Section 3
Initial Study/Environmental Checklist Form

1.	**Project Title:**	San Miguel Regional Training Facility Major Use Permit
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:**	Otay Water District 2554 Sweetwater Springs Boulevard Spring Valley, CA 91978-2004
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:**	Lisa Coburn-Boyd, Environmental Compliance Specialist (619) 670-2219
4.	**Project Location:**	The San Miguel Regional Training Facility would be located at 11880 Campo Road, Spring Valley, CA 91978, within the boundaries of the Otay Water District's Regulatory Reservoir site, with Fury Lane to the north, Via Escuda to the northwest, Cuyamaca Community College to the east, Jamacha Road and Campo Road to the south, and Via Palma to the west. APN: 502-030-51 and 506-010-10. Thomas Guide Page: 1271 4H/5H. The site's regional location is shown in Figure 1.
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**	San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District 2850 Via Orange Way Spring Valley. California 91978-1746
6.	**General Plan Designation:**	Valle De Oro Community Plan Area (21) Specific Plan Area (22) Public/Semi Public Lands
7.	**Zoning:**	S80 Open Space S88 Specific Plan S90 Holding Area

8. Description of Project:

The proposed Project, entitled the San Miguel Regional Training Facility, would be a Regional Emergency Services Training Center (RESTC) established in partnership with the Otay Water District (Water District), the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District (Fire District), and the Heartland Training Facility Authority (HTFA). The RESTC has secured a long-term lease from the Water District for a 3.5 acre portion of the 70-acre Regulatory Reservoir property on which the facility would be located. This existing site would be co-used and cohabitated by the Water District. This existing site would be co-used and cohabitated by the Water District. The RESTC would be funded for ongoing maintenance and operations through the HTFA and its partner and contract agencies. Figure 2 illustrates the location of the proposed site within the Regulatory Reservoir site.

The RESTC is intended to provide emergency services training to fire and public utilities entities to meet modern-day training standards and requirements. As shown in the proposed site plan (Figure 3), this facility would provide a variety of training props, including a pre-engineered five-story training tower prop; a simulated hazardous materials prop; search and rescue props, including trench rescue, confined space rescue, and Rescue Systems 1 and 2 certified site prop; overpass bridge simulation; vehicle extrication area; water recovery system; fire attack and control simulations; rappelling; row-construction prop; and a propane-driven fire simulation system. The site would also include one portable office building, two portable classrooms; and one pre-engineered apparatus and equipment storage building with bathroom/shower facilities. The facility would comply with the ADA. The RESTC facility and operational requirements would be met by extending existing on-site electrical conveyances, water lines, sewer lines, and storm drains.

The facility would also serve as an alternative Emergency Operation Center (EOC). The EOC would be incorporated into a dual use/purpose with RESTC classrooms and office structures. This would take advantage of the RESTC computers, teleconferencing system, and other audio-visual components designed for training venues. The EOC would be activated for annual training purposes and during large-scale, multi-operational period (more than 12 hours) emergency conditions that affect the Fire District and/or the neighboring jurisdictions where local and regional mutual aid is in place. These emergencies could include wildland fires, earthquakes, and pandemic medical disasters. Countywide fire training or use of the site as a staging/meeting area during fires could occur infrequently, likely once or twice a year.

Figure 4 provides a grading plan of the Project site. As shown, the site is relatively flat and proposed Project drainage is designed to flow toward a trench drain in the center of the site. Immediately to the northwest and outside the Project boundary, manufactured slopes would be implemented as part of the Project.

Estimated use of the facility would be from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday, with occasional weekend training as needed. A minimum of two full-time staff would be onsite 40 hours per week to manage the facility and provide training programs and oversight.

The site would include exterior lighting for security purposes. There is lighting on the RESTC site and similar lighting would be included for the proposed Project. Figure 3 shows the locations of lighting. Site lighting would be divided into four zones, as follows: (1) reserve building exterior lights, (2) pole lights at the trailers, (3) wall-mounted site perimeter lights, and (4) lights mounted at the top of the training tower. All lights would be individually operated and come with default on/off programmable timers. The wall-mounted perimeter lights would be on a timer and would

go on at dusk and off at approximately 8:00 pm. Lighting would be designed in accordance with the requirements of the San Diego County Code, Division 9 Light Pollution Code, including installing low sodium lamp types and shielding light to minimize spill light into the night sky or adjacent properties.

Access to the site would be via the existing access road that runs perpendicular to Jamacha Road and Campo Road/SR-94. No widening of the access roads is proposed as a part of the Project. The infrequent special events previously described (e.g., countywide fire training or use of the site as a staging/meeting area during fires would involve more trips to and from the site, but considering the events would occur so infrequently, they do not require analysis.

Use of the existing access road directly from SR-94 as a primary access to the Project site would be temporary. An access road will be extended from the SR-94/Jamacha Boulevard signalized intersection to the Project site during construction of the Rancho San Diego Sheriff Station Project. When this access road is completed, use of the signalized SR-94/Jamacha Boulevard intersection would be the primary access point from SR-94 for RESTC vehicles.

Traffic impacts would be further minimized because the fire apparatus monthly load/use would be split between the existing Owen Training Facility in El Cajon and the new San Miguel Training Facility. Additionally, there would be two training apparatuses permanently located on the Project site for use by Reserve Fire Fighters during regular training exercises, which reduces the need to transport fire apparatus to the site. The Fire District would utilize multi-passenger vans to shuttle Reserve Fire Fighters to the site for Fire Academy purposes and for ongoing training. Reserves would be transported to the RESTC from Fire District headquarters on Via Orange Way.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The proposed Project site consists of 3.5 acres of land within the 70-acre Regulatory Reservoir site (see Figure 2). The Regulatory Reservoir site consists of four drinking-water reservoirs, three of which are partially buried and partially above ground. In addition to the reservoirs, there are two pump stations and supporting water conveyance facilities on this site. The primary access points to the site are paved and unpaved roads that access from Jamacha Road. There is a secondary unpaved access road off of Via Escuda.

The site proposed for the RESTC is partially vacant and used mostly for materials and vehicle storage within the Regulatory Reservoir site. The specific Project site measures 3.5 acres and currently serves as a storage area for heavy machinery, storage tanks, and vehicles; it also doubles as a staging area for construction operations. There are two one-story pump stations immediately south of the Project site. The 3.5-acre site is characterized by level terrain that has been disturbed in association with operation of the existing Water District facilities and recent construction of two reservoirs within the 70-acre Regulatory Reservoir site.

The areas surrounding the Project site are as follows: residential housing to the north and west, Cuyamaca Community College to the east, existing water reservoirs to the south, and Skyline Wesleyan Church to the southwest. Figure 2 shows the surrounding uses.

The Water District prepared a MND for construction of the two reservoirs in the northern portion of the Regulatory Reservoir site in 2006 (SCH No. 2005111026). This MND incorporates by reference the results of analyses from the 2006 MND that apply to the RESTC site.

10. Other Public Agencies whose Approval Is Required:

- County of San Diego - Major Use Permit
- Caltrans - State Highway Encroachment Permit

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

Determination:

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 will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed Project MAY have an impact on the environment that is "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" 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 is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the Project, nothing further is required.

Lisa Coburn-Boyd — Signature
August 16, 2010 — Date

Lisa Coburn-Boyd — Printed Name
Otay Water District — 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 if 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 account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, 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 may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a "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 if, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where earlier analyses are available for review.
   (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, when 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 should normally 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 criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
1.	**AESTHETICS.** Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

1. Aesthetics

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. As shown in Figure 2, the proposed Project site consists of 3.5 acres of land within the 70-acre Regulatory Reservoir site. The Regulatory Reservoir site consists of four drinking-water reservoirs, three of which are partially buried/above ground. In addition to the reservoirs, there are two pump stations and supporting water conveyance appurtenances at this site. The specific Project site measures 3.5 acres and currently serves as a storage area for heavy machinery, storage tanks, and vehicles and doubles as a staging area for construction operations. There are two one-story pump stations immediately south of the Project site.

Construction of the proposed facilities would represent an extension of the visual character of the existing public facility uses on the Regulatory Reservoir site. The Project would place three, one-story, prefabricated portable buildings on the site (see Figure 3). The RESTC would also include fire training props on the Project site. One of the training props would be a five-story structure. There are two one-story pump station structures and an above-ground reservoir immediately to the south of the proposed RESTC (see Figure 2). There are two partially buried reservoirs north of the proposed RESTC. The above-ground reservoir to the south of the site is approximately 25 feet tall and 100 feet wide. The two reservoirs to the north of the RESTC are 15 feet tall and 268 feet wide. Except for the proposed five-story tower training prop, the proposed structures would be of a smaller scale and height than the existing reservoirs on the Regulatory Reservoir site. The proposed classroom structures would be of a similar scale and height to the existing pump station structures south of the site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact to the visual character of the Regulator Reservoir site.

