quality? (3,5,8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i. Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or ground water receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses? (8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j. Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, can it result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired? (3,8,9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
k. Create or exacerbate already existing environmentally sensitive areas? (8,9,10,11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
l. Create potentially significant environmental impact on surface water quality, to either marine, fresh, or wetland waters? (8,9,10,11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
m. Impact aquatic, wetland or riparian habitat? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
n. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
o. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (3,8,9,10,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
p. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (8,9,10,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
q. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (8,9,10,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
r. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (8,9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

X. 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? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XI. NOISE

Would the project result in:

a. Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (1,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (8,9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (8,9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (8,9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

a. Induce substantial 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)? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (3,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

- a. 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 objectives for any of the public services: (2,3,8,9,10,14)

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. 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? (1,2,3,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS				
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (8,9,10,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require, or result in, the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (5,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (5,8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. 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? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (8,9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>a. Does the project have 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? (2,3,5,6,7,8,9,10)</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>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. (1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9,10)</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (3,8,9,10)</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source of Information/Material Used in Preparation of this Analysis

1. Escondido General Plan – 1990
2. Escondido General Plan EIR
3. Escondido Zoning Code and Land Use Map
4. SANDAG Summary of Trip Generation Rates
5. Escondido Drainage Master Plan (1995)
6. County of San Diego Health Department, Hazardous Material Management Division (HMMD) Hazardous Sites List
7. Escondido Historical Resources Survey
8. Site Visits/Field Inspection
9. Comments from other Departments:
 - Engineering Division
 - Building Division
 - Fire Department
 - Police Department
 - Planning Division
 - Utilities Division
10. Project Description and Preliminary Information
11. Draft Escondido Subarea Plan, Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan-June, 2001
12. A Biological Assessment Report prepared in May 28, 2009 by Vincent N. Scheidt (Biological Consultant) and revised in July 16, 2009
13. Escondido General Plan Update & Environmental Impact Report 2000.
14. Fire Protection Plan prepared in May 2008 by David C. Bacon, Firewise 2000 Inc & revised May 2009.
15. FIRM maps (Flood Insurance Maps)
16. USGS Map for San Diego (Escondido) area