DRAFT

Jutras Residence Project
Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared for:

City of Santee, Department of Development Services
10601 Magnolia Avenue
Santee, California

Prepared by:

DUDEK
605 Third Street
Encinitas, California 92024
Contact: Sean Kilkenny
760.479.4246

APRIL 2023

Printed on 30% post-consumer recycled material.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page No.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section **Page No.**

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
BMP	best management practice
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
GHG	greenhouse gas
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
WPCP	Water Pollution Control Plan
SWRCB	State Water Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminant

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The proposed project involves the construction of one single-family residence on an approximately 1.01-acre project site within the City of Santee (City), in the eastern part of San Diego County. The proposed project site is currently undeveloped and is surrounded by existing single-family residential development to the north. The land immediately to the east, south and west of the proposed project site is open space and includes the Rattlesnake Mountain Preserve, Padre Dam Park and Shadow Hill Park. Further west, north and east is additional existing single-family residential housing.

1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The Initial Study has been prepared by the City of Santee to address the potential environmental effects associated with the planning, construction, implementation, and operation of the project. This Initial Study uses the CEQA Appendix G, Environmental Checklist (2020) as the significance criteria to analyze the potential impacts of the project. As Lead Agency under CEQA, and based on the finding contained in the attached Initial Study, the City has determined that the project would not have a significant effect upon the environment with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures.

The City also finds that the Initial Study reflects the City's independent judgment.

The location and custodian of the documents and any other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City bases its determination to adopt this Mitigated Negative Declaration are as follows:

City of Santee, Department of Development Services
10601 Magnolia Avenue
Santee, California
Custodian: Mr. Doug Thomson

1.3 List of Discretionary Actions

- Grading Permit (City of Santee, Municipal Code Section 11.40.160)
- Development Review Permit (DR 2021-03)

1.4 Public Review Process

In compliance with CEQA, a 30-day public and agency review period is provided for the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Project Purpose and Need

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify potential environmental impacts in the City of Santee, California, from implementation of the proposed Jutras Residence project (proposed project). The purpose of the proposed project is to construct one single-family home within the City.

2.2 Project Location

The project is located within the City of Santee and consists of approximately 1.01 acres. The proposed project site is located within the eastern portion of the County of San Diego, west of the southern terminus of Shadow Hill road. The proposed project site is located approximately 300 feet southeast of Shadow Hill Park and approximately 100 feet north of Padre Dam Park. Additionally, the proposed project site is located in Township 15 South, Range 1 West of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute El Cajon quadrangle (USGS 1996).

2.3 Environmental Setting

The proposed project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. It is noted that northwesterly portion of the project site was disturbed and cleared in 2002, and roads were extended to the project site as part of the development of the single family pads north of the project site; however, native vegetation has re-grown on the project site.

Surrounding land uses include existing single-family residences to the north and undeveloped land to the west, south and east. The areas to the south and east are preserved lands managed by the CNLM.

2.4 Project Characteristics

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence on approximately 1.01 acres of undeveloped land. Vehicular access would be provided by a driveway extension from Shadow Hill Road. The proposed project would include connections to existing natural gas, water, and sewer facilities. In addition, the proposed project would include Fuel Modified Defensible Space (FMDS) zones approved by the Fire Marshall which would consist of 100 feet of brush management from the proposed residence within the proposed project site.

Construction activities are estimated to take approximately 12 months and would include a mix of equipment such as dozers, scrappers and excavators. Once grading and site work are complete, the site would be landscaped with appropriate vegetation and irrigation in fuel management zone (FMZ) 1, which would extend from the residence outward for the first 50’. FMZ 2 would consist

of thinned native vegetation and would not be irrigated. The remaining natural vegetation would remain onsite and be avoided.

3 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. **Project title:** Jutras Residence Project

2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of Santee
   10601 Magnolia Avenue
   Santee, California 92071

3. **Contact person and phone number:** Louis Jutras / (619) 495-2785

4. **Project location:** West of the southern terminus of Shadow Hill Road (APN 385-010-16-00)

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Louis Jutras
   850 Lagoon Drive
   Chula Vista, California 91910

6. **General Plan Designation:** Existing: Low Density Residential (R-1)

7. **Zoning**: Low Density Residential (R-1) and Hillside Overlay (HL)

8. **Description of project. (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation):**

The Jutras Residence Project includes the construction of one single-family residence on approximately 1.01 acres in the City of Santee (City). The proposed project site is located at the southern terminus of Shadow Hill Road. The proposed project site is vacant and undeveloped. Surrounding land uses include open space and existing residential development.

Construction of the proposed project would involve grading, excavation, and the installation of utilities connections. The proposed project would include a driveway extension to provide access to the site via Shadow Hill Road. Fuel Modified Defensible Space (FMDS) would be included on-site, which would consist of 100 feet of brush management from the proposed residence.

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

North: Residential single-family homes
South: Open Space, Padre Dam Park
East: Open Space, Residential single-family homes
West: Shadow Hill Park, Open Space

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

No other public agency approvals are required of the project.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significant impacts to tribal resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

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

The City completed the AB52 notification process. Certified notification letters were mailed to the following tribes and confirmed receipt on the following dates:

i. Barona Band of Mission Indians – 8/29/22
ii. Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians – 9/2/22
iii. Kumeyaay Heritage Preservation Council – 8/30/22
iv. Jamul Indian Village – 9/27/22

The City was not contacted by any of the tribal representatives for consultation on the project. Consultation ended on October 26, 2022.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

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

☐ I find that the project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the 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.

Signature — Date: 4/3/23

Doug Thomsen — Printed Name

Associate Planner — Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, 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 where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
    a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
    b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
    c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or

refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

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

3.1 Aesthetics

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	**AESTHETICS –** Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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 within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

A scenic vista is a public viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape. There are no scenic vistas onsite or of the proposed project site, and sight lines are obstructed by intervening landscape to the west and south, and existing residential development to the north and beyond the preserve to the east.

The proposed project site would be visually consistent with adjacent residential development to the north. Therefore, upon completion of construction, views of the proposed project site and surrounding area would be similar to existing conditions. The proposed project would have a **less than significant impact** to scenic vistas.

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

There are no state scenic highways within the viewshed of the proposed project site. The nearest state scenic highway is State Route (SR-) 52, which is designated scenic from post mile 9.5 near Santo Road to post mile 13.0 near Mast Boulevard, approximately 4.39 miles west from the proposed project site.

SR-67 is a County Scenic Highway and is located approximately 0.45 miles west of the project. Intervening vegetation and residential development obstruct views of the proposed project site from SR-67. Further, there are no significant tree, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings on the project site. Therefore, the project would have **no impact** on state scenic highways.

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

As defined in CEQA Section 21071 (a), an urbanized area means "an incorporated city that meets either of the following criteria: (1) Has a population of at least 100,000 persons; (2) Has a population of less than 100,000 persons if the population of that city and not more than two contiguous incorporated cities combined equals at least 100,000 persons." According to the United States Census Bureau (USCB), the estimated population of Santee as of July 1, 2021 was 59,703 persons. Furthermore, the estimated population of El Cajon as of July 1, 2021 was 105,432 persons (USCB 2022). Therefore, since Santee and El Cajon are contiguous cities, the proposed project site would be considered as located in an urbanized area because the combined population exceeds 100,000 persons.

The proposed project site is currently undeveloped. The proposed project site is located on a large hill that looks down on Shadow Hill Park to the west and Padre Dam Park to the south. The project would include the construction of the proposed single-family residence. The proposed development would be visible to nearby residents and park users. In addition, the proposed development would be located adjacent to similar land uses, primarily, existing single-family homes to the north. Therefore, upon completion of construction, views of the proposed project site and surrounding area would be similar to existing conditions.

Finally, implementation of the project would not conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

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

No light sources occur on the proposed project site. The proposed project would introduce nighttime lighting that would be typical of a single-family residence. The proposed project was designed to comply with the City's building code, design guidelines, FMDS

requirements and the draft MSCP Subarea Plan. The Subarea Plan provides guidelines for projects that occur adjacent to preserve lands to reduce or prevent indirect impacts to the preserve. One of the adjacency guidelines addresses lighting. The proposed onsite lighting would comply with building code, and lighting would be low illumination and directed away from the preserve areas (Busby Biological Services, Inc.2022). Consequently, lighting would not adversely affect day or nighttime views, and the project would have **no impact**.

