County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

JOHN L. SNYDER
DIRECTOR

5555 OVERLAND AVE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1295

(858) 694-2233 FAX: (858) 268-0461
Web Site: sdcdpw.org

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION
April 22, 2004

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the County of San Diego intends to adopt a Negative Declaration in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act for the following project. The proposed Negative Declaration can be reviewed at the Department of Public Works ("DPW"), Environmental Services Unit, 5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305, San Diego, California 92123 and the public libraries listed below. Comments on the proposed Negative Declaration must be sent to the DPW address indicated above, adding MS O385 to the street address line, and should reference the project name. If you wish to bring a legal challenge to the County's proposed action on the Negative Declaration, you may be limited to raising only those issues that you, or someone else, have raised in written correspondence.

Siting Element Update of 2004 (UJ0004): This is the first update of the Countywide Siting Element ("Siting Element") of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan. In compliance with Assembly Bill 939 requirements, the Siting Element describes the facilities and strategies necessary to provide 15 years' worth of solid waste disposal capacity for all the jurisdictions within San Diego County, when other alternatives, such as additional waste diversion programs and waste export, are included. An update of the Siting Element was made necessary by a number of changes in San Diego County solid waste management, including: (i) County divestiture of its public landfills; (ii) increased state solid waste diversion requirements; (iii) the mandatory deletion of several potential landfill sites classified as "tentatively reserved" in the prior Siting Element; (iv) a new landfill expansion suggested since adoption of the first Siting Element; and (v) revision of the landfill siting criteria for new or expanded landfills. The update also includes the mandatory reclassification of the Gregory Canyon landfill from "tentatively reserved" to "proposed," as required under applicable law. The Siting Element can be reviewed at http://www.sdcdpw.org/siting/.

Comments on the proposed Negative Declaration may be submitted beginning on Thursday, April 22, 2004, and must be received no later than May 24, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. (a 30-day public review period).

This proposed Negative Declaration can also be reviewed at the following Libraries: Alpine, 2130 Arnold Way, Alpine, California 91901; Bonita-Sunnyside, 5047 Central

Ave., Bonita, California 91902; Borrego Springs, 500 Palm Canyon Dr., Borrego Springs, California 92004; Casa de Oro, 9805 Campo Rd., Spring Valley, California 91977; Crest, 105 Juanita Lane, El Cajon, California 92021; Descanso, 9545 River Dr., Descanso, California 91916; Fallbrook, 124 South Mission Rd., Fallbrook, California 92028; Jacumba, 44605 Old Hwy 80, Jacumba, California 91934; Julian, 2133 4th St., Julian, California 92036; Lakeside, 9839 Vine St., Lakeside, California 92040; Lincoln Acres, 2725 Granger Ave., National City, CA 91950; Campo-Morena Village, 31466 Highway 94, Campo, California 91906; Otay Mesa, 3003 Coronado Ave., San Diego, California 92154; Pine Valley, 28804 Old Hwy 80, Pine Valley, California 91962; Potrero, 24883 Potrero Valley Road, Potrero, California 91963; Ramona, 1406 Montecito Rd., Ramona, California 92065; Rancho San Diego, 11555 Via Rancho San Diego, El Cajon, CA 92019; Rancho Santa Fe, 17040 Avenida de Acacias, Rancho Santa Fe, California 92067; Spring Valley, 1043 Elkelton Blvd., Spring Valley, California 91977; and Vista, 700 Eucalyptus Ave., Vista, California 92084. All documents referenced in the proposed Negative Declaration are available for review at the County of San Diego Department of Public Works, Office of Environmental Services, 5469 Kearny Villa Road, San Diego, California.

For additional information, please contact Wayne T. Williams at (858) 874-4108, fax (858) 874-4058 or by e-mail at Wayne.Williams@sdcounty.ca.gov.