As shown in Figure 2, the Project site is surrounded by vacant hillsides to the north, east, and west. There are single-family residential uses along the ridgelines approximately 1,500 feet to the north and northeast of the RESTC. The proposed RESTC structures would be visible to residents at the

perimeter of these residential developments. However, as discussed above, the proposed structures would be predominantly smaller in scale than the existing reservoir structures and would therefore represent a visual extension of the existing facilities on the Regulatory Reservoir site, including the two towers that are 15 feet tall and 268 feet wide. In addition, the proposed Project would not result in any impacts to the vacant hillsides surrounding the Regulatory Reservoir site. Therefore, impacts of the RESTC to views from these residences would be less than significant.

The five-story training prop is not considered an adverse impact to the visual character of the site, considering the topography of the landscape and distance of the proposed tower from surrounding residences. As shown in Figures 2 and 5, the topography of the site is a bowl shape and the proposed Project would be positioned at a lower elevation and approximately 1,000 to 1,500 feet from the existing residences on Via Escuda, Fury Lane, and Via Palma. The proposed tower would represent a visual extension of the other public facilities on the Regulatory Reservoir site and be of a smaller scale than the existing reservoirs on the Regulatory Reservoir site. The proposed tower structure would be 25 feet wide and 62 feet long, whereas the existing reservoirs are 15 feet high and 268 feet in diameter. In addition, the nearest residences are at higher elevations than the proposed Project. As a result, although the tower would be visible from surrounding residences, the tower would not substantially obstruct the expansive and long-range views to the south or east from these residences. In addition, the five-story building would be painted in earth tones to blend into the surrounding landscape. Therefore, implementation of the RESTC training tower would be an extension of the visual character of the Regulator Reservoir site and would result in a less-than-significant impact to views from surrounding residences.

As shown in Figure 2, Cuyamaca College and Skyline Wesleyan Church are to the west and east of the site, respectively. Views of the proposed RESTC site from these uses would be partially obscured by intervening topography. The proposed five-story training prop would be visible from these sites. However, as described above, the proposed RESTC would represent a visual extension of the existing Regulatory Reservoir site facilities and would not impact views from the adjacent vacant hillsides. In addition, the five-story building would be painted in earth tones to blend into the hills and vegetation of the surrounding landscape. Therefore, impacts of the RESTC to views from Cuyamaca College and the Skyline Wesleyan church would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Three highways in the Project area have been classified as eligible for state scenic highway status. Only State Route 125 (SR-125) has been officially designated as a state scenic highway from Interstate 8 (I-8) to SR-94. I-8 and SR-94 have been classified as "eligible state scenic highway-not officially designated." SR-125 is more than 3.5 miles west of the proposed Project site and is not visible from the site. There are no other officially designated scenic routes in the Project vicinity. Therefore, implementation of the RESTC would not adversely impact views from a scenic highway.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See the response to 1a. The proposed Project would be on a disturbed parcel of land owned and operated by the Water District as a Regulatory Reservoir site. Construction of the proposed facilities would represent an extension of the visual character of the existing public facility uses on the Regulatory Reservoir site. Therefore, implementation of the

RESTC would result in a less-than- significant impact to the visual character of the Regulatory Reservoir site.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed Project does not entail extensive use of daytime or nighttime lighting to operate. The facility would operate Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, with occasional weekend use as needed. No training activities would occur during night hours. Nighttime lighting would be limited to security lighting similar to that already on the property. Figure 3 shows the locations of the proposed security lighting. Lighting would be designed in accordance with the requirements of the San Diego County Code, Division 9 Light Pollution Code, including installing low-sodium lamp types and shielding light to minimize spill light into the night sky or adjacent properties. In addition, all lights would be individually operated and come with default on/off programmable timers. The wall-mounted perimeter lights would be on a timer and would go on at dusk and off at approximately 8:00 pm. Therefore, the proposed RESTC would not be a significant source of light and glare and impacts would be less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
2.	**AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts on 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. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

2. Agricultural and Forest Resources

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?

No Impact. According to the San Diego Important Farmland Map, the Project site is in an area classified as grazing land; therefore, the proposed site does not contain any designated prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide significance. Therefore, there would be no impact to prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance from implementation of the proposed Project.

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. No impact would result from implementation of the proposed Project. There are no Williamson Act contracts for the Project site, and the site is not zoned for agricultural use. In addition, no agricultural land adjoins the Project site.

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?

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

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

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

No Impact. No impact would result from implementation of the proposed Project. There are no agricultural land or forest uses on or adjacent to the Project site or the Water District's Regulatory Reservoir site. The proposed RESTC would not involve any other changes to the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest to non-forest use.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.	**AIR QUALITY.** When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3. Air Quality

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Project site is in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), which is contiguous with San Diego County. The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) is required, pursuant to the federal and state Clean Air Acts, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the SDAB is in nonattainment. The SDAB is currently classified as a nonattainment area for the federal 8-hour ozone (O_3) standard and a maintenance area for the federal O_3 and a nonattainment area for the state particulate matter less than 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$) and particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM_{10}) standards (SDAPCD 2008).

All areas designated as nonattainment are required to prepare plans showing how the area would meet the state and federal air quality standards by their attainment dates. The San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) is the region's plan for improving air quality. It addresses state and federal requirements and demonstrates attainment with ambient air quality standards.

The applicable air quality plans in the SDAB rely on information from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), including projected

growth in the county, which is based in part on local general plans. The proposed project site is in an area designated as (21) Specific Plan Area and (22) Public/Semi Public Lands according to the County of San Diego General Plan. The site is zoned S80 (Open Space), S88 (Specific Plan), and S90 (Holding Area). The Water District and Fire District, in accordance with the site zoning requirements, would obtain a Major Use Permit from the County of San Diego for operation of the RESTC. The proposed RESTC is consistent with the General Plan and zoning use regulations. Both short-term construction and long-term operations would result in result in minimal emissions, as described below. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would be consistent with the general plan and operations would not conflict with any air quality plan or result in violation of air quality standards. This impact is considered less than significant.

The primary construction-related pollutant in terms of the SDAB air quality plan is PM_{10}. Grading and construction activities would be subject to SDAPCD rules and regulations, including Rule 50 (Visible Emissions), Rule 51 (Nuisance), and Rule 55 (Fugitive Dust Control) (SDAPCD 2009). The principal sources of PM_{10} emissions would be fugitive dust from earthmoving activities and vehicle travel on unpaved and paved surfaces. The requirements of Rules 50, 51, and 55 can be met by the implementation of standard construction best management practices (BMPs) for dust control. The standard construction measures utilized by the Water District during recent construction projects that will be included as part of the Project include the following:

- Dust prevention to eliminate amounts of dust that could damage property, cultivated vegetation, or domestic animals, or cause a nuisance to persons living in or occupying buildings in the vicinity of the site
- Measures to enclose, cover, water (as needed), or apply nontoxic soil binders according to manufacturer's specifications on material piles (i.e., gravel, sand, dirt) with a silt content of 5% or greater
- Application of water or non-toxic soil stabilizers to maintain adequate dust control for active or inactive construction areas

Project construction and grading activities would also be required to adhere to these dust control measures, and would thereby adhere to applicable SDAPCD rules and regulations.

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed RESTC would result in emissions as a result of ground disturbance, off-road construction vehicle exhaust, emissions from employee and delivery travel, and as a result of off-gasing from paving activities. Emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of construction activity occurring, and, for fugitive dust, prevailing weather conditions. The Project's construction emissions were estimated and compared to SDAPCD air quality impact analysis (AQIA) trigger levels, as shown in SDAPCD Rule 20.2. An adverse impact on air quality would result if the emission levels from the Project were to exceed any of the AQIA trigger levels. As shown in Table 1, project construction is not anticipated to exceed any AQIA trigger levels.

Emissions were calculated using the URBEMIS2007 (version 9.2.4) emissions model. URBEMIS defaults were used to estimate the construction schedule, inventory of equipment, and hours of construction per day for each phase of project construction. For purposes of analysis, it was assumed

that project construction would occur in five separate phases, as follows: site grading, trenching, building construction, paving, and architectural coatings.

As shown in Table 1, Project construction emissions would be below applicable SDAPCD thresholds for criteria pollutants. Construction of the Project would not result in an impact on air quality because emissions would not exceed SDAPCD applicable air quality standards or contribute to existing air quality violations. Item 7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, discusses greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from project construction and operations.

Table 1. Estimated Construction Emissions

	Pounds per day						Metric Tons/yr
Construction Phase	**ROG**	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**	**CO_2**
Mass Site Grading	3.04	25.05	13.51	< 0.01	17.60	3.68	37
Trenching	2.06	17.75	9.26	< 0.01	0.89	0.81	5
Building Construction	1.23	9.29	5.47	< 0.01	0.59	0.54	54
Paving	2.04	12.1	8.86	< 0.01	1.05	0.96	6
Architectural Coatings	13.16	0.01	0.16	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.1
Maximum Emissions	3.04	25.05	13.51	< 0.01	17.60	3.68	101 [1]
SDAPCD Significance Threshold	**75**	**250**	**550**	**250**	**100**	**55**	**900** [2]
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

ROG = reactive organic gas.
CO = carbon monoxide.
PM10 = particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns.
PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns.
NO_X = oxides of nitrogen.
SO_X = sulfur oxides.
CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent

[1] CO_2 emissions are the sum of CO_2 emissions from all construction activities.
[2] 900 Metric Tons is the Interim GHG threshold adopted by the County of San Diego and is shown for purposes of analysis.
Note: URBEMIS emission output sheets are provided in Appendix A.