3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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 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)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project 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?

According to the California Important Farmland Finder database, the proposed project site and its immediate surroundings are classified as both "Urban and Built-Up Land" and "Grazing Land" (DOC 2022a). The project would not be located on land classified as Farmland pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and would therefore not convert any Farmland to non-agricultural use. **No impact** would occur.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

The proposed project site is zoned Low Density Residential (R-1) within a Hillside Overlay (HL) and does not contain agricultural land (City of Santee 2020). There are no existing lands under a Williamson Act contract within the City (DOC 2017). **No impact** would occur.

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

The proposed project site and surrounding areas are not zoned for and do not contain any forest land or timberland as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526 or Government Code Section 51104(g). Therefore, the project would not conflict with or cause the rezoning or conversion of forest land or timberland. **No impact** would occur.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The proposed project site does not contain any forest or timberland as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526 or Government Code Section 51104(g). Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. **No impact** would occur.

e) Would the project 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 land to non-forest use?

There are no agricultural or forest land uses within the proposed project site or surrounding areas. Therefore, the project would not result in the significant conversion of farmland or forest land to a non-agriculture use. **No impact** would occur.

3.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

The proposed project site is located within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) monitors and regulates SDAB. SDAPCD's air quality plans include the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS), addressing state requirements, and the San Diego portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP), addressing federal requirements. Both the RAQS and SIP are based on the San Diego Association of Governments population projections included in local general plans.

The project would include the construction of one single-family residence. The project site is zoned Low Density Residential (R-1) and therefore, the project would comply with the underlying zoning and General Plan, which is part of the RAQs and SIP. Accordingly,

implementation of the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Construction emissions would be temporary, and confined to the approximately one-year period when construction equipment and workers are present at the proposed project site. These emissions are associated with typical construction activities, including grading and vertical construction. Similar to nearby residences, operational emissions would be minimal would not conflict with applicable air quality plans.

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

Air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development, and the SDAPCD develops and implements plans for future attainment of ambient air quality standards. If a project's emissions would exceed the SDACPD significance thresholds, it would be considered to have a cumulatively considerable contribution.

The project would include the construction of one single-family residence. The project would result in construction emissions similar to emissions associated with construction of single-family residential development. As such, construction emissions associated with the project would be minimal compared to larger development projects. Upon completion of construction, operational emissions associated with the project would be similar to existing operational emissions of adjacent residential uses.

To evaluate the potential for the project to result in a potential air quality impact under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), criteria air pollutant[1] emissions from the construction and operational phases of the project were estimated using the CalEEMod Version 2022.1 and compared to the applicable emission thresholds applied by the City of Santee, which are based on the County of San Diego's *Guidelines for Determining*

[1] Criteria air pollutants are defined as pollutants for which the federal and state governments have established ambient air quality standards, or criteria, for outdoor concentrations to protect public health. The national and California standards have been set, with an adequate margin of safety, at levels above which concentrations could be harmful to human health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect the most sensitive persons from illness or discomfort. Pollutants of concern include ozone (O_3), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns in size (PM_{10}), and particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in size ($PM_{2.5}$), and lead. In California, sulfates, vinyl chloride, hydrogen sulfide, and visibility-reducing particles are also regulated as criteria air pollutants. Pollutants evaluated herein include volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), which are important because they are precursors to O_3, as well as sulfur oxides (SO_x), PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$.

Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements – Air Quality.[2] Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were also estimated and presented below for disclosure.

Construction was assumed to commence in June 2023[3] and last approximately 11 months. Mass grading would result in 2,400 cubic yards of export. For operational emissions modeling, an operational year of 2024 was assumed. Default CalEEMod values were applied to estimate maximum daily operational emissions.

The estimated project-generated maximum daily construction emissions without mitigation for both summer and winter periods are summarized in Table 3.3-1. Detailed construction model outputs are presented in the Appendix A.

Table 3.3-1. Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Construction Year	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
	Pounds per Day					
			Summer			
2023	2.64	15.7	12.8	0.04	6.58	3.33
2024	0.60	4.58	6.19	0.01	0.36	0.23
			Winter			
2023	0.59	5.93	7.01	0.01	0.29	0.26
2024	0.60	5.60	6.99	0.01	0.36	0.24
Maximum	***2.64***	***15.7***	***12.8***	***0.04***	***6.58***	***3.33***
Threshold	*75*	*250*	*550*	*250*	*100*	*55*
Threshold exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter; – = no emission estimates reported.
Year 2050 was used to model 2054 in CalEEMod.
See Appendix A for complete results.

As shown in Table 3.3-2, daily construction emissions would not exceed the applied significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$ during project construction, and short-term construction impacts would be less than significant.

[2] The SDAPCD has not developed thresholds of significance for air quality, however, the SDAPCD has provided emission levels under its permitting authority for new source review for which an AQIA is triggered. The County of San Diego has reviewed SDAPCD's trigger levels, as well as EPA rulemaking, and CEQA thresholds adopted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to develop screening level thresholds (SLTs) to assist lead agencies in determining the significance of project-level air quality impacts within the County.

[3] The analysis assumes a construction start date of June 2023, which represents the earliest date construction would initiate, but could commence at a later date. However, assuming the earliest start date for construction represents the worst-case scenario for criteria air pollutants because equipment and vehicle emission factors for later years would be slightly less due to more stringent standards for in-use off-road equipment and heavy-duty trucks, as well as fleet turnover replacing older equipment and vehicles in later years.

Estimated project-generated operational emissions for summer and winter scenarios are presented in Table 3.3-2. Detailed operational model outputs are presented in Appendix A.

Table 3.3-2. Estimated Maximum Daily Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Source	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
	Pounds per Day					
Summer						
Mobile	0.04	0.03	0.30	<0.01	0.02	<0.01
Area	1.67	0.03	1.95	<0.01	0.26	0.26
Energy	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Total	***1.72***	***0.07***	***2.25***	**<0.01**	***0.28***	***0.26***
Winter						
Mobile	0.04	0.03	0.28	<0.01	0.02	<0.01
Area	1.67	0.03	1.89	<0.01	0.26	0.26
Energy	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Total	***1.71***	***0.07***	***2.18***	**<0.01**	***0.28***	***0.26***
Threshold	*75*	*250*	*550*	*250*	*100*	*55*
Threshold exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter; <0.01 = reported value is less than 0.01.
See Appendix A for complete results.

As shown in Table 3.3-2, daily operational emissions for the project would not exceed the County of San Diego's significance thresholds for any criteria air pollutant. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to emissions of criteria air pollutant emissions during operation.

As such, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under applicable the NAAQS or CAAQS. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the proposed project site include Padre Dam Park, Shadow Hill Park, and adjacent residential uses. Toxic air contaminant emissions, or TACs, are a potential source of contaminants that can affect sensitive receptors. The most common TAC as it relates to grading and construction is diesel particulate matter (DPM) from equipment and heavy-duty trucks. Diesel engines used during construction can emit a complex mixture of air pollutants, including both gaseous and solid material. The solid material in diesel exhaust is known as DPM. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has identified DPM as a TAC based on published evidence of a relationship between diesel exhaust exposure and lung cancer and other adverse health effects (CARB n.d.).

The project would comply with the City of Santee grading permit requirements which require construction operations to include standard measures and BMPs related to construction emissions. Total construction of the project would last approximately 12 months. Once constructed, TAC emissions associated with operation of the project would be minimal.

Impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be **less than significant**.

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

Odors produced during construction of the project would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment. Such odors are temporary and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect a substantial number of people. Odors are highest near the source and would quickly dissipate. Additionally, odors associated with construction activities would be temporary and would cease upon completion of construction. Therefore, the project is not expected to result in other emissions, such as those leading to odors, adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

3.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

A Biological Resource Letter Report (Appendix B) was prepared for the Project Site (Busby Biological Service, January 2023). As part of the Letter Report, biological resources surveys were conducted. Prior to conducting the biological surveys, BBS reviewed existing literature and historical databases for available biological information and records of occurrence of sensitive biological resources within 2 miles of the proposed project site.

A general biological survey which included the proposed project site plus all accessible habitat within 100 feet was conducted on September 15, 2021. The survey was conducted on foot. Off-site areas of private property were not directly accessible and were surveyed from the edge of accessible land with the aid of binoculars.