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

JOHN L. SNYDER
DIRECTOR

5555 OVERLAND AVE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1295
(858) 694-2233 FAX: (858) 268-0461
Web Site: sdcdpw.org

April 22, 2004

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/98)

1. Project Name/Number:

   Siting Element Update of 2004, UJ0004

2. Lead agency name and address:
   County of San Diego, Department of Public Works
   5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305
   San Diego, CA 92123

3. a. Contact Wayne T. Williams, Program Coordinator.
   b. Phone number: (858) 874-4108
   c. E-mail:Wayne.Williams@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

   Incorporated and unincorporated areas of San Diego County.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

   Wayne T. Williams
   Department of Publics Works
   Solid Waste Management
   5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305
   San Diego, CA 92123

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	N/A
Land Use Designation:	N/A
Density:	N/A

7. Zoning

Use Regulation: N/A
Density: N/A
Special Area Regulation: N/A

8. Description of project:

A. Update of the Countywide Siting Element

The proposed project is the first update of the Siting Element of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. In compliance with Assembly Bill 939 requirements, the Siting Element describes the facilities and strategies necessary to provide 15 years' worth of solid waste disposal capacity for all the jurisdictions within San Diego County, when other alternatives, such as additional waste diversion programs and waste export, are included.

Siting Elements must be reviewed and revised, if necessary, every five years. *See,* Pub. Res. Code § 41770. An update of the Siting Element was warranted due to a number of changes in San Diego County solid waste management since adoption of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan in 1996. For example, the County of San Diego divested itself of its public landfills in 1997. All landfills previously owned by the County are now owed by a private company. In addition, increased state solid waste diversion requirements have changed the dynamics of County solid waste management policy and impacted the management strategies described in the Siting Element. Several landfill sites classified as "tentatively reserved" in the prior document have been removed, as required by applicable statutes and regulations. One new facility expansion suggested since adoption of the first Siting Element has been tentatively reserved in the updated document.

The Siting Element update also includes updated siting criteria. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations section 18756, a siting element must describe the criteria to be used in the siting process for new solid waste disposal facilities or expansions of existing solid waste disposal facilities. Section 18756 requires that the criteria include the following major siting considerations: Environmental Considerations, Environmental Impacts, Socioeconomic Considerations, Legal Considerations, and any additional considerations developed by the particular jurisdiction. The updated siting criteria address each of the mandatory considerations and include ten general categories of evaluation: Groundwater and Aquifers, Surface Water, Floodplains, Seismic Stability, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Aesthetics, Land Use, Health and Safety, and Technical Site Suitability. Each general category is broken down into multiple "sub-categories" of evaluation (*e.g.,* site groundwater quality, site visibility, adjacent land uses, etc.). Applying the siting criteria to a proposed new landfill or landfill expansion allows a jurisdiction to rate a proposed site as more or less suitable for landfill development. Certain "pass/fail" criteria previously included in the Siting Element have been eliminated.

The Siting Element serves as a policy manual, rather than a specific development program. While the Siting Element discusses new landfills and landfill expansions, it does not effect or guarantee the approval of such new or expanded facilities by any agency or jurisdiction. Each new or expanded facility must be reviewed separately through local land use approval and state solid waste facility permitting procedures. All environmental issues associated with any new or expanded facility are required to be thoroughly analyzed in an environmental impact report or other appropriate environmental review document prior to facility development. Review and adoption of the Siting Element does not limit any jurisdiction or interested party's right to conduct more in-depth review of each proposal.

Notwithstanding its status as a policy manual, the Siting Element does not in any event warrant extensive environmental review at this time. With the exception of the Gregory Canyon landfill, discussed below, there is only one suggested expansion of a facility described in the Siting Element at the existing Sycamore Canyon landfill, and the expansion is classified as "tentatively reserved." Environmental review of such facilities is not appropriate or required at this stage in the landfill planning process. Each tentatively reserved site will receive complete environmental evaluation by the local land use authority if it is found to be necessary to meet community landfill capacity needs and proposed for actual development.

B. Reclassification Of The Gregory Canyon Landfill

The updated the Siting Element, reclassifies the Gregory Canyon landfill from the "tentatively reserved" classification in the 1996 Siting Element to the "proposed" classification in the updated document. Pursuant to provisions of the California Public Resources Code and the California Code of Regulations, reclassification of a proposed new landfill from "tentatively reserved" to "proposed" in a Siting Element is mandatory once the landfill has been found to be consistent with the applicable General Plan. *See, e.g.*, Pub. Res. Code §§ 41701, 41702; Title 14 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 18756.1, 18756.3.

On November 8, 1994, County voters approved Proposition C, which amended the San Diego County General Plan to designate the Gregory Canyon site Public/Semi-public lands with a Solid Waste Facility Designation. As such, the Gregory Canyon landfill has been found consistent with the County General Plan. Having been found consistent with the General Plan, the Gregory Canyon landfill must be reclassified as "proposed" in the Siting Element. Because reclassification is mandatory under the circumstances, the County has no discretion in the matter and CEQA does not require environmental analysis of the Gregory Canyon landfill reclassification component of the proposed project.