Project operations would result in emissions from motor vehicle exhaust and from area sources (space and water heating, consumer products, and architectural coatings). Average daily trips (ADT) to the Project site were obtained from the traffic impact analysis (Appendix J). As shown in Table 2, Project operations would be below applicable SDAPCD thresholds for criteria pollutants. Project operations would not result in an impact on air quality because emissions would not exceed SDAPCD applicable air quality standards or contribute to existing air quality violations. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

Table 2. Estimated Operational Emissions

	Pounds per day						Metric Tons/yr
Emission Source	**ROG**	**CO_2**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**	**CO_2**
Mobile Source	0.68	8.42	3.93	0.01	1.03	0.41	12
Area Source	0.17	0.08	22.77	< 0.01	19.74	5.64	209
Maximum Emissions	0.85	8.50	26.70	0.01	20.77	6.05	220 [1]
SDAPCD Significance Threshold	**75**	**250**	**550**	**250**	**100**	**55**	**900** [2]
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

ROG = reactive organic gas.
CO = carbon monoxide.
PM10 = particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns.
PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns.
NO_X = oxides of nitrogen.
SO_X = sulfur oxides.
CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent

[1] CO_2 emissions are the annual sum of CO_2 emissions from operations.
[2] 900 Metric Tons is the Interim GHG threshold adopted by the County of San Diego and is shown for purposes of analysis.
Mobile and area source emissions are the maximum of summer or winter daily emissions.
Note: URBEMIS emission output sheets are provided in Appendix A.

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response to 3a. Cumulative construction impacts on nearby receptors might occur if the Project is constructed at the same time as other development projects in the area, thereby exposing sensitive receptors to cumulative emission concentrations (see response 3d). As shown in Figure 2, surrounding uses consist of development and open space. Therefore, it is not anticipated that extensive construction would occur in the area while the proposed Project is being constructed. In addition, construction activities that might occur near the same period as proposed Project construction include construction at the college and road improvements. Possible cumulative impacts on air quality as a result of these activities and all construction activities in the area would be addressed by the standard SDAPCD measures that apply to construction projects. It is anticipated that with the incorporation of the standard SDAPCD dust control measures, the contribution of the Project to cumulative impacts related to PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would be less than significant. RESTC operations would not contribute to any significant cumulative impacts related to non-attainment status for ozone, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$. The proposed facilities would include classrooms and training props that would not result in significant emissions (see Table 2). Therefore, RESTC construction and operations would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response to 3a. Construction activities would create emissions and fugitive dust that could impact nearby sensitive receptors. Implementing BMPs for dust control (see response to 3a) would limit fugitive dust emissions from construction activities. In addition, adherence to SDAPCD Rules 50, 51, and 55 would limit emissions that could impact nearby receptors. Therefore, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Project-related odor emissions would be limited to the construction period, during which emissions from construction equipment could be temporarily evident in the immediately surrounding area. Potential sources of odors during construction activities include diesel exhaust from construction equipment and asphalt paving. In addition, material deliveries from heavy-duty truck trips could create an occasional "whiff" of diesel exhaust for nearby receptors along roadways. These odors would not affect a substantial number of people, because the scale of construction is small, the frequency of permanent trips is very low, and the potentially affected area is limited due to the localized evidence of these odors. RESTC operations would result in a minimal amount of large-truck trips to the Project site, which could also create an occasional whiff of diesel exhaust for nearby receptors along roadways. However, such temporary sources of odors are not considered significant. Additionally, odors from staged fire events are not anticipated to be significant considering the fires would be started with propane and the nearest residence from the Project site is approximately 1,500 feet away. Therefore, the Project's odor impact would be less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
4.	**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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or 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, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, 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 or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

4. Biological Resources

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?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. ICF International staff performed biological surveys and prepared a Biological Letter Resources Report (Biological Letter) in May 2010 to analyze potential effects of the proposed Project on sensitive biological resources (Appendix B). Project impacts would include grading, paving, and construction of buildings and other facilities within the approximately 3.5-acre Project site, which is entirely within existing disturbed/ developed areas of the Water District's 70-acre property. While widening the existing dirt/paved access roads is not proposed, re-grading/paving is proposed; however, impacts would not occur beyond the existing disturbed/developed areas.

Field surveys and a search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and California Native Plant Species (CNPS) identified 82 special status plant species that occur or have the potential to occur in the Project vicinity (refer to Attachment E of the Biological Letter). During a site visit in February 2008, one San Diego sunflower plant, a special status species, was detected in the immediate vicinity of the Project footprint. However, the Project does not propose any road widening or vegetation removal for paving of the road. Therefore, impacts to the San Diego sunflower would not occur as a result of the proposed Project.

Field surveys and a search of the CNDDB also identified 56 sensitive wildlife species that occur or have the potential to occur in the Project vicinity. The Project site consists primarily of disturbed and developed lands that do not support Quino checkerspot butterfly host plans; however, the coastal sage scrub immediately east of the Project footprint was identified as having the potential to support Quino host plants. Thus, subsequent focused surveys for Quino were performed between March 23 and April 22 of 2008 and between March 5 and March 31 of 2009. No adult Quino or larvae were detected during the focused surveys for this species. Therefore, the Project would not result in adverse impacts on the Quino checkerspot butterfly.

Sensitive wildlife species, such as the coastal California gnatcatcher, are known to occur in the immediate area surrounding the Project footprint, as documented by surveys within the Water District's 640-1 Reservoir Project. ICF International did not perform focused surveys of this species because no suitable breeding or foraging habitat (i.e., coastal sage scrub) known to support, or likely to support, the coastal California gnatcatcher occurs within the Project footprint. The Project would not result in direct impacts to suitable habitat (i.e., coastal sage scrub) known to support, or likely to support, the coastal California gnatcatcher. The Project has been designed so that the existing paved and dirt access roads would not be widened or subject to vegetation removal, thus avoiding direct impacts to the adjacent coastal sage scrub vegetation.

Due to the nature and frequency of proposed Project activities and existing ongoing activities in the Project vicinity, operations activities associated with the RESTC would not result in significant indirect impacts on special status wildlife. However, increased noise during construction could result in indirect impacts to the coastal California gnatcatcher (or other special status birds/raptor species or

species protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act), if construction would occur during the breeding season. Because project construction activities could result in impacts to the coastal California gnatcatcher, this would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the Project's potential adverse impacts on special status birds/raptor species or species protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Construction not to occur during the coastal California gnatcatcher breeding season. Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the County of San Diego shall verify that the following Project requirements regarding sensitive wildlife species are completed.

- No clearing, grubbing, grading, or other construction activities shall occur between March 1 and August 15, the breeding season of the coastal California gnatcatcher. However, if construction is proposed during the breeding season for the gnatcatcher, the following requirements will have to be met to the satisfaction of the County:

  – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol surveys will be required in order to determine species' presence or absence.

  – If no gnatcatchers are detected within 300 feet of the proposed grading/construction, then no restriction on grading will be necessary.

  – If gnatcatchers are present, measures to minimize noise impacts will be required and should include temporary noise walls and/or berms.

  – If the survey is not performed and construction is proposed during the species' breeding season, presence would be assumed and a temporary wall/berm would be required.

  – Noise levels from grading/construction activities during the breeding season should not exceed 60 dBA hourly LEQ at the edge of the occupied habitat, or the ambient noise level if noise levels already exceed 60 dBA hourly LEQ.

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

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Natural sensitive vegetation communities were not identified within the Project footprint, which consists of disturbed habitat and developed areas. The Project would impact approximately 0.063 acre of a coastal sage scrub revegetation site (associated with construction of the Water District's 640-1 and 640-2 Reservoirs) and approximately 0.12 acre of adjacent areas outside the revegetation site but seeded with coastal sage scrub species. The portion of the 640-1 and 640-2 Reservoirs revegetation site and adjacent areas seeded with coastal sage scrub species do not warrant the mapping classification of coastal sage scrub, a sensitive vegetation community, because they are still in the early stages of growth (low and sparse vegetation) and do not provide suitable habitat (nesting or foraging) for wildlife species, including the coastal California gnatcatcher. These areas are classified as disturbed habitat, which is not considered to be a sensitive vegetation community. While the 0.063-acre portion of the revegetation site and the 0.12 acre of adjacent areas do not currently warrant the mapping classification of coastal sage scrub, if left undisturbed they would eventually establish into mature coastal sage scrub. Therefore, the Water

District is proposing to mitigate impacts to 0.063 acre of the revegetation site and 0.12 acre of the adjacent areas seeded with coastal sage scrub species (classified as disturbed habitat) at a 2:1 ratio through the use of coastal sage scrub credits at the Water District's established San Miguel Habitat Management Area (HMA), which is approximately 4 miles to the south of the Project site near Salt Creek Golf Course.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: San Miguel HMA. Impacts to the 0.063-acre area of the revegetation site and the 0.12-acre area would be mitigated at a ratio of 2:1 through the use of available credits at the Water District's San Miguel HMA.