Vegetation communities were mapped onto aerial imagery, plant and wildlife species observed directly and/or detected indirectly through sign (e.g., scat, burrows, vocalization) were recorded, habitats for sensitive plant and wildlife species were assessed, and the presence of potentially jurisdictional resources were considered. Digital photographs were taken to visually document existing habitat conditions at the time of the survey.

Three vegetation communities/land cover types occur within the survey area: Diegan coastal sage scrub (including disturbed), disturbed land, and urban/developed land (Table 3.4-1). These vegetation communities are discussed below. A total of 28 plant species were observed within the survey area during the biological survey, including 14 species (50 percent) that are considered non-native and/or naturalized into the area, and 14 species (50 percent) that are considered native. One of the plants observed – San Diego sunflower (*Bahiopsis laciniata*) – is considered a sensitive plant species.

Table 3.4-1. Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types[1]

Vegetation Community	Project Site	100-foot Survey Buffer	Total
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	0.833	2.123	2.956
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub (Disturbed)	0.104	0.087	0.191
Disturbed Habitat	0.078	0.167	0.245
Urban/Developed Land	-	0.290	0.290
Total	**1.015**	**2.667**	**3.682**

[1]All areas are presented in acres, rounded to the nearest thousandth.

Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub (including Disturbed)

Diegan coastal sage scrub consists of low-growing, aromatic, drought-deciduous, soft-woody shrubs. It is the dominant vegetation community within the survey area, covering approximately 3.147 acres, including 0.937 acre within the proposed project site and 2.210 acres within the 100-foot survey buffer. This vegetation community is dominated by native species, such as California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*), and broom baccharis (*Baccharis sarothroides*). This vegetation community also includes abundant non-native annuals, including short-pod mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), tocalote (*Centaurea melitensis*), and red brome (*Bromus rubens*). Vegetation cover within the Diegan coastal sage scrub is high, with native cover of approximately 65 percent and non-native cover of approximately 25 percent. Overall, plant diversity within the survey area was relatively low, possibly as a result of the historical clearing. Of the total 3.147 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub documented in the survey area, approximately 0.191 acre in the northern portion of the survey area is mapped as disturbed. This disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub occurs in the northern portion of the project site and appears to lie within the 100-foot FMDS zone for the existing residence to the north. This area has sparser vegetation cover (approximately 15 percent) and lower plant diversity than the areas of intact Diegan coastal sage scrub.

Disturbed Habitat

Disturbed habitat is a common vegetation community that includes areas that have been physically disturbed by previous human activity and are no longer recognizable as a native or naturalized vegetation association. A total of approximately 0.245 acre of disturbed land occurs within the survey area, including 0.078 acre within the proposed project site and 0.167 acre in the 100-foot survey buffer. This includes three main areas: a sparsely vegetated strip along the western edge of the proposed project site that historically contained a dirt trail or road; a large patch of non-native weeds and an adjacent unvegetated area with a fire ring in the southeast corner; and a graded, weedy slope on the adjacent

residential property to the north. The disturbed habitat is characterized by non-native annual species, including short-pod mustard, tocalote, and common Mediterranean grass (*Schismus barbatus*). The area of disturbed habitat on the residential property off-site to the north contains occasional broom baccharis and California buckwheat.

Urban/Developed Land

Urban/developed land is a common land cover type that includes areas of hardscape or areas where permanent or semi-permanent structures have been constructed as well as areas where native vegetation is no longer supported. This land cover type also includes areas landscaped with ornamental plants that often require irrigation. A total of approximately 0.290 acre of urban/developed land was mapped within the survey area, all of which is within the 100-foot survey buffer. This land cover type includes the existing Shadow Hill Road and the residence, associated landscaping, and driveway on the property to the north of the proposed project. This urban/developed land is either devoid of vegetation or is dominated by non-native species, such as Canary Island date palm (*Phoenix canariensis*), queen palm (*Syagrus romanzoffiana*), banana trees (*Musa* sp.), and other ornamental grasses and shrubs.

a) Would the project 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?

Sensitive Plant Species

Sensitive plant species include those that are (1) listed as threatened, endangered, or proposed for listing by USFWS or CDFW; (2) California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) 1 through 4 (CNPS 2021); or (3) considered rare, endangered, or threatened by other local conservation organizations or specialists, including MSCP-covered species and Narrow Endemic Species.

19 sensitive plant species for potential to occur within the survey area based on the literature review, database search (County of San Diego 2021, CDFW 2021a, CNPS 2021), and observations made during the biological survey. One sensitive plant species – San Diego sunflower – was observed within the survey area no additional sensitive plant species have a moderate or high potential to occur within the survey area.

San Diego Sunflower

San Diego sunflower is not state- or federally listed but is a CNPS CRPR 4.3 species, meaning its distribution is limited in California but that less than 20 percent of populations are threatened. It is a perennial shrub that occurs in chaparral and coastal sage scrub at elevations below 2,500 feet amsl. Four individuals were observed growing in a cluster in the southeastern corner of the proposed project site. This area is located outside of the proposed impact footprint, and impacts would be avoided. Therefore, there would be no impacts to sensitive plant species from implementation of the proposed project. As such, no avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures would be required for sensitive plant species.

Sensitive Wildlife Species

Sensitive wildlife species include those that are (1) listed as threatened or endangered or proposed for listing by USFWS or CDFW or (2) designated as "fully protected," "species of special concern," or "taxa to watch" by CDFW (CDFW 2021b). While not necessarily sensitive, species that are covered by the federal MBTA or CFGC are also protected.

Two sensitive wildlife species were observed during the biological survey conducted for the proposed project: coastal California gnatcatcher and southern California rufous-crowned sparrow. Three additional sensitive wildlife species were determined to have a moderate to high potential to occur within the proposed project site: red diamond rattlesnake, Blainville's horned lizard, and Belding's orange-throated whiptail. Additionally, Diegan coastal sage scrub is one of the vegetation communities present within the proposed project site. Diegan coastal sage scrub provides habitat to numerous native bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Commission (CFGC) (Busby Biological services Inc. 2022).

Red Diamond Rattlesnake

The proposed vegetation removal and grading have potential to impact red diamond rattlesnake. These potential impacts would not be considered significant, because they are not expected to reduce the local population of this species to below sustainable levels, and the proposed project comprises a small fraction of habitat that is contiguous with a large swath of adjacent preserved land. Therefore, the impacts would be considered less than significant and would not require additional avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.

Blainville's Horned Lizard

The proposed vegetation removal and grading have potential to impact Blainville's horned lizard. These potential impacts would not be considered significant, because they are not

expected to reduce the local population of this species to below sustainable levels, and the proposed project comprises a small fraction of habitat that is contiguous with a large swath of adjacent preserved land. Furthermore, the proposed construction of one single-family residence is not anticipated to increase Argentine ant populations in the surrounding habitat. Therefore, impacts to Blainville's horned lizard would be considered less than significant and would not require additional avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures.

Belding's Orange-throated Whiptail

The proposed vegetation removal and grading have potential to impact Belding's orange-throated whiptail. These potential impacts would not be considered significant, because they are not expected to reduce the local population of this species to below sustainable levels, and the proposed project comprises a small fraction of habitat that is contiguous with a large swath of adjacent preserved land. In addition, the proposed project would reduce edge effects to the adjacent preserved areas, as discussed in Section 5.6.1 through 5.6.6, below. Therefore, the impacts would be considered less than significant and would not require additional avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.

Coastal California gnatcatcher

Project construction would result in significant direct and indirect impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher. Vegetation removal during breeding season (February 15 to August 31) could result in significant direct impacts if the species is nesting in the affected area. Additionally, indirect impacts to species in adjacent habitat would occur if construction noise levels exceed 60 dBA. As such, the proposed project would implement **Mitigation Measure (MM) BIO-1 through MM-BIO-5** to reduce impacts to less than significant.

California Rufous-crowned Sparrow

Project construction would result in significant direct and indirect impacts to southern California rufous-crowned sparrow if vegetation trimming or clearing of occupied habitat occurs during the breeding season (February 15 to August 31). As such, the proposed project would implement **MM-BIO-1, 2, 3, 6 and 7** to reduce impacts to less than significant.

Nesting Birds

Project construction would result in significant direct and indirect impacts to nesting raptors and other bird species covered under the MBTA and CFGC if the required vegetation

removal occurs during breeding season (February 15 to August 31). To reduce potential impacts to less than significant, the proposed project would implement MM-BIO-2.

The proposed project could have a potentially significant impact on sensitive wildlife species during construction. However, with the implementation of **MM-BIO-1, 2, 3, 5** and **6**, impacts to sensitive wildlife species would be reduced to less than significant. As such the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species. Impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Mitigation Measures

MM-BIO-1: Pre-construction Meeting and WEAP Training. Prior to construction, a qualified biological monitor will attend the pre-construction meeting, discuss the biological monitoring program with construction contractors, and arrange to perform any follow up mitigation measures (e.g., monitoring construction fencing installation, nest clearance surveys, biological monitoring) and reporting. The qualified biological monitor shall also conduct an on-site contractor environmental awareness training to discuss the need to avoid impacts outside the approved construction area and to protect sensitive plants and wildlife (e.g., discuss construction limits fencing, sensitive resource flagging, clarify acceptable access routes/ methods and staging areas).

MM-BIO-2: Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey. To prevent potentially significant direct and indirect impacts birds protected by the MBTA and CFGC, all construction activities (e.g., fence installation, equipment staging, clearing or grubbing of vegetation, grading) should begin outside the bird breeding season (February 15 to August 31). If construction must begin within the breeding season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting birds within the proposed impact footprint. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 7 calendar days prior to the start of construction activities. If no nesting birds are detected in the proposed area of disturbance, no further avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures will be required. However, if nesting birds are detected, an appropriate construction avoidance buffer around the nest(s) would be required based on the avian species nesting to prevent potential direct and indirect impacts to the nest. No removal of vegetation within the avoidance buffer may occur until the end of the breeding season or until the nest is no longer active, whichever comes first.

MM-BIO-3 **Resource Delineation & Protection Measures.** Prior to construction, a qualified biological monitor will inspect the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the limits of disturbance adjacent to sensitive biological resources and verify compliance with any other mitigation measures. This will include flagging sensitive resources and delineating any required buffers to protect sensitive biological resources (e.g., habitats, flora and fauna species, nesting birds) during construction. The biological monitor will also inspect any installed Best Management Practices (BMPs), measures to prevent fugitive dust, lighting and noise impacts in adjacent habitats, and introduction of exotic and invasive plant and animal species. Responsible construction practices as well as storm water and runoff management will also be included as part of the BMPs.

MM-BIO-4A **Coastal California Gnatcatcher Pre-Construction Surveys. To prevent potentially significant direct and indirect impacts** to coastal California gnatcatcher, construction activities should occur outside the breeding season (February 15 to August 31). If construction must begin within the breeding season, protocol-level pre-construction surveys for coastal California gnatcatcher shall be conducted within 300 feet of the proposed impact footprint to determine if coastal California gnatcatchers are nesting within or adjacent to the proposed project site. If nesting coastal California gnatcatchers are detected, no grading or clearing of vegetation may occur within 300 feet of the nest until the young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. Alternatively, noise measures, such as noise walls, hay bales, or other measures may be incorporated such that construction noise levels at the edge of occupied nesting habitat do not exceed 60 dB(A) L_{eq} or ambient noise levels, whichever is greater.

MM-BIO4B **Coastal California Gnatcatcher Low Effect HCP.** Impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher will require an incidental take permit with the USFWS. A low-effect Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) will be prepared and submitted to the USFWS for approval. The applicant will be required to receive an incidental take permit from USFWS prior to issuance of a Grading Permit.

MM-BIO-5: **Nesting Birds.** To prevent potentially significant impacts to raptors, southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, and other birds protected by the MBTA and CFGC Section 3503, the project would comply with the nesting bird regulations described in Section 5.5.1.2 of the City's draft Subarea Plan. To comply with these nesting bird regulations, the start of

construction (including, but not limited to, disturbance of vegetation, grading, or building construction) should occur outside of the avian breeding season (February 15 to August 30).

If construction must begin during the breeding season (February 15 to August 30), a pre-construction nesting bird survey must be conducted by a qualified biologist beginning at least 2 weeks prior to the initiation of work. The survey will be conducted in suitable nesting habitat within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) of the project impact area. The qualified biologist may recommend a reduced survey area with the approval of the City and Wildlife Agencies. The surveys should continue weekly, with the last survey occurring no more than 3 days before the start of work. If an active nest is found, one of the following measures will be required prior to the start of construction activities during the breeding season:

A. Avoidance buffers (300 feet for migratory birds and 500 feet for raptors) will be established around the active nest(s). The breeding habitat/nest site will delineated with flagging, stakes, and/or construction fence in all directions, and this area will not be disturbed until the nest is inactive, the young have fledged, the young are no longer being fed by the parents, the young have left the area, and the young will no longer be impacted by the project.

B. If a reduced avoidance buffer is deemed appropriate by the qualified biologist, a project-specific Nesting Bird Management Plan will be prepared and submitted to the City and Wildlife Agencies.

C. An alternative avoidance plan for avoidance of nesting birds may be prepared and submitted to the City and Wildlife Agencies for review and approval.

D. All personnel on-site should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. The project proponent will document the results of the recommended protective measures described above to demonstrate compliance with applicable local, state, and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

   A biological monitor will be present on-site during grubbing and clearing of vegetation to ensure that these activities remain within the approved project footprint (i.e., outside the avoidance buffer) and that the flagging/stakes/fencing is being maintained to minimize the likelihood that active nests are abandoned or fail due to project activities. The biological monitor will send weekly monitoring reports

to the City during the grubbing and clearing of vegetation and will notify the City immediately if project activities take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird or raptor.

MM-BIO-6: **Construction Monitoring and Subsequent Resource Identification.** During construction, all construction activities, including access and staging, will be restricted to areas previously identified and depicted on the approved project plans. A qualified biological monitor will monitor construction activities as needed to verify that construction activities do not encroach into biologically sensitive areas and that, if applicable, the mitigation measures developed to accommodate any sensitive species located during the pre-construction surveys are being implemented. The qualified biological monitor will complete a Daily Biological Monitoring Form to document construction and monitoring activities and compliance.

During construction, the qualified biological monitor will note/act to prevent any new disturbances to habitat, flora, and/or fauna (e.g., flag newly identified sensitive resources). If active nests or other previously unknown sensitive resources are detected, all project activities that may impact the resource will be delayed until species-specific local, state, or federal regulations have been determined and applied by the qualified biological monitor.

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

The proposed project site does not contain riparian habitat.

Vegetation communities within the proposed project site consist of Diegan coastal sage scrub and disturbed habitat as shown in Table 3.4-2.

Table 3.4-2. Proposed Project Impacts[1]

Vegetation Community/ Land Cover Type	Permanent Impacts				Not Impacted	
	Grading		*FMDS*	*Total*	*Avoided*	*FMDS for APN 385-010-03[2]*
	Proposed Project Site	*100-foot Survey Buffer*				
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	0.273	0.001	0.234	0.508	0.260	0.066
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub (Disturbed)	0.068	0.000	0.027	0.095	0.009	0.000
Disturbed Habitat	0.007	0.005	0.000	0.012	0.052	0.019
Urban/Developed	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total	**0.348**	**0.006**	**0.262**	**0.615**	**0.321**	**0.085**

[1]All areas are presented in acres, rounded to the nearest thousandth.
[2]This area is subject to FMDS for the adjacent property to the west; therefore, the impacts are not attributed to the proposed project.

Proposed project implementation would impact 0.615 acre of vegetation, including 0.348 acre from on-site grading, 0.006 acre from off-site road improvements and construction, and 0.262 acre from FMDS.

As a project design feature, the proposed project would preserve 0.269 acre of habitat on-site, within the southern and eastern portions of the proposed project site. However, the proposed project would disturb 0.603 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub (including 0.95 acres of disturbed CSS) during construction activities. Direct impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub would be considered a **potentially significant impact (BIO-3)** and would require mitigation in accordance with the City's Subarea Plan.

MM-BIO-7: In accordance with the City's draft Subarea Plan, impacts to 0.603 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio (1.206 acres). Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, this mitigation requirement shall be met through acquisition and/or preservation of 1.206 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub either within a conserved parcel in the project vicinity or through purchase of mitigation credits at a mitigation bank approved by the City and resource agencies (i.e., CDFW, USFWS).

Mitigation would occur off-site, through one or both of the following options:

1. Acquisition of Diegan coastal sage scrub credits at a mitigation bank approved by the City and resource agencies; or

2. Preservation of land supporting Diegan coastal sage scrub at a location approved by the City and resource agencies

There are currently no mitigation banks with coastal sage scrub credits within the City, accordingly, credits would have to be purchased outside the City. The nearest mitigation banks with available credits are the San Miguel Conservation Bank, located 9 miles to the south of the proposed project site, and the Willow Road Conservation Bank, located approximately 4 miles to the east of the proposed project site (Busby Biological services Inc. 2022).

With the implementation Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-7**, impacts to 0.603 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant impact with mitigated incorporated** on candidate, sensitive, or special status plant species.

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

No potentially jurisdictional drainages, wetlands, or wetland indicators (i.e., wetland vegetation, ordinary high-water mark, streambed, stream bank, channel) were observed within the survey area during the biological survey. Therefore, the proposed project site does not contain any state or federally protected wetlands. As such, **no impact** to state or federally protected wetlands would occur as a result of the proposed project.

d) Would the project 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?

Although the proposed project site is not considered a part of a regional wildlife corridor, the proposed project site does support wildlife movement (Busby Biological Services 2022). However, the proposed project would be located adjacent to existing residential development and would not substantially encroach into any major wildlife corridors. The effects on wildlife movement would be addressed through the mitigation required for impacts to sensitive vegetation, as well as through implementation of adjacency guidelines from Section 7.2.4.6 of the City's draft Subarea Plan, which provides guidance for projects that occur adjacent to preserve lands to reduce or prevent indirect impacts to the preserve. As explained in Appendix B, these include measures related to drainage, lighting, noise, invasive species, buffers, and fuel modifications.

Drainage

All drainage would be directed to storm drain systems, and no toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, or excess water would drain into the preserved lands to the east or south.

Lighting

Proposed project lighting would comply with the City building code, and lighting would be low illumination and directed away from the preserved areas.

Noise

As a single-family residential development, the proposed land use is not anticipated to result in noise impacts within the adjacent preserved lands. However, construction noise has potential to impact sensitive wildlife, such as coastal California gnatcatcher, in the preserve. **MM-BIO-4A** is required if construction is proposed during the nesting season.

Invasive species

The proposed project does not propose to introduce any invasive plant species, as the proposed project would follow a City-approved landscape plan that would not include any species on the California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) "Invasive Plant Inventory" (Cal-IPC 2021).

Buffers

The proposed project does not propose any buffers to the existing preserved properties to the east or south. As no wetlands are present within or adjacent to the proposed project site, no wetland buffers are required.

Fuel Modification Zones

The proposed project design includes FMDS as required per the City's municipal code. FMDS comprises two distinct brush management areas: Zone 1 (the first 50 feet from flammable structures) and Zone 2 (the second 50 feet). Zone 1 may consist of pavement; walkways; turf; and permanently landscaped, irrigated, and maintained ornamental planting. Zone 2 may include low-growing, fire-resistant shrubs, and ground covers.

Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant impact** on wildlife movement.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

The proposed project would comply with all applicable ordinances and permits of the City of Santee, including the City's Urban Forestry Ordinance (Ordinance 421 Section 2 (part), 2002). Impacts would be **less than significant**.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

The City of Santee is within the boundaries of the 1998 San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Plan. The City is in the process of developing an MSCP Subarea Plan and is not currently covered under existing federal or state permits for a habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation Plan, or other conservation plan. However, the proposed avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures required for the proposed project are consistent with the draft Subarea Plan. In addition, the project would comply with the adjacency requirements from Section 7.2.4.6 of the City's draft Subarea Plan as discussed under threshold (d), above. As such, the development of the proposed project would not prejudice the ability of the City to adopt an MSCP Subarea Plan with this goal in mind. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

3.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings." The proposed project site is currently vacant and undeveloped and is surrounded by existing residential uses and open space. Therefore, no historical resources would be demolished, destroyed, relocated, or altered as a result of the proposed project. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

The City's general plan identifies areas with Moderate Potential for Register Eligible Archaeological and Buried Archaeological Sites (City of Santee 2003, Figure 6-2). According to Figure 6-2, the proposed project site is not located within an area identified to have moderate potential for register eligible archaeological or buried archaeological sites (City of Santee 2003). As such, it is unlikely that implementation of the proposed project would impact unknown archaeological resources. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

In the event that human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, there are regulatory provisions to address the handling of human remains in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e). Pursuant to these codes, in the event that human remains are discovered during construction, construction activity shall be halted and the area shall be protected until the County coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the PRC. The County coroner is required to make a determination within 2 working days of notification of the discovery of the human remains. If the County coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority, and if he or she recognizes or has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall consult with the Native American Heritage Commission by telephone within 24 hours, to designate a Most Likely Descendant who shall recommend appropriate measures to the landowner regarding the treatment of the remains. If the owner does not accept the Most Likely Descendant's recommendations, the owner or the Most Likely Descendant may request mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission. Therefore, with compliance with this existing state law, impacts associated with human remains would be **less than significant**.

3.6 Energy

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	**Energy** – Would the project:				
a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

Project implementation would result in energy use for construction and operation, including use of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels. The electricity and natural gas required for construction and operation of the proposed project would require energy usage that is standard for residential development. Project implementation would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence. Once completed, energy usage due to operational activities would be standard for single-family residences. The proposed project would not conflict or obstruct with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The impact would be **less than significant**.

3.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) 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 on- or off-site 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, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

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

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

and

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

The proposed project site, like all of southern California, is located within a seismically active region that contains major active faults. The project would likely be exposed to seismic ground shaking should a seismic event occur in the region. The intensity of ground shaking at any specific location within the region depends on the characteristics of the earthquakes, the distance from the earthquake epicenter, and the local geologic and soil conditions. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act (Alquist-Priolo Act) requires the delineation of fault zones along active faults in California. The purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Act is to regulate development on or near active fault traces to reduce hazards associates with fault rupture. The proposed project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (DOC 2022b). No known active faults cross the proposed project site. The nearest fault zone to the project is the Newport-Inglewood/Rose Canyon Fault Zone, located approximately 15.4 miles to the west. Strong seismic activity along nearby faults could result in ground shaking conditions that are a common hazard in much of southern California.

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence, which would be designed in accordance with all applicable provisions established in the current California Building Code (CBC), which sets forth specific engineering requirements to ensure structural integrity during a seismic event. Compliance with these requirements would reduce the potential risk to both people and structures with respect to strong seismic activity. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Liquefaction occurs when partially saturated soil loses its effective stress and enters a liquid state, which can result in the soil's inability to support structures above. Liquefaction can be induced by ground-shaking events and is dependent on soil saturation conditions. The proposed project site is not located within or adjacent to a liquefaction zone, as mapped by the California Department of Conservation (DOC 2022b). As such, **no impact** would occur.

iv) Landslides?

Landslides typically occur on moderate to steep slopes that are affected by such physical factors as slope height, slope steepness, shear strength, and orientation of weak layers in the underlying geologic units contribute to landslide susceptibility. The proposed project site is not located in a landslide zone, as mapped by the California Department of Conservation (DOC 2022b). As such, no impact would occur.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Soils within the proposed project site consists of Vista coarse sandy loam, which has rapid runoff with high to very high erosion hazard (Busby Biological Services Inc. 2023). The project has prepared a a Standard Development Project (SDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP). As part of the construction permit approval, prior to project-related construction, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared for the proposed project. The SWPPP would include BMPs to control erosion and sediment during construction activities. With adherence to the SWPPP requirements, construction-related impacts related to soil erosion impacts would be less than significant.

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

As discussed in response to Threshold 3.7 iii) and iv), the proposed project site is not located within a landslide zone or liquefaction zone (DOC 2022b). Furthermore, due to the proposed project site's distance to Newport-Inglewood/ Rose Canyon Fault Zone, the project is unlikely to result in impacts associated with seismic hazards. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

Expansive soils are clay-based and tend to increase in volume due to water absorption and decrease in water volume due to drying. As discussed in response to Threshold 3.7 b), the soil present within the proposed project site consists of Vista Coarse Sandy Loam, which is not a clay-based soil (Busby Biological Services Inc. 2023). As such, no expansive soils are present within the proposed project site and soil expansion would not pose a potential concern for project implementation. If such conditions are encountered, the project would employ standard engineering protocols to limit the potential effects on project-related infrastructure. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

The proposed project does not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. **No impact** would occur.

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

Soils on-site are mapped as Vista coarse sandy loam, 30 to 65 percent slopes. These soils occur on steep slopes and are well-drained, moderately deep, coast sandy loams with a depth of 20 to 40 inches over weathered rock. Based on this depth to weathered rock, there is the potential for paleontological resources to be encountered. Project construction would include ground-disturbing activities which would have the potential to destroy a unique paleontological resource or sites. Such an impact would be potentially significant (Impact GEO-1)).

MM-GEO1: Prior to any clearing, grubbing, or grading, a qualified project paleontologist shall be retained to oversee the mitigation program. A qualified project paleontologist is a person with a doctorate or master's degree in paleontology or related field and who has knowledge of the County of San Diego paleontology and documented experience in professional paleontological procedures and techniques. In addition, a regional fossil repository, such as the San Diego Natural History Museum, shall be designated by the City of Santee to receive any discovered fossils.

2. Preconstruction Meeting: The project paleontologist shall attend the preconstruction meeting to consult with the grading and excavation contractors concerning excavation schedules, paleontological field techniques, and safety issues.

3. Preconstruction Training: The project paleontologist shall conduct a paleontological resource training workshop to be attended by earth excavation personnel.

4. During-Construction Monitoring: A project paleontologist or paleontological monitor shall be present during all earthwork in formations with moderate to high paleontological sensitivity. A paleontological monitor (working under the direction of the project paleontologist) shall be

on site on a full-time basis during all original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits.

5. During-Construction Fossil Recovery: If fossils are discovered, the project paleontologist (or paleontological monitor) shall recover them. In most cases, fossil salvage can be completed in a short period of time. However, some fossil specimens (e.g., a bone bed or a complete large mammal skeleton) may require an extended salvage period. In these instances, the project paleontologist (or paleontological monitor) has the authority to temporarily direct, divert, or halt grading to allow recovery of fossil remains in a timely manner.

6. Post-Construction Treatment: Fossil remains collected during monitoring and salvage shall be cleaned, repaired, sorted, and cataloged.

7. Post-Construction Curation: Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos, and maps, shall be deposited in the designated fossil repository.

8. Post-Construction Final Report: A final summary paleontological mitigation report that outlines the results of the mitigation program shall be completed and submitted to the City of Santee within two weeks of the completion of each construction phase of the proposed project. This report shall include discussions of the methods used, stratigraphic section(s) exposed, fossils collected, inventory lists of cataloged fossils, and significance of recovered fossils.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-GEO-1** the proposed project would not result in the destruction of a unique paleontological resource. Impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

and

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

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence on an approximately 1.01-acre proposed project site. The proposed project would generate construction and operational emissions consistent with residential development. Construction and operation activities are not anticipated to generate a substantial amount of greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. Furthermore, the proposed project would be consistent with the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) would not interfere with the City's achievement of the requirements therein. Project implementation is not anticipated to conflict with measures in the CAP. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle 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) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Project construction would include the use of commonly used hazardous substances such as gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, adhesive materials, grease, solvents, and architectural coatings. These materials are not considered extremely hazardous and are used routinely throughout urban environments for construction projects. Further, these materials would be transported and handled in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials. Consequently, use of these materials for their intended purpose would not pose a significant risk to the public or environment. With adherence to state and local regulations, impacts associated with routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be **less than significant**.

b) Would the project 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?

As discussed in response to Threshold 3.9 a), construction would involve the use of commonly used hazardous substances such as gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, grease, adhesive materials, solvents, and architectural coatings. These materials are not considered acutely hazardous and are used routinely throughout urban environments for both construction and operation of projects. Further, these materials would be transported and handled in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

The closest school to the proposed project site is Hill Creek School, located approximately 0.93 miles to the north. Therefore, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school. **No impact** would occur.

d) Would the project 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?

According to the DTSC's EnviroStor database, there are no clean-up sites located within or near the proposed project site (DTSC 2022). Other state and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous materials release information for the Cortese

List. The SWRCB's GeoTracker database identifies leaking underground storage tanks, waste discharge sites, oil and gas sites, and other waste or cleanup sites. A review of GeoTracker did not identify any sites or facilities within or adjacent to the proposed project site. The nearest identified site with open-site assessment statuses include the following: Dion & Sons (ID#: T10000004271) a Cleanup Program Site, located approximately 0.65 miles north of the proposed project site; Discount Gun Mart (ID#:T10000013228), a Cleanup Program Site, located approximately 0.94 miles southwest of the proposed project site; and 8234 Wenatchee (ID#: T10000016317), a Cleanup Program Site, located approximately 0.96 miles south of the proposed project site (SWRCB 2022). These hazardous materials sites are located at adequate distances from the proposed project site such that they would be of no concern to present a worker hazard for construction crews. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

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

Gillespie Field is located approximately 1.25 miles west of the proposed project site. With respect to safety hazards, the proposed project site is located within *Safety Zone 6 – Traffic Pattern Zone*. However, new residential development is compatible with Zone 6; thus, the project development would not conflict with this safety zone (Appendix C). With respect to noise, the proposed project site lies outside the 60 dB CNEL noise exposure contour (Appendix C). Therefore, as determined in the Airport Land Use Commission Consistency Determination (Appendix C), the proposed project would be compatible with airport uses. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The proposed project would be located on an undeveloped vacant parcel and would not reroute traffic and physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan. **No impact** would occur.

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

Fire response services for the proposed project site are provided by the Santee Fire Department. The proposed project site is located within in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA), but is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) (Cal Fire 2022). However, the project site is in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI); therefore, the proposed project is required to implement fuel modification zones as required by the Fire

Code. This includes two zones that extend outward from the proposed building. These zones consist of. FMZ-1, which is an irrigated zone that would extend from the residence outward for the first 50 and FMZ 2 would consist of thinned native vegetation that would not be irrigated.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would comply with Chapter 33 of the California Fire Code (CFC), which outlines general fire safety precautions during construction and demolition that are intended to maintain minimum levels of fire protection and limit the spread of fire (CFC 2019). As such, people and structures would not be exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildfires. **No impact** would occur.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? or	☐	☐	☐	☒
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

The proposed project site is located within the San Diego River Watershed Management Area (WMA). The San Diego River Watershed Management Area Water Quality Improvement Plan (WQIP), outlines water quality objectives, and includes measures to reduce discharge pollutants, and protect and improve the water quality in storm drain discharges and receiving waters (County of San Diego 2016). Additionally, the City has prepared Guidelines for Surface Water Pollution Prevention (Manual). The purpose of the Manual is to establish storm water management requirements and controls to meet requirements of the WQIP (City of Santee 2015).

Construction of the proposed project would involve ground-disturbing activities for grading that could result in sediment discharge in stormwater runoff. Additionally, construction would involve the use of oil, lubricants, and other chemicals that could be discharged from leaks or accidental spills. These potential sediment and chemical discharges during construction would have the potential to impact water quality in receiving water bodies. However, the proposed project would be required to prepare and implement a WPCP, which would include water quality BMPs to ensure that water quality standards are met, and that runoff from the construction work areas do not cause degradation of water quality in receiving water bodies.

Through the incorporation of, BMPs, adherence to the WMA, WQIP, the City's Manual, and preparation and compliance with WPCP requirements, impacts associated with water quality standards would be **less than significant**.

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

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the use of groundwater and, therefore, would not decrease or interfere with existing groundwater or sustainable groundwater management. The proposed project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. As such, project implementation would result in an increase in impervious surfaces. However, the proposed project would include 6,741 square feet (0.15 acres) of impervious surface. The remaining area within the project site would remain permeable. As such, the proposed project would not interfere with groundwater recharge or impede the sustainable groundwater management of the any groundwater basin, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

As discussed in response to Threshold 3.8 b), soils present within the proposed project site include Vista coarse sandy loam, which has a very high erosion hazard (Busby Biological Services Inc. 2022). The WPCP prepared for the proposed project would include BMPs to control erosion and sediment during construction activities. Additionally, development of the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would increase erosion on the proposed project site. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

As analyzed in Appendix D, the current runoff rate from the proposed project site is $1.3ft^3/s$ and upon completion of the proposed development, the runoff rate would remain $1.3ft^3/s$ (Project Engineering, Inc. 2022). Project implementation would not result in on- or off-site flooding. **No impact** would occur.

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

As previously discussed, the current runoff rate from the proposed project site is $1.3ft^3/s$. Upon completion of the proposed development, the runoff rate would remain $1.3ft^3/s$ (Project Engineering, Inc. 2022). As such, the proposed project would not increase runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing drainage facilities. **No impact** would occur.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood maps, the proposed project is not located within a designated high risk or special flood hazard area (FEMA 2022). Implementation of the proposed project would not impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

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

The proposed project site is not located near any coastal areas, which are subject to tsunamis. The proposed project site is located approximately 18 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and at elevations ranging between approximately 567 feet to 650 feet above mean sea level. As such, based on the distance and elevation from the Pacific Ocean, the risk of a tsunami affecting the proposed project site is low. A seiche is a standing wave in a completely or partially enclosed body of water that can be caused by high winds, seismic activity, or changes in atmospheric pressure. The proposed project site is not located adjacent to any standing bodies of water; therefore, seiche risk is low. Finally, according to the FEMA flood maps, the proposed project site is not located within a flood hazard area (FEMA 2022). Therefore, the proposed project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation from flooding. The project would have **no impact** because the project location is not within a flood hazard, tsunami or seiche zone**.**

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

The proposed project would prepare a WPCP, which would include measures to reduce impacts to water quality during construction. In addition, the proposed project would comply with the San Diego River WQIP and the City's Manual.

The proposed project does not propose to extract groundwater and; thus, does not have the potential to decrease local groundwater supplies. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

3.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
rb) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

The proposed project site is a vacant, undeveloped parcel located at the southern terminus of Shadow Hill Road, adjacent to existing development. Construction of the proposed project would not divide an established community. The project would have **no impact**.

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

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence on an approximately 1.01-acre project site. The proposed project site is designated Low Density Residential (R-1) within a Hillside Overlay (HL) (City of Santee 2003), which permits the construction of single-family homes subject to the appropriate review and permits. Project implementation would not conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation. As such, impacts related to plan consistency would be **less than significant**.

3.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project 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?

The Santee General Plan identifies locations of areas designated as Mineral Resource Zone MRZ-2 within the City. These are primarily along the northern banks of the San Diego River and on hills underlain by granitic rock. The MRZ-2 designation indicates that, in spite of mineral recovery potential, consideration of economics, land use compatibility, and environmental protection must be considered. These areas are located north of the existing development in Carlton Hills, south of Prospect Avenue between Mesa Road and Fanita Drive, and the north end of Magnolia Avenue. The proposed project site is not within any

of these areas as identified by the Santee General Plan. Furthermore, the proposed project site is zoned Low Density Residential (R-1) within a Hillside Overlay (HL). Mineral extraction is not a permitted use within this zone. **No impact** would occur.

b) Would the project 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?

As discussed in response to Threshold 3.12 a), the proposed project site is not located within a MRZ-2, as identified by the City's General Plan. The proposed project site consists of undeveloped, vacant land and is not considered a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

3.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Short-term noise impacts would be associated with on-site grading and construction activities. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the proposed project site but would be temporary in nature and

cease upon completion of construction. The closest residence to the property is located approximately 90 feet to the north of the proposed project boundary.

The nearby residences in the area may be temporarily affected by construction noise; however, all construction activities would be performed in accordance with the City of Santee's Municipal Code Section 5.04.040, which establishes the City's noise regulation, generally prohibits nuisance noise and states that it is unlawful for any person to make, continue, or cause to be made or continued within the City limits any disturbing, excessive, or offensive noise that causes discomfort or annoyance to reasonable persons of normal sensitivity residing in the area. Construction noise would be intermittent and present only for a limited duration, activities requiring use of construction equipment could temporarily increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed project site. Once construction is complete, operational activities would not result in an increase in ambient noise levels in excess of applicable standards. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Project construction activities, such as the use of high power or vibratory tools, compactors, and tracked equipment, have the potential to generate vibration in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site. However, in general, these construction tools only generate vibration in the immediate vicinity of 25 feet of the equipment. As the distance from the center of construction activities to adjacent receivers would be greater than 25 feet, these construction activities would not generate substantial vibration that would be perceptible to nearby receivers. The closest residence is located approximately 90 feet to the north. Therefore, any vibration potentially generated by construction activities is not anticipated to be perceptible to nearby receivers. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

The proposed project site is located approximately 1.25 miles to the east of Gillespie Field. The proposed project site lies outside the 60 dB CNEL noise exposure contour as shown in the Gillespie Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Thus, impacts would be **less than significant**.

3.14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV .POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence, which is consistent with the zoning and land use designation in the General Plan. The proposed project would not develop new roads or infrastructure. Development of the site is planned and would not induce substantial growth. **No impact** would occur.

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

The proposed project site consists of approximately 1.01 acres of undeveloped vacant land. Project development would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing. **No impact** would occur.

3.15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

Fire protection?

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence. Project development would not result in a substantial unplanned population growth within the City. The proposed project site is located within an area that is adequately served by the Santee Fire Department. The project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Police protection?

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence. Project development would not result in a substantial unplanned population growth within the City. The proposed project site is located within an area that is adequately served by the Santee Sheriff's Station. The proposed project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth. As such, it is anticipated that the Santee Sheriff's Station would have the resources to adequately serve the proposed project. Project implementation would not result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Schools?

The proposed project site would be located within the Santee School district. The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence and would not result in substantial unplanned population growth within the City. The project may also be conditioned to pay any applicable school impact fee(s) prior to, or at the time of building

permit issuance. As such, project implementation would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Parks?

The proposed project site located approximately 300 feet southeast of Shadow Hill Park and approximately 100 feet north of Padre Dam Park. The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence and would not result in a substantial unplanned population growth within the City. As such, project implementation would not result in the need for new of physically altered parks of recreational facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Other public facilities?

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence and would not result in substantial unplanned population growth. Project implementation would not result in result in the need for new or physically altered library facilities, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

As part of the conditions of approval, the applicant will be required to pay any applicable development impact fees, including any impact fees which cover public facilities.

3.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Parks located within the vicinity of the proposed project site include Shadow Hill Park to the west and Padre Dam Park to the south. The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence. The proposed project would result in a negligible amount of population growth within the City. As such, the increase in usage of Shadow Hill Park and Padre Dam Park would not result in the substantial physical deterioration of these parks. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence on an approximately 1.01 acre-project site. The proposed project would not include the construction recreational facilities. Furthermore, the proposed project would result in a negligible amount of population growth within the City. As such, project implementation would not require the construction of expansion of recreational facilities. **No impact** would occur.

3.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

The proposed project would result in a short-term increase in traffic due to construction traffic to the proposed project site; however, traffic impacts would be temporary due to the duration of construction and the minimal number of construction traffic is anticipated. Further, the proposed project does not include any project elements that could potentially conflict with policies, plans, or programs related to the circulation system, including public transit, roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

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

The proposed project would result in a short-term increase in traffic due to construction traffic to the proposed project site; however, traffic impacts would be temporary due to the short duration of construction and the minimal number of construction traffic anticipated. Further, once constructed and occupied, the single-family residence would generate an average of 10 trips/day which is less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts would be **less than significant.**

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

The proposed project does not include any project elements that could potentially create a traffic hazard to the public. A driveway would be constructed to provide access to the proposed project from Shadow Hill Road, which would be used by the future residents and guests. No new roads are proposed as a component of project development. As such, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

The proposed project site is located within a vacant, undeveloped parcel at the southern terminus of Shadow Hill Road. Construction equipment and activities would occur entirely within the proposed project site. Project implementation would not interfere with emergency access to the proposed project or surrounding area. **No impact** would occur.

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

The proposed project site consists of 1.01 acres of undeveloped vacant land. No historical resources listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR are located within the proposed project site. Therefore, project implementation would not result in the substantial adverse change historical resources that are either listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR or in a local register of historical resources. **No impact** would occur.

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

The City completed the AB52 notification process. Certified notification letters were mailed to the following tribes and confirmed receipt on the following dates:

i. Barona Band of Mission Indians – 8/29/22
ii. Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians – 9/2/22
iii. Kumeyaay Heritage Preservation Council – 8/30/22
iv. Jamul Indian Village – 9/27/22

The City was not contacted by any of the tribal representatives for consultation on the project. Consultation ended on October 26, 2022.

As discussed in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, the City's general plan identifies areas with Moderate Potential for Register Eligible Archaeological and Buried Archaeological Sites (City of Santee 2003, Figure 6-2). According to Figure 6-2, the proposed project site is not located within an area identified to have moderate potential for register eligible archaeological or buried archaeological sites (City of Santee 2003).

Due to the physical conditions of the proposed project site, it is unlikely that project implementation would disturb unknown tribal cultural resources. The proposed project site consists of Vista coarse sandy loam with a depth of 20 inches to 40 inches over weathered rock. As such, it is unlikely that an unknown tribal cultural resource would be unearthed during project implementation due to the underlying geologic conditions. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. . UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
	☐	☐	☒	☐
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence. The proposed project would require connections to water, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities. The proposed project site is located adjacent to existing residential development served by existing facilities. Project implementation would result in a minimal increase in demand of these services and would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing water, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

The proposed project site is surrounded by existing residential development that is served by the Padre Dam Municipal Water District. Padre Dam previously provided a Water Availability Form for the proposed project indicating the District had facilities available to serve the project. The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence on approximately 1.01 acres. As such, it is anticipated that the Padre Dam Municipal Water District would have the capacity to serve the proposed project during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

Padre Dam previously provided a Sewer Availability Form for the proposed project indicating the District had facilities available to serve the project. The project would not increase wastewater treatment requirements; therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

The proposed project would include the construction of one single-family residence on a 1.01-acre project site. The proposed project is anticipated to generate solid waste standard of residential development. The proposed project would be served by Sycamore Landfill (8514 Mast Boulevard), approximately 4.53 miles west of the proposed project site. Solid waste generated by the proposed project would not exceed State or local standards, or the capacity of local infrastructure. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

As discussed in response to Threshold 3.19 d), the proposed project would be adequately served by Sycamore Landfill. The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations regarding the proper disposal of solid waste, including the City of Santee Municipal Code as it relates to solid waste and recycling. The proposed project would also be required to comply with required solid waste and recycling measures as provided in the California Green Building Code (24 CCR Part 11). Impacts would be **less than significant**.

3.20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. Wildfire – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Preliminary, it is noted that the project site is not located within a VHFHSZ, and is within the City's LRA (CAL FIRE 2022) and not a State Responsibility Area; however, the project site is within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and there is exiting open space to the south, west and east; therefore, the following analysis is provided.

a) Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The proposed project site is located on a vacant and undeveloped parcel at the southern terminus of Shadow Hill Road. Project construction activities would occur entirely within the proposed project site and would not require road closures. Access to the proposed project would be provided by a driveway on the west side of Shadow Hill Road and no off-site improvements or other traffic improvements are required. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. **No impact** would occur.

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

The proposed project site is located on a large hill, which may exacerbate wildfire risks. However, according to maps prepared by CAL FIRE, the proposed project site is not located within a VHFHSZ within the City's LRA (CAL FIRE 2022). The proposed project site is located in an area where urban development currently exists and it is not susceptible to the threat of wildfire. While there is a substantial amount of open space to the south, east and west, this area does not represent a significant source of wildfire risk, and the proposed project itself is not located within a fire hazard area.

As such, in the unlikely event of a wildfire in the areas proximate to the proposed project site, all occupants at the proposed project site would evacuate the area, as directed by local fire officials. As such, the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

The proposed project would include the installation of water, sewer, and natural gas connections to existing infrastructure. However, project construction would comply with CFC requirements to manage and minimize fire risk during construction. Further, the project would implement two fuel modification zones, including Zone 1 which would be irrigated, and zone 2 which would be thinned, to address the potential effects of a wildland fire. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

Project implementation would not pose a substantial risk from wildfire related to flooding or landslides from runoff, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes. The proposed project site is located on a large hill which may be subject to post-fire runoff. However, the proposed residence is located on the uphill side of the project site, and would implement stormwater management BMPs during construction. Once occupied, the risks of flooding or landslides would be minimized because drainage rates would be the same in the pre- and post-development condition. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. . MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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 which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

Implementation of the proposed project would not cause any fish or wildlife species to drop below self-sustaining levels. The proposed project would result in direct impacts to Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub, which has the potential to impact sensitive species**.** Potential indirect impacts could result from interference with nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Fish and Game Code. Additionally, development of the proposed project site could result in construction-related indirect impacts.

With implementation of mitigation measures identified above, including **MM-BIO-1** through **MM-BIO-7** and **MM-GEO-**1, all potentially significant impacts would be reduced to **less than significant**.

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)?

As revealed in the analysis presented throughout Chapter 3, Initial Study Checklist, of this MND, the proposed project would not result in unmitigated significant impacts in any issue area. Mitigation measures recommended for paleontological resources (**MM-GEO-1**) and biological resources (**MM-BIO-1** through **MM-BIO-7** would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

The proposed project, as with potential cumulative projects, would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce impacts, as applicable. Upon completion of construction, the proposed project would have no potential to contribute to a cumulative impact. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

The proposed project would not result in any significant and unmitigable impacts that would result in an adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4 REFERENCES AND PREPARERS

4.1 References Cited

Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). 2010. Gillespie Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.https://www.san.org/DesktopModules/Bring2mind/DMX/API/Entries/Download?Command=Core_Download&EntryId=2984&language=en-US&PortalId=0&TabId=225

Busby Biological services Inc. 2023. Revised Biological Resources Letter Report for the Proposed Shadow Hill Road Project, City of Santee, California

CAL FIRE. 2022. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. Accessed August 2022. https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/?lang=zh-CN

California Fire Code (CFC). 2019. https://up.codes/viewer/california/ca-fire-code-2019

County of San Diego. 2016. San Diego River Watershed Management Area Water Quality Improvement Plan. https://projectcleanwatermy.sharepoint.com/personal/support_projectcleanwater_org/_layouts/15/onedrive.aspx?ga=1&id=%2Fpersonal%2Fsupport%5Fprojectcleanwater%5Forg%2FDocuments%2FProject%20Clean%20Water%2FRegional%20Clearing%20House%2F2019%2FWatershed%20Management%20Areas%2FSan%20Diego%20River%2FPlans%2FWQIP%2FSan%20Diego%20River%20Water%20Quality%20Improvement%20Plan%2FCertified%20San%20Diego%20River%20WMA%20Water%20Quality%20Improvement%20Plan%20%2D%20January%202016%2Epdf&parent=%2Fpersonal%2Fsupport%5Fprojectcleanwater%5Forg%2FDocuments%2FProject%20Clean%20Water%2FRegional%20Clearing%20House%2F2019%2FWatershed%20Management%20Areas%2FSan%20Diego%20River%2FPlans%2FWQIP%2FSan%20Diego%20River%20Water%20Quality%20Improvement%20Plan

United States Geological Survey (USGS)
1996 El Cajon 7.5-minute quadrangle

U.S. Census Bureau (USCB). 2022. Quick Facts. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/elcajoncitycalifornia,santeecitycalifornia/PST045221

City of Santee. 2003. City of Santee General Plan. https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/services/development-services/planning-and-zoning-services/general-plan

City of Santee. 2015. Guidelines for Surface Water Pollution Prevention. https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/8197/636341656414500000

City of Santee. 2020. City of Santee District Zoning Map https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/8549/637952158010870000

DOC (California Department of Conservation). 2017. State of California Williamson Act Contract Land. https://planning.lacity.org/eir/HollywoodCenter/Deir/ELDP/(E)%20Initial%20Study/Initial%20Study/Attachment%20B%20References/California%20Department%20of%20Conservation%20Williamson%20Map%202016.pdf.

DOC. 2022a. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed August 2022. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/.

DOC. 2022b. Earthquake Zones or Required Investigation. Accessed March 2022. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/.

DTSC. 2022. EnviroStor. Accessed August 2022. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Search

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2022. FEMA Flood Map Service Center. Accessed August 2022. https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search.

Project Engineering, Inc. 2022. 0 Lea Terrace Drive Preliminary Drainage Study.

SWRCB . 2022. GeoTracker. Accessed August 2022. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/.

4.2 List of Preparers

Sean Kilkenny, Project Manager
Madison Brown, Environmental Analyst