Nor does CEQA require the County to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the Gregory Canyon landfill project itself in connection with reclassification of the landfill. The County, in satisfying its mandatory duty to reclassify the landfill as "proposed," has no authority to require mitigation for, or shape implementation of, the landfill project in a way that would respond to concerns raised in an EIR for the

landfill; therefore, environmental review of the Gregory Canyon landfill project in connection with approval of the Siting Element update would be a meaningless exercise. The environmental impacts of the landfill project were assessed in the Gregory Canyon Landfill Final Environmental Impact Report, December 2002 (SCH No. 1995061007). For these reasons, this Initial Study does not consider the potential environmental impacts of the Gregory Canyon landfill project.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

   The proposed project is the 2003 update to the Siting Element of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. As such, the proposed project is not site-specific.

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

JURISDICTIONS AND AGENCIES IN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

Carlsbad,
Chula Vista,
Coronado,
Del Mar,
El Cajon,
Encinitas,
Escondido,
Imperial Beach,
La Mesa,
Lemon Grove,
National City,
Oceanside,
San Diego,
San Marcos
Santee,
Solana Beach,
Vista,

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

List of Preparers of Initial Study

Nelson Olivas, Environmental Services, Department of Public Works, Co. of San Diego
Ryan Binns, Environmental Services, Department of Public Works, Co. of San Diego

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 Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology & Soils
☐ Hazards & Haz. Materials	☐ Hydrology & Water Quality	☐ Land Use & Planning

- ☐ Mineral Resources
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Population & Housing
- ☐ Public Services
- ☐ Recreation
- ☐ Transportation/Traffic
- ☐ Utilities & Service Systems
- ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Public Works finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Public Works finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

11/1/04
Date

Ryan Binns
Printed Name

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNER
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

-

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a reasonably foreseeable 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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated as such. A highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from Caltrans that the highway has been designated as an official scenic highway. The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a reasonably foreseeable substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

-

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not propose any alterations to the visual environment, including landform modification or construction. The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project will not alter the existing visual character or quality of the project site and surrounding area.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. The project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

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

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

-

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Consequently, the proposed project would not impact any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, and no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The updated Siting Element does not advocate or guarantee approval of new or expanded landfill facilities, either in general or at specific locations. Nonetheless, the facilities described in the Siting Element are not located in areas zoned for agriculture, nor are they under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an update of the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project would not cause changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

-

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

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. Therefore, the project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the RAQS or the SIP on a project or cumulative level.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: This project does not propose any operation or activity that has the potential to emit air pollution. No increase in vehicular trips is anticipated as a result of the project. Further, there are no substantial grading operations associated with the project. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact

-

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any construction and/or operation with the potential to emit any criteria air pollutants. No increase in vehicular trips is anticipated as a result of the project. Further, there are no substantial grading operations associated with the project. As such, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of PM_{10}, or any O_3 precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not result in any air pollutant emissions. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not involve any potential sources of objectionable odors; therefore, no impact from odors is anticipated.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

-

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will no have substantial adverse effects on any species.

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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact:
The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project will not have any reasonably foreseeable direct or indirect impacts on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act over which the Army Corps of Engineers maintains jurisdiction or wetlands over which the Regional Water Quality Control Board has jurisdiction as defined by Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.

-

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, nor will it impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document that does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. It does not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local polices or ordinances that protect biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

-

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose, nor is there any reasonable expectation of, any ground disturbing activities whatsoever or alterations to existing historical structures. Therefore, there is no potential for impacts to historical resources.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose, nor is there any reasonable expectation of, any ground disturbing activities whatsoever. Therefore, there is no potential for impacts to archaeological resources.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not destroy any unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

-

No Impact: The project does not propose, nor is there any reasonable expectation of, any ground disturbing activities whatsoever. Therefore, there is no potential for disturbance of interred human remains.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☑ No Impact

-

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project will not expose people to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.

iv. Landslides?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The project will not expose people to adverse effects from landslides.

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

-

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not produce unstable geological conditions that would result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore the proposed project would not result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) creating risks to life or property.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Because the project will not generate any wastewater, no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

-

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity.

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
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact:
The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

-

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project is not located on a site listed on the list of State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

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 for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project site is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports, or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, and the project site is not located within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

-

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop a specific operational area for San Diego County. The plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The proposed project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The proposed project will not interfere with the San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius around the station. No portion of the proposed project site is located within that emergency planning zone; therefore, the project is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The proposed project will not interfere with the Oil Spill Contingency Element because the project site is not located in the coastal zone or along the coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The proposed project will not interfere with the Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

-

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The proposed project will not interfere with the Dam Evacuation Plan because the project site is not located within a dam inundation zone.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

i) Expose people to significant risk of injury or death involving vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. lagoons, agricultural irrigation ponds, etc.). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (e.g., chicken coops, dairies etc.) or other similar uses. Therefore, the project will not expose people to significant risk of injury or death involving vectors.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

-

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The project does not propose waste discharges that require a waste discharge requirement permit, NPDES permit, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB). In addition, the project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff or land use activities that would require special site design considerations, source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) or treatment control BMPs, under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01).

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element and the project site is not tributary to an impaired water body. The project will not result in an increase in any pollutant.

c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The project does not propose any new source of polluted runoff. In addition, the project does not propose new storm water drainage

-

facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff offsite.

d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The project does not involve construction of new or expanded development that could alter the drainage pattern of any site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Furthermore, the

-

proposed project will not alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on-site or off-site.

f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. It does not involve construction of new or expanded development that could alter the drainage pattern of any site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Furthermore, the proposed project will not alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on-site or off-site.

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. There is no existing or planned storm water drainage systems proposed by the project, nor does the project require such systems.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

-

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. It does not propose any known additional sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff off-site.

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact will occur.

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site. The project will not place any structure within a 100-year flood hazard area; therefore, no impact will occur.

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

-

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir and, therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The proposed project site is located more than a mile from the coast and, therefore, would not be inundated in the event of a tsunami.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is a type of landslide. The proposed project site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. In addition, the project does not propose land disturbance activities that will expose soils, and the project site is not located downstream from exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation by mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

-

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not propose introducing new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not disrupt or divide an established community.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element and will not be in conflict with any element of the County General plan, including community plans, land use designation, or zoning. Throughout the Siting Element preparation process, the County responded to concerns expressed by individuals, organizations and other jurisdictions. As a result, the strategy to achieve sufficient landfill space during the 15-year planning period includes a “tentatively reserved” expansion of the Sycamore landfill, a mandatory reclassification of the Gregory Canyon landfill from "tentatively reserved" to "proposed," strong emphasis on recycling, and reliance on out-of-county transport of refuse, if needed, plus additional landfill maintenance and other technologies.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any

-

new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The proposed project will not result in the loss of available of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project will not expose people to, or generate, any noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, or other applicable local, state, and federal noise control regulations.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

-

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. It does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

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

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

-

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The proposed project site is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The proposed project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

-

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in any area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in any area including, but limited to, the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore the proposed project will not displace any existing housing.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people.

-

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

XIV. RECREATION

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document. The project does not propose any residential use, including, but not limited to, a residential subdivision, mobilehome park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

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

-

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the project cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment related to recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any additional ADTs; therefore, the project will have no impact on the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any additional ADTs; therefore, the project will have no impact on the level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

-

Mitigation Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project site is not located within any Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, or place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. No on-site or off-site parking is required or proposed

-

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. Project implementation will not result in any construction or new road design features; therefore, it will not conflict with policies regarding alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

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

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. The project does not involve any uses that will discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the project will not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

-

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. It does not include new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. Moreover, the project does not involve any landform modification or require any source, treatment or structural Best Management Practices for storm water. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve or require water services from a water district. The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and will not result in the development of any new facilities that rely on water service for any purpose.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

-

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. It will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers' service capacity.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. It will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an amendment to update the Siting Element, which is a planning document and does not involve the discretionary approval of any new solid waste disposal facilities. It will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County. Therefore, compliance with any federal, state, or local statutes or regulations related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

-

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the proposed project's potential for significant cumulative effects. There is no substantial evidence that there are biological or cultural resources that are affected or associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the proposed project's potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☑ No Impact

-

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

All references to federal, state and local regulation are available on the Internet. For federal regulation refer to http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available for review at the County of San Diego Department of Public Works, Office of Environmental Services, 5460 Kearny Villa Road, San Diego, California.

Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997.

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476.

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

Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites, (PRC §5097-5097.6), California Public Resources Code.

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162.

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste.

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997.

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

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Abandoned Mined Lands Unit, GIS Data.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997.

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.

California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit Statistics, 2000.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993.

California Department of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153.

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

-

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

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998.

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003.

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000.

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033.

California Emergency Services Act Government Code, Title 2, Division 1, Chapter 7 § 8585-8589.

California Emergency Services Act, Government Code, Title 2, Division 1, Chapter 7 § 8585-8589.

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003.

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

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2000.

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25316 and §25117.

California Health & Safety Code Section 2000-2067.

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 4000-41956.

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001.

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084.

California Register of Historical Resources. Public Resources Code. §5024.1.

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996.

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996.

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988.

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000.

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

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.

California Water Code, Sections10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq.

CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993.

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

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan.

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. Revised February 25, 1999.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. Revised September 1998.

County of San Diego, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses-Division 7 of Title 8 of the San Diego Code.

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994.

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater.

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility.

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002.

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

-

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994.

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998.

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

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

County of San Diego, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000.

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Ordinance No. 5281 (New series).

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000.

Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act.

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

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, Title 2, Division 1, Chapter 7.5 § 8680-8692.

Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987.

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985).

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972.

FEMA: Floodplain Management Summary, Updated April 11, 2002.

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

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999.

Hazardous Buildings. California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2.

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

Historical Resources. California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029.

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

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

Human Remains. California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5.

Integrated Waste Management Plan, Countywide Siting Element 2003 Amendment. Final Review Draft. Department of Public Works County Recycling Program.

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.

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

Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.

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

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

National Environmental Policy Act, 1969.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968.

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.

Native American Heritage. Public Resources Code §5097.9-5097.991.

Nonpoint Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government.

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

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

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

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality.

Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68.

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

Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended 42 U.S.C. 5121, et seq., Pub. L. 103-181, Pub. L. 103-337, and Pub. L. 106-390, October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68.

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997.

San Diego County Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994.

San Diego County Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003.

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

San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982.

San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations.

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

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

San Diego County, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989.

San Diego County, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2003 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2003.

San Diego County, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002

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

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758.

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan.

SANDAG Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000.

SANDAG, 1999a. 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments.

SANDAG, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994).

SANDAG, The San Diego Region's Housing Crisis, July 2001.

Sax, J.L. Review of the laws establishing the SWRCB's permitting authority over appropriations of groundwater classified as subterranean streams and the SWRCB's implementation of those laws. January 2002.

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

State Historic Building Code. California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961.

State Landmarks. Public Resources Code §5031-5033.

State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998.

State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 and CAS000002

Subdivision Map Act, 2002.

Todd, D. K., Ground Water Hydrology, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1959.

U.S Department of Defense, Air Installations Compatible Use Zones Program, 1977

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42

USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996.

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995.

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002.

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

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

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code.

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

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

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

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

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

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

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

-

Form A

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

SCH # 200404115

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, PO Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 916/445-0613

Project Title: Siting Element Update of 2004

Lead Agency: County of San Diego, Department of Public Works
Contact Person: Wayne T. Williams
Street Address: 5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305
Phone: (858) 874-4108
City: San Diego
Zip: 92123
County: San Diego

Project Location:

County: San Diego
City/Nearest Community: San Diego
Cross Streets: Entire County of San Diego
Zip Code: N/A
Total Acres: N/A
Assessor's Parcel No. N/A
Section: N/A
Twp. N/A
Range: N/A
Base: N/A
Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: _____
Waterways: _____
Airports: _____
Railways: _____
Schools: _____

Document Type:

CEQA:
- ☐ NOP
- ☐ Early Cons
- ☒ Neg Dec
- ☐ Draft EIR
- ☐ Supplement/Subsequent EIR (Prior SCH No.)_____
- ☐ Other _____

NEPA:
- ☐ NOI
- ☐ EA
- ☐ Draft EIS
- ☐ FONSI

Other:
- ☐ Joint Document
- ☐ Final Document
- ☐ Other_____

Local Action Type:

- ☐ General Plan Update
- ☐ General Plan Amendment
- ☐ General Plan Element
- ☐ Community Plan
- ☐ Specific Plan
- ☐ Master Plan
- ☐ Planned Unit Development
- ☐ Site Plan
- ☐ Rezone
- ☐ Prezone
- ☐ Use Permit
- ☐ Land Division (Subdivision, etc.)
- ☐ Annexation
- ☐ Redevelopment
- ☐ Coastal Permit
- ☒ Other Siting Element

Development Type:

- ☐