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, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. As described in the Biological Letter referenced above, no jurisdictional wetlands or waterways were identified within the Project study area during any of the field surveys. Because there are no jurisdictional wetlands and waterways within the Project site, the proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 0f the Clean Water Act. No impacts would occur.

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

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. See responses to 4a and 4b. Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish, because there are no waterways with the ability to support fish on the site. Coastal sage scrub within the Project footprint is known to provide suitable breeding and foraging habitat for the California gnatcatcher; however, as stated in the response to 4b, impacts to this vegetation community would be mitigated to less than significant. As identified in the response to 4a, project construction activities that could result in indirect noise impacts to the coastal California gnatcatcher would require mitigation to ensure impacts remain less than significant. There are no other resident or migratory fish, wildlife species or within established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or native wildlife nursery sites within the Project footprint. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would ensure that impacts to wildlife movement remain less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed Project site is within the San Diego County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP); however, the site is excluded from the County MSCP because the site is owned and operated by the Water District and the Water District operates an HMA to provide offsite mitigation for impacts to wildlife and/or vegetation communities associated with implementation of projects sponsored by the Water District. Design of the proposed Project is considered consistent with the provision of the County MSCP. In addition, the Water District has an approved coastal sage scrub mitigation bank from which it would use available credits to reduce potential impacts to coastal sage scrub to less than significant (see response to 4b). The proposed Project would not conflict with either one of the above-mentioned plans or provisions of these plans because its design would not result in significant impacts on any biological resources (see responses

to 4a and 4b). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances regarding the protection of biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response to 4e. The proposed Project would be consistent with provisions identified in the County MSCP. Impacts would be less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
5.	**CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

5. Cultural Resources

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

No Impact. ICF International completed a cultural resource inventory and field survey for the proposed Project on February 11, 2008 (Appendix C). The purpose of the cultural resources report was to assess whether historical resources might be adversely affected within the area of potential effect (APE) by the activities associated with construction of the proposed facilities, pursuant to CEQA.

The APE included a 50-foot buffer around the 3.5-acre Project site, plus a 40-foot buffer width along the ingress and egress roadways, for a total APE of 10.3 acres.

A cultural resource records search performed at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) and the San Diego Museum of Man revealed 57 surveys or studies, and 31 cultural resources have been previously recorded within a 1-mile radius of the APE.

The current records and literature search indicated that no previously recorded resources were known to be present within the Project APE. No sites in the APE are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, California Inventory of Historic Resources, or California Historical Landmarks. Finally, an intensive pedestrian survey used to verify the existence of any previously recorded sites on the property and to identify, map, and describe all new prehistoric and historic cultural resources did not uncover any existing or new cultural resources.

Considering that no previously recorded cultural resources and no new cultural resources were discovered to be present in the APE during the records search and the current field survey, no impacts

would occur. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in an impact to historical or archaeological resources.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response to 5a. Based on a literature and records search and cultural resources site survey, the Project would not result in direct impacts to any known archaeological resource.

Project construction includes activities that have a potential to disturb previously unknown, buried, and important cultural resources. In accordance with State regulations, if human remains are identified or suspected, the Water District and/or Fire District would immediately notify the Principal Investigator (PI) who, in turn, would notify the Medical Examiner's (ME) office. If the ME, in consultation with the PI, determines that the remains are Native American, then the ME would contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC would then identify Most Likely Descendent (MLD) candidates. The PI would initiate consultation with the MLD(s) before activity continues at the site of discovery. The PI and MLD would establish a mutually agreed upon protocol for processing the remains, associated grave goods, and sacred objects and the analysis and ultimate disposition of these materials. Following completion of applicable analyses, the human remains and any other items of interest would be repatriated to the MLD. Written verification of repatriation from MLD would complete this process. Compliance with these policies in accordance with State regulations would result in less-than-significant impacts on archaeological resources.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No Impact. Previous analysis prepared for the Project site identified the site as primarily fill material from previous excavation work on the Water District property (see Appendix D). This fill material is underlain by granitic rock, which has a very low potential for paleontological resources. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not impact paleontological resources or unique geologic feature.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. See responses to 5a and 5b. In addition, a letter was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on February 5, 2008. The response, dated February 11, 2008, indicated that no sacred sites on record with the commission were present on the Project property. However, there is a possibility that unmarked, previously unknown Native American or European-American graves could be present within the Project site. Potential disturbance of previously undiscovered human remains during project construction activities (i.e., trenching, grading) would not result in significant impacts with compliance of the above-listed policies (see response to 5b) in accordance with State regulations. Therefore, impacts on human remains would be less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
6.	**GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:				
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	1. 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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
	2. Strong seismic groundshaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
	4. Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

6. Geology and Soils

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

1. 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.)

Less-than-Significant Impact. According to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map (2002), the proposed Project site is approximately 2.5 miles south of the nearest branch of the Lyon Valley Fault. There are no other faults within 6 miles of the Project site. Therefore, potential impacts from rupture of an onsite fault or faults in the vicinity to the RESTC facilities would be less than significant.

2. Strong seismic groundshaking?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As with most southern California regions, the Project site would be subject to strong ground shaking in the event of a major earthquake. Two branches of the Lyons Valley Fault are within 2.5 and 5 miles north of the Project site. In addition, branches of the Nacion Fault are between 6 and 10 miles southwest of the Project site. There are no other faults within 10 miles of the Project site. Therefore, the Project site could experience ground motion during its design life as a result of regional seismic activity. Potential for ground shaking during earthquakes would be considered in the engineering design of the proposed training center subject to this hazard. Compliance with standard measures in the 2007 California Building Code (CBC) regarding structures and construction ensures that significant impacts would not occur. With incorporation of standard Uniform Building Code (UBC) measures, potential impacts to the RESTC facilities from seismic groundshaking would be less than significant.

3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. Based on the geotechnical report prepared by Ninyo and Moore in August 2005 and the update of the geotechnical report prepared by Southern California Soil and Testing, Inc., in August 2009 for the 640-1 and 640-2 Reservoirs project (see Appendices D and E), which is in the same project area as the proposed Project, liquefaction of cohesionless soils can be caused by strong vibratory motion due to earthquakes. Research and historical data indicate that loose granular soils and non-plastic silts saturated by a relatively shallow groundwater table are susceptible to liquefaction. Due to the lack of a shallow groundwater table, and the dense nature of the granitic materials underlying the Project site, the potential for liquefaction is not a design consideration. Based on this information, there is no potential impact to the proposed Project from liquefaction.

4. Landslides?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Based on the above-referenced geotechnical report and update, no landslides were identified on or near the proposed Project site. The generally flat terrain of the Project area would make it unlikely for a landslide to occur. Additionally, according to County sources the proposed Project is not within an area of high or moderate landslide susceptibility (County of San Diego 2009). Based on this information, there is no potential impact to the proposed Project from landslides.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Onsite soils consist of loose to medium-dense topsoil, fill, alluvium/slopewash, and granitic rock. Based on the above-referenced geotechnical report and update, onsite soils are likely to be susceptible to erosion; therefore, the Project plans and specifications should contain design features and construction recommendations of the geotechnical report. Additionally, the Project would be required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (Drainage – Erosion Prevention) and 87.417 (Planting). Compliance with these standard measures during and

after construction would ensure that there would be no significant impacts from substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Therefore the impact is considered less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The above-referenced geotechnical report and update determined that the proposed reservoirs would be on geologic units that are suitable to support the expected loads of the reservoirs. Based on this information, and considering that the RESTC site is close to the reservoirs, the potential impact to the proposed Project from unstable geologic units would be less than significant.

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The above-referenced geotechnical report and update determined that the proposed reservoirs would be on soil that is suitable to support the expected loads of the reservoirs. Additionally, according to County sources the proposed Project is not within an area of potential expansive soils (County of San Diego 2009). Based on this information and considering that the RESTC site is close to the reservoirs, the potential impact to the proposed Project from expansive soils would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. Sewer services are already available on the Project site for the disposal of wastewater. The Project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, no impacts would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
7.	**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.** Would the project:				
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. California Assembly Bill 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, codified the State's GHG emissions target by requiring the State's global warming emissions to be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. State Senate Bill 97 directed the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to adopt CEQA Guidelines concerning the effects and mitigation of GHG emissions by January 1, 2010. These CEQA Guidelines were finalized on December 30, 2009, and became effective on March 18, 2010. The new CEQA Amendments do not prescribe a particular threshold of significance or method for determining significance of GHG emissions in CEQA documents, but instead defers adoption of CEQA thresholds to the lead agency. Various air districts and jurisdictions throughout California are considering and have proposed quantitative GHG thresholds.

Project construction would result in GHG emissions from off-road diesel equipment exhaust and emissions from employee and material delivery travel. The primary emissions occur as CO_2 from gasoline and diesel combustion, with more limited vehicle tailpipe emissions of nitrous oxide (N_2O) and methane (CH_4) and other GHG emissions related to vehicle cooling systems. RESTC operations would result in GHG emissions from motor vehicle travel (from visitors, material deliveries, and employees) to and from the RESTC and from on-site natural gas use. The primary emissions occur as CO_2; therefore, only CO_2 emissions are presented in this analysis. GHG emissions from of N_2O and CH_4 would likely be minimal and are not presented in this analysis. Construction- and operations-period CO_2 emissions were obtained from the URBEMIS2007 (version 9.2.4) emissions model. As shown in Table 1, project construction would result in approximately 101 metric tons of CO_2 over the entire 6- to 8-month construction period and project operations would result in approximately 220 metric tons of CO_2 annually. When summed, RESTC construction and operations would result in approximately 321 metric tons of CO_2 per year. The relative quantity of project-related CO_2 emissions is negligible compared to statewide and worldwide daily emissions. URBEMIS2007 model outputs are presented in Appendix A.

The new CEQA Guidelines state that when assessing the significance of impacts of GHGs, the lead agency should determine whether project emissions exceed a threshold of significance. While the

Water District has not adopted thresholds for GHG impacts under CEQA, the County of San Diego has adopted 900 metric tons as the screening criteria for determining which projects require further analysis and mitigation with regard to climate change. While the Water District has not adopted this threshold, the 900-metric-ton threshold is used for this analysis to show the relatively minor contribution project construction would have on climate change. GHG emissions generated from project construction would not exceed this 900-metric-ton threshold, or any other threshold proposed throughout the State. Therefore, the Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that could have a significant impact on the environment.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The combined construction and operations GHG emissions would not exceed the 900-metric-ton threshold, or any other threshold proposed throughout the State. Long-term operations are intended to provide emergency services training to fire and public utilities entities, and project traffic and on-site energy use would be minimal. Therefore, RESTC construction and operations would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
8.	**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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Be located on a site that 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less-than-Significant Impact. During the Project construction phase, construction equipment would use diesel fuel. The use of diesel fuel would be temporary and standard BMPs would be applied to ensure that all hazards occur during this phase of the Project do not create a significant hazard to the public. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Substantial amounts of hazardous materials would not be used during project operations. No long-term use of diesel fuel or other hazardous materials would occur from the implementation of the proposed Project. The Project would use propane for creating fire for training exercises. However, the Fire District would install all necessary equipment and follow procedures utilized by the Fire District at other training facilities to ensure that use and storage of the propane would not create hazards to surrounding land uses.

Although project operations would require the use of hazardous materials such as propane, the materials would be used in small enough amounts that the potential hazard would be considered minimal. The Project would use less than 1,000 gallons of propane, and therefore be exempt from preparing a Hazardous Materials Business Plan in accordance with County Department of Environmental Health standards. The Project would also be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations for all storage, handling, transport, emission, and disposal of hazardous substances. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response to 8a. A substantial amount of hazardous materials would not be used during project operations. The Project would utilize propane for creating fire for training exercises. However, the Fire District would install any necessary equipment and follow procedures utilized by the Fire District at other training facilities to ensure that use and storage of the propane would not create hazards to surrounding land uses. In addition, the Project would be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations for all storage, handling, transport, emission, and disposal of hazardous substances. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Cuyamaca Community College is approximately 0.25 mile east of the proposed Project site; however, the Project is not expected to use hazardous materials or substances in large enough quantities that any emissions would be noted. In addition, as noted in the response to 8b, the Fire District would install any necessary equipment and follow procedures utilized by the Fire District at other training facilities to ensure that use and storage of the propane would not create hazards to surrounding land uses. The Project would also be in full compliance with local,

State, and Federal regulations for all storage, handling, transport, emission, and disposal of hazardous substances. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant

d. Be located on a site that 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. A government listing of recorded hazardous material/waste sites within a 1-mile radius of the proposed Project was generated by Environmental Data Resources (EDR) (Appendix F). The database indicated that there had been one previously identified waste site within 1 mile of the Project area. The site within Water District property consists of a cluster of three reported leaking underground storage tanks (LUST). All cases have been closed and underground tanks removed; therefore, the former LUST sites are not expected to present a hazard to the proposed Project or associated components. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e. Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The proposed Project site is not within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

f. Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The Project site is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, no impacts would occur.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. Emergency response or evacuation plans of San Diego County include the Operational Area Emergency Plan and Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan; San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan, Oil Spill Contingency Element; Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan; and Dam Evacuation Plan. The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the above plans because it is not near their features of concern (i.e., nuclear plant or dam). Additionally, during operations the amount of additional traffic to and from the Project site would be minimal and is not anticipated to impact any emergency access routes. Also, design improvements are planned for the access road, which would improve emergency access so that potential impacts associated with access to the site are avoided. Therefore, Project operations would not conflict with any adopted emergency response plan.

Construction activity associated with the proposed Project is expected to increase the number of vehicles that enter the Project site by way of Jamacha Road; however, these additional vehicles would not interfere with any emergency response or evacuation plans. Emergency response services would be provided with information concerning closures and applicable contract information to reach the on-site construction manager. Prior notification would ensure that access through the construction area would be possible in case arrival of an emergency vehicle was necessary. Furthermore, construction vehicles would not be blocking any other access points. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response to 8a. The Project would utilize propane for creating fire for training exercises. However, the Fire District would install any necessary equipment and follow procedures utilized by the Fire District at other training facilities to ensure that use and storage of the propane would not create hazards to surrounding land uses.

In addition, the Fire District submitted a Fire Protection Plan (FPP) Letter Report in July 2009 pursuant to Chapter 47 of the County Fire Code (Appendix G). The letter report lists elements of the proposed Project that could expose the Project to wildland fires and measures to ensure that the Project does not unnecessarily expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fire. On site, the Project is hardscape and completely clear of vegetation. Off site, there is native vegetation of coastal sage scrub to the northeast of the Project and limited vegetation to the southwest that would be managed in accordance with the San Miguel Fire Protection Weed Abatement Ordinance. The Project would include multiple access roads and meets the emergency response objectives identified in the Public Facilities Element of the County General Plan. Fire protection systems of the proposed Project would meet all San Diego Consolidated Fire Codes. Appropriate setbacks from property lines and defensible space around all buildings would be applied. Therefore, impacts involving the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires would be less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
9.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:				
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in 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 that 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g.	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i.	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

9. Hydrology and Water Quality

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less-than-Significant Impact. BDS Engineering, Inc., completed a preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulics Report for the proposed Project in March 2010 (Appendix H-1) and a Major Stormwater Management Plan in July 2010 (Appendix H-2). The Hydrology and Hydraulics Report utilized an aerial topographic survey and a proposed grading plan provided by project sponsors to estimate peak flood flows with 100-year return periods. Findings indicate the proposed training operations/activities are not anticipated to overload the existing storm drain system or result in erosive downstream conditions.

Applicable Regulations. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) administers the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). In California, the EPA authorizes the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to oversee the NPDES program through Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQBs). The NPDES program provides for both general permits (those that cover a number of similar or related activities) and individual permits. Construction projects that disturb more than 1 acre of land are required to obtain coverage under the statewide NPDES General Permit for Construction Activities (Permit No. CAS000002). This general permit requires the applicant to file a public notice of intent to discharge stormwater and to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP includes a site map and a description of proposed construction activities and demonstration of compliance with relevant local ordinances and regulations, and describes BMPs) that would be implemented to prevent soil erosion and discharge of other construction-related pollutants that could contaminate nearby water resources. Permittees are further required to conduct annual monitoring and reporting to ensure that BMPs are correctly implemented and effective in controlling the discharge of stormwater-related pollutants.

Title 6 (Health and Sanitation), Division 7 (Water and Water Supplies), and Chapter 8 (Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control) of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances (added by Ordinance No. 9424 and effective February 20, 2002; amended by Ordinance No. 9926) or County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance contains regulations designed "to protect water resources and to improve water quality by controlling the non-stormwater conveyance system and receiving waters; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that would reduce the adverse effects of polluted run-off discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from use of stormwater as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal law". This chapter requires that all applications for a permit of approval associated with a "land disturbance activity" must be accompanied by a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) per Section 67.804(f). The purpose of the SWMP is to describe how the proposed Project would minimize the short- and long-term impacts on receiving-water quality. The proposed Project also meets the definition of "priority development" in accordance with Section 67.802 because the Project would include development of an "education institution" larger than 1 acre; therefore, the proposed Project "shall not receive final approval until the developer has installed the required [BMPs] in accordance with the requirements of this chapter" [Section 67.803(d)]. The priority development designation requires that a SWMP for Priority Projects (Major SWMP) be developed that implements construction and operational water quality BMPs). In accordance with Section 67.812(a), all priority development projects must install, implement, and maintain low-impact development BMPs, where feasible.

Short Term Construction Impacts. There is the potential for short-term impacts to surface water quality during the grading and construction phases, including runoff of loose soils and/or a variety of construction wastes and fuels that could be carried off the site in surface runoff and into local storm drains and streets that drain eventually into water resources protected under Federal and State laws. Considering the Project is larger than 1 acre (3.5 acres), it is subject to the NPDES requirements and an appropriate SWPPP would be prepared by the Fire District and implemented during construction. The SWPPP would show methods for compliance with NPDES and implementation of appropriate BMPs) that would ensure that runoff from the construction site would not create significant off-site water quality or erosion impacts. The SWMP identifies the following temporary construction BMPs that could be incorporated into the SWMPP.

- Silt fence.
- Fiber rolls.
- Storm drain inlet protection.
- Stockpile management.
- Solid-waste management.
- Stabilized construction entrance/exit.
- Vehicle and equipment maintenance.
- Material delivery and storage.
- Spill prevention and control.
- Concrete-waste management.
- Water conservation practices.
- Paving and grinding operations.
- Any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final building approval.

Implementation of standard BMPs identified in the SWMP would minimize potential impacts from construction activities in accordance with County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Long-term Operations Impacts. The Project site would be converted to impervious surfaces with implementation of the RESTC. As a result, runoff would flow from the site at greater velocities than associated with the existing conditions at the site. An SWMP that identifies both short- and long-term BMPs has been completed for the proposed Project. All remaining runoff from the Project site would be collected in a storm drain system that would be connected with the existing storm drain system within the Regulatory Reservoir site. In addition, the Fire District proposes to incorporate the BMPs listed below into the storm drain design to ensure that stormwater runoff from the site does not result in increased erosion or impacts to water quality offsite. The proposed BMPs would also comply with requirements of the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance.

Long-term BMPs identified in the SWMP are divided into categories and include site design, source control, Low Impact Development (LID), and treatment control. The SWMP completed for the Project identifies the following long-term BMPs for implementation during proposed Project operations.

LID and Site Design Features. Locate the project and improve road alignments to avoid or minimize impacts to receiving waters or to increase the preservation of critical (or problematic) areas such as floodplains, steep slopes, wetlands, and areas with erosive or unstable soil conditions.

- All areas within the property, but not within the limits of work, shall remain undisturbed – Pervious areas will be located at the northwesterly and southwesterly corner and near the front entrance to the site. All unpaved, pervious areas are identified in the SWMP as Self Treating Areas and will be hydroseeded.
- Minimize erosion from slopes.
- Disturb existing slopes only when necessary.
- Minimize cut and fill areas to reduce slope lengths.
- Incorporate retaining walls to reduce steepness or shorten slopes.
- Shape slopes to reduce concentrated flow.
- Collect concentrated flows in stabilized drains and channels; a Decomposed Granite (DG) area will be located along the western border of the site to collect flows.

Source Control. All storm drain inlets and catch basins within the Project area shall have a stencil or tile placed with prohibitive language (such as "NO DUMPING – DRAINS TO OCEAN") and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping. In addition, plazas, sidewalks, and parking lots shall be swept regularly to prevent the accumulation of litter and debris. Debris from pressure washing shall be collected to prevent entry into the storm drain system. Wash water containing any cleaning agent or degreaser would be collected and discharged into a sanitary sewer and not discharged into a storm drain.

Treatment Control. Treatment control BMPs incorporated into the site design include use of a Continuous Deflective Separate (CDS) unit in the southeastern portion of the site and a water recycling system. The CDS unit would strain out large particles (leaves, rocks, etc.) and prevent them from entering the storage tanks for the water recycling system. An additional treatment control BMP would be to design the northern portion (48,468-square-foot area) of the storm drain system to collect stormwater and fire training water for reuse in training exercises. A system of pumps and 10,000-gallon storage vaults would be located on the southern portion of the site to collect and distribute the training water for reuse.

Considering that stormwater runoff from the Project site would be conveyed to existing Regulatory Reservoir site systems and that the Fire District would incorporate BMPs into the proposed drainage system, the Project would not create significant impacts to off-site water quality or erosion or flooding impacts. In addition, as identified in the SWMP, the proposed Project is not considered an exceptional threat to water quality and would not require the use of "Advanced Treatment BMPs." Considering the Project would be required to apply both short- and long-term BMPs (identified above) by implementing an approved SWPPP and SWMP, the Project would comply with the County's Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance.

Therefore, the proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements identified, and impacts would be less than significant.

b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would not require the consumption of groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Potable water would be supplied to the area. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?

Less-than-Significant Impact. According to a preliminary hydrology and hydraulics report prepared by BDS Engineering, Inc., for the Project, the site is currently undeveloped, with only small concrete pads to be demolished and an existing 24-inch corrugated metal pipe (CMP) storm drain line running from the northwest to the southeast. The site has relatively level terrain and drainage generally sheet flows across the site from the northwest to southeast toward two existing catch basins. The existing CMP storm drain continues southeasterly and eventually discharges into a natural valley. The site currently has an average runoff of 3.70 cubic feet per second (cfs) for a 100-year storm. The proposed Project would increase the site's impervious surface area by constructing a new building, installing modular buildings, installing retaining walls, adding pavement, installing a water recycling system, and rerouting associated utilities. It is anticipated that the proposed Project would have a calculated runoff of 80.42 cfs for a 100-year storm, resulting in a total runoff decrease of 2.72 cfs for a 100-year storm from pre- to post-construction. (All calculations assume the storage reservoir is full and all runoff would be bypassed). Although the Project would increase impervious area within the watershed, the additional pipe routing and junction headlosses would decrease the overall discharge from the watershed (Appendix H). Additionally, grading for the Project would not involve substantial changes to the topography of the site and no waterways flow through the Project area, so the alteration of a stream or river would not occur. Therefore, the proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Project area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off the site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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 that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See responses to 9a and 9c. Although the proposed Project is anticipated to increase the extent of impervious surfaces on the Project site, the existing storm drain system along with the proposed water recycling system would be sufficient to handle the increase in stormwater runoff and would not result in flooding on or off the site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See responses to 9a and 9c. Impacts would be less than significant.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See responses to 9a and 9c. Impacts would be less than significant.

g. 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?

No Impact. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps for San Diego County, the entire Project site is mapped as being outside the 100-year and 500-year floodplains, meaning that there is a very low chance that damaging floods would occur on the site (FEMA 1997). In addition, the proposed Project does not include the construction of any housing units. Therefore, the Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no impact would occur.

h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?

No Impact. See response to 9h. The proposed Project site is mapped as being outside the 100-year and 500-year floodplains (FEMA 1997). Therefore, no impact would occur.

i. 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?

No Impact. As discussed above, the Project area is not in an area that is prone to flooding events. The proposed Project would not 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, because there are no levees or dams in the Project vicinity. No impact would occur.

j. Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. The Project site is more than 15 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. The closest body of water is the Sweetwater River, approximately 0.75 mile southeast of the Project site. No impacts associated with inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
10.	**LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:				
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, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

10. Land Use and Planning

a. Physically divide and established community?

No Impact. The proposed Project is on 3.5 acres within the Regulatory Reservoir site. The Project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, construction of the regional fire training facility on the site would not 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, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The subject parcel is in an area designated as (22) Public/Semi Public Lands and (21) Specific Plan Area according to the County of San Diego General Plan. The site is zoned S80 (Open Space), S88 (Specific Plan), and S90 (Holding Area). The Water District and Fire District, in accordance with zoning requirements, would obtain a Major Use Permit from the County for operation of the RESTC. Through compliance with the requirements of the MUP, the RESTC would be consistent with and conform to the applicable land use plan and policies established by the County of San Diego.

Additionally, the Project is considered a Major Impact Service and Utility in accordance with the County zoning code. Any project defined as a Major Impact Service and Utility use is allowed in any land use zone with approval of either a Minor Use Permit or a Major Use Permit by the County of San Diego. Considering the Project will be required to comply with the conditions of the approved Major Use Permit, the project would not conflict with the zoning code.

Other applicable plans within the Project area include the Rancho San Diego Specific Plan and the Valle De Oro Community Plan. The Project would not conflict with the land use designations in these land use plans because the Project would be on the existing Water District Regulatory Reservoir site, which has been developed with public water supply facilities. The proposed Project is designed to be compatible with the existing water supply facilities on the Regulatory Reservoir site; therefore, the Water District considers the proposed Project to be an acceptable use on the Regulatory Reservoir by the D. In addition, development of the proposed Project would be compatible with the surrounding land uses outside the Regulatory Reservoir site because, as discussed further in other sections of this Initial Study, implementation of the project would not result in significant impacts related to aesthetics, noise, light, or traffic. Therefore, operation of the Project would not conflict with the applicable County land use plans and there would be no impact.

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

No Impact. The only applicable habitat conservation plan for the Project area is the San Diego County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, and the County Resource Protection Ordinance. As discussed at Item 4, Biological Resources, the development of the RESTC would occur on a disturbed graded site and would not result in direct or indirect impacts to sensitive biological resources. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with the MSCP, the Biological Mitigation Ordinance, or the Resource Protection Ordinance.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
11.	**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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

11. Mineral Resources

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?

No Impact. The Project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of "Potential Mineral Resource Significance" (MRZ-3). However, the Project site is surrounded by densely developed land uses, including residential housing to the north and west, Cuyamaca Community College to the east, existing water reservoirs to the south, and Skyline Wesleyan Church to the southwest, which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the Project site. A future mining operation at the Project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly others. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value because the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

No Impact. See response to 11a. The Project site is zoned S80, S88, and S90, which are not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element 2000). No impact would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
12.	**NOISE.** Would the project:				
a.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

12. Noise

a. Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less-than-Significant Impact. ICF International completed a Noise Letter for the proposed Project in January 2010 (Appendix I), which summarizes the results of a focused noise analysis performed for the proposed Project. The analysis utilized information provided by project sponsors, topographical and aerial maps, equipment manufacturer specification sheets, and available data from the literature to evaluate the worst-case 1-hour noise-generating operations and activities associated with the training facility. Findings indicate the proposed training operations/activities would comply with the 1-hour average daytime sound level limit of 50 dBA) between 7 am and 10 pm and nighttime 45 dBA between 10 pm and 7 am at the property line in accordance with County noise standards.

Applicable Regulations. The San Diego County Noise Ordinance (Title 3, Division 6, Chapter 4, Section 36.404, General Sound Level Limits) has established maximum noise levels at the boundary of various land uses. Regarding construction noise, San Diego County Noise Ordinance Section 36.409, Sound Level Limits, states:

> Except for emergency work, it shall be unlawful for any person to operate construction equipment or cause construction equipment to be operated, that exceeds an average sound level of 75 decibels for an eight-hour period, between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., when measured at the boundary line of the property where the noise source is located or on any occupied property where the noise is being received.

Short Term Construction Noise. Noise from construction of the proposed Project is not anticipated to exceed County Noise Ordinance limits. Construction of the proposed RESTC would take approximately 6 to 8 months. The contractor for the Fire District would comply with all construction activity time limits required by the County Noise Ordinance. The Project would also adhere to all construction noise regulations of the County Noise Ordinance. In addition, the closest existing single-family residence is approximately 1,500 feet to the north of the Project site. Therefore, it is not anticipated that noise from construction activities would exceed County Noise Ordinance limits at the closest sensitive receptor. As a result, the impact from construction noise would be less than significant.

Long Term Operational Noise. Operations noise associated with the proposed Project would comply with the 1-hour average daytime sound level limit of 50 dBA and nighttime dBA at the property line in accordance with County noise standards. Operations noise would result from fire equipment training; driver training; and heating, ventilation, air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. It is important to note that due to the relatively small area of the training grounds, non-driver fire equipment training and driver training would not take place simultaneously. Calculations were performed in the analysis for worst-case scenarios of each of the Project's operational activities at five separate analysis locations, as follows:

- Case 1: Nearest Property Line, East of Project Site;
- Case 2: Second-Nearest Property Line, South of Project;
- Case 3: Nearest Noise-Sensitive Land Use (NSLU) (College, to Southeast);
- Case 4: Second-Nearest NSLU (Residences, to Northwest); and
- Case 5: Third-Nearest NSLU (Residences, to North)

Potential noise impacts could result in the exposure of existing or future NSLUs to increased noise levels from project operations. Adherence to the County's noise ordinance standards would ensure that noise impacts do not occur during site development. No new NSLUs are known or anticipated in the Project vicinity at this time. Table 3 summarizes the noise analysis results and compares them to the relevant noise standard.

Table 3. Data Summary: Fire Equipment Training, Driver Training, and HVAC Noise (Leq 1-hour dBA)

Case :	Fire Equipment Training Noise	Driver Training Noise	HVAC Noise	Combined (Fire Equipment plus HVAC) Noise	Combined (Driver Training plus HVAC) Noise	DPLU Daytime Noise Ordinance Standard (50 dBA L_{eq1H}) Exceeded?
1 Nearest Property Line, East of Project	49	45	21	49	45	No
2 2nd-Nearest Property Line, South of Project	42	37	16	42	37	No
3 Nearest Noise-Sensitive Land Use (College, to Southeast)	47	43	11	47	43	No
4 2nd-Nearest Noise-Sensitive Land Use (Residences, to Northwest)	29	25	4	29	25	No
5 3rd-Nearest Noise-Sensitive Land Use (Residences, to North)	41	37	16	41	37	No

Source: Noise Letter for San Miguel Regional Emergency Training Facility Project, ICF International, September 2009.

As shown in Table 3, none of the noise measurements exceeded the applicable noise standards. For Case 1 (the nearest property line location), the combined noise level from fire equipment training activities and office/classroom HVAC was predicted to be 49 dBA Leq during the worst-case hour for fire equipment training, and 45 dBA Leq during driver training. At locations with existing NSLUs, predicted worst-case combined project noise levels range from 47 dBA Leq at the college to the southeast to 29 dBA Leq at residences to the northwest. Therefore, exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of noise ordinance standards would not occur and noise impacts as a result of the Project would be less than significant.

b. Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed Project is not expected to create excessive groundborne vibrations or excessive noise levels. During construction, there could be a potential for the creation of short-term vibrations related to the use of construction equipment in the Project area, but because the buildings proposed for the Project would be prefabricated, the potential for excessive groundborne vibrations and noise levels would be significantly reduced. The contractor for the Fire District would comply with all construction activity time limits required by the County Noise Ordinance. In addition, the closest existing single-family residence is approximately 1,500 feet to the north of the Project site. As a result, it is not anticipated that noise from construction activities would exceed County Noise Ordinance limits at the closest sensitive receptor. Therefore, the impact from construction groundborne vibration noise would be less than significant.

c. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response to 12a. Operations noise associated with the proposed Project would comply with the 1-hour average daytime sound level limit of 50 dBA and nighttime dBA at the property line in accordance with County noise standards. As discussed in the response 12a, potential noise impacts could result in the exposure of existing or future NSLUs to increased noise levels from project operations. Adherence to the County's noise ordinance standards would ensure that noise impacts do not occur during site development. Therefore, impacts related to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise would be less than significant.

d. Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response to 12a.

e. Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The Project site is not within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

f. Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. There are no private airstrips in the Project vicinity so no one residing or working in the Project area would be exposed to excessive noise levels. No impact would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
13.	**POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:				
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

13. Population and Housing

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

No Impact. The Project proposes the development of a 3.5-acre fire training facility. The access road leading to the Project site would be re-paved to allow for the easier maneuvering of vehicles, but it would not be expanded or upgraded in any way. There could be other road improvements along SR-94, but these improvements would only serve to mitigate for cumulative traffic impacts associated with the proposed Project. Finally, the extension of water, sewer, and wastewater service lines would be completed to serve the training facility, but would not serve the general public in any way. No impacts would occur.

b. Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. There are no existing housing units on the proposed Project site. The Project would not displace existing housing and no impact would occur.

c. Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The proposed Project would not displace a substantial number of people because there are no residential uses on the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
14.	**PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project:				
a.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a 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 following public services:				
	Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
	Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
	Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
	Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
	Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

14. Public Services

a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a 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 following public services:

Fire protection?

No Impact. The proposed Project is intended to serve as a training center for firefighters that provide fire protection in the San Diego region. Because the Project would improve firefighting skills, fire protection would be improved. Additionally, the Water District has received a Service Availability Form from the Fire District that indicates existing services are available to the Project. Impacts would be beneficial.

Police protection?

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would not increase the demand for or impact response times of police protection services. No impacts would occur.

Schools?

No Impact. The proposed Project would serve as an educational institution for fire fighters in the San Diego region. This Project would not generate a demand for public school services. No impacts would occur.

Parks?

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would not generate a demand for parks or park services. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Other public facilities?

No Impact. No other public facilities would be affected. No impact would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
15.	**RECREATION.** Would the project:				
a.	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.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

15. Recreation

a. 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?

No Impact. The proposed Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities. Therefore, substantial physical deterioration of these facilities would not occur or be accelerated. No impact would occur.

b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No Impact. The proposed Project does not include the construction of new recreational facilities or the expansion of existing recreational facilities. The construction or expansion of recreational facilities would not be required. No impact would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
16.	**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project:				
a.	Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d.	Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

16. Transportation and Traffic

a. Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, completed a Traffic Letter Report (TLR) dated May 2010 for the September 2009 traffic for proposed Project (Appendix J). This TLR analyzed the Campo Road (SR-94) intersections at Jamacha Boulevard and Jamacha Road. The TLR indicates that the proposed Project would generate 46

average daily trips (ADT), with 19 (13 inbound/6 outbound) trips during the am peak hour and 19 (6 inbound/13 outbound) trips during the pm peak hour.

With the added project traffic, the study area roadway facilities would continue to operate at their existing LOS of LOS D or better, during both am and pm peak traffic hours.

The TLR also notes that special events, including Countywide fire training or use of the site as a staging/meeting area during fires, could occur infrequently, likely once to twice a year. These special events would result in more project trips, but because the special events would occur so infrequently, it was determined that a traffic analysis was not warranted.

In addition, the proposed Project would not change or impede any established policies, plans, or programs that support alternative forms of transportation.

Based on the County of San Diego significance criteria, no significant direct traffic impacts were calculated due to Project traffic. The Project will mitigate its local and regional cumulative impacts with a payment of the County of San Diego's TIF. The Project will construct improvements on SR-94 at the project driveway to improve access to the project site. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated would occur.

b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Currently, the study area intersections are calculated to operate at acceptable LOS D or better, according to the County of San Diego significance criteria, during both the am and pm peak hours. While the proposed Project itself would not result in exceedance of the LOS standards established by the County, Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, performed a conservative analysis assuming 15% ambient growth based on one known cumulative project. This cumulative analysis found that the study area intersections are calculated to operate at acceptable LOS D or better during both the am and pm peak traffic hours, with the exception of the Jamacha Boulevard/Campo Road intersection during the pm peak hour (LOS F). Based on the County of San Diego's significance criteria, the proposed Project would cause a significant cumulative impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the Project's impact to LOS to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Pay the County of San Diego a TIF. The land uses associated with the Water District and the Fire District require the payment of a County TIF to mitigate traffic impacts to below a level of significance. Paying this fee would reduce the cumulative traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

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?

No Impact. The proposed Project does not anticipate creating any change in air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.

d. Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Access to the Project site is available via an existing right-turn-in/-out only driveway on SR-94. The project proposes driveway improvements, because of the high speeds and high traffic volumes on SR-94, coupled with the need to serve slow-moving trucks turning into and out of the Project site. Proposed design changes for public road SR-94 and the Project site access road, listed below, are intended to improve traffic flows to and from the Project site. These roadway improvement measures would reduce the increase in hazardous roadway conditions to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Complete All of the Recommended Site Access Improvements. Linscott Law, and Greenspan, Engineers, identified the following access-related improvements for the proposed Project:

- The southbound approach should be placed under stop-sign control.
- County of San Diego/Caltrans sight distance standards for outbound vehicles turning right onto westbound SR-94 should be met at the project driveway.
- Based on the high speeds and high traffic volumes on SR-94, a dedicated westbound right-turn lane should be provided on SR-94 at the project driveway. Due to the access's proximity to the adjacent driveway, construction of the right-turn lane would need to be coordinated with the adjoining parcel.

Figure 6 shows a conceptual striping plan for the proposed right-turn lane on SR-94 at the site access point. A Caltrans encroachment permit would be required and it would be possible to construct the proposed lane within the current 132 feet of right-of-way on SR-94.

A less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated will occur with the implementation of these design site access roadway improvements.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Project site is on a parcel of land owned by the Water District. The Project site is accessible via Jamacha Road. The amount of additional traffic to and from the Project site would be minimal and is not anticipated to impact any emergency access routes. Also, design improvements are planned for the access road, which would improve emergency access. Construction of the proposed Project could affect local access. To ensure that emergency response services would not be affected, emergency response services would be provided with information concerning closures and applicable contract information to reach the on-site construction manager. Prior notification would ensure that access through the construction area would be possible in case arrival of an emergency vehicle was necessary.

f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact. The proposed Project would not change or impede any established policies, plans, or programs that support alternative forms of transportation. No impact would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
17.	**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** Would the project:				
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 stormwater 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 would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

17. Utilities and Service Systems

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed Project would utilize existing onsite wastewater treatment facilities and follow all requirements of the RWQCB. A project facility availability form has been received from the Water District for wastewater services that indicates the Water District would serve the Project. No significant impacts would occur.

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed Project would extend the existing on-site water and wastewater treatment facilities to serve the operational needs of the training facility. This extension would be minimal and a project facility availability form has been received from the Water District for water and sewer services that indicates the Water District would serve the Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed Project would provide for the construction of new storm water drainage facilities and implement an approved SWMP. The construction of these facilities would feed into existing drainage facilities. The SWMP would include BMPs that comply with requirements of the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance. With approval of the SWMP, construction of these facilities would not result in significant environmental impacts.

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve its operational needs. A project facility availability form has been received from the Water District for water services that indicates the Water District would serve the Project. No significant impact would occur.

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Existing onsite sewer lines would be used for wastewater transport. These lines would be expanded to accommodate the Project. A project facility availability form has been received from the Water District for wastewater services that indicates the Water District would serve the Project. Therefore, the proposed Project would have adequate capacity to serve the projected wastewater treatment demand. No impact would occur.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills, require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency, issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440 et seq.). The proposed Project would be served by a landfill that would have sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate all solid waste disposal needs. No significant impact would occur.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less-than-Significant Impact. See response to 17F. The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No significant impact would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
18.	**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**				
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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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.)	☐	☒	☐	☐
c.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

18. Mandatory Findings of Significance

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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Based on evaluations, technical studies, and discussions in this Initial Study, the proposed Project has limited potential to degrade the quality of the environment. To reduce potential impacts to biological resources to less than significant, the Project would implement mitigation measures to protect sensitive vegetation communities and wildlife (see Item 4). In addition, the Project would comply with policies in accordance to State regulations if unknown buried archaeological or paleontological resources are found (see Item 5). Therefore, with mitigation incorporated, the proposed Project would not significantly affect the quality of the environment.

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.)

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed Project could result in cumulative impacts to biological resources and traffic and circulation; however, mitigation measures presented below are proposed to reduce all impacts to below a level of significance. With implementation of the proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Biological Resources

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Construction not to occur during the coastal California gnatcatcher breeding season. Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the County of San Diego shall verify that the following Project requirements regarding sensitive wildlife species are completed.

- No clearing, grubbing, grading, or other construction activities shall occur between March 1 and August 15, the breeding season of the coastal California gnatcatcher. However, if construction is proposed during the breeding season for the gnatcatcher, the following requirements will have to be met to the satisfaction of the County:
  - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol surveys will be required in order to determine species' presence or absence.
  - If no gnatcatchers are detected within 300 feet of the proposed grading/construction, then no restriction on grading will be necessary.
  - If gnatcatchers are present, measures to minimize noise impacts will be required and should include temporary noise walls and/or berms.
  - If the survey is not performed and construction is proposed during the species' breeding season, presence would be assumed and a temporary wall/berm would be required.
  - Noise levels from grading/construction activities during the breeding season should not exceed 60 dBA hourly LEQ at the edge of the occupied habitat, or the ambient noise level if noise levels already exceed 60 dBA hourly LEQ.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: San Miguel HMA. Impacts to the 0.063-acre area of the revegetation site and the 0.12-acre area would be mitigated at a ratio of 2:1 through the use of available credits at the Water District's San Miguel HMA.

Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Pay the County of San Diego a TIF. The land uses associated with the Water District and the Fire District require the payment of a County TIF to mitigate traffic impacts to below a level of significance. Paying this fee would reduce the cumulative traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Complete All of the Recommended Site Access Improvements. Linscott, Law and Greenspan, Engineers, identified the following access-related improvements for the proposed Project:

- The southbound approach should be placed under stop-sign control.
- County of San Diego/Caltrans sight distance standards for outbound vehicles turning right onto westbound SR-94 should be met at the project driveway.
- Based on the high speeds and high traffic volumes on SR-94, a dedicated westbound right-turn lane should be provided on SR-94 at the project driveway. Due to the access's proximity to the adjacent driveway, construction of the right-turn lane would need to be coordinated with the adjoining parcel.

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

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction and operation of the proposed Project would be within the Water District-owned property designated for such uses. As discussed further in this Initial Study, the proposed Project would not have environmental effects that would cause direct or indirect adverse effects on human. As discussed further in the response to 18b, the proposed Project could result in cumulative impacts to biological resources and traffic and circulation; however, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce all impacts to below a level of significance. With implementation of the proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSIS. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

Earlier Analysis

a. Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

Final Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Otay Water District 640-1 and 640-2 Reservoirs (SCH No 2005111026). *This document is available for review at the Otay Water District, 2554 Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, Spring Valley, CA 91978. Also see Appendices C, D, and F of this MND.*

b. Impact adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

Geology/Soils and Hazards/Hazardous Materials were adequately analyzed in the earlier documents.

c. Mitigation measures. For effects that are "potentially significant unless mitigated," 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.

Not Applicable.

References

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). *Flood Insurance Rate Maps: Map Service Center*. Available: http://msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/FemaWelcomeView?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1. Accessed: June 30, 2009.

San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). 2008a. Fact Sheet: Attainment Status. Available: <http://www.sdapcd.org/info/facts/attain.pdf>. Accessed: August 2010.

SDAPCD. 2009. Rules and Regulations. Available:< http://www.sdapcd.org/rules/current_rules.html>. Accessed: August 2010.

San Diego, County of. 2009. Draft San Diego County General Plan Update EIR.

This page intentionally left blank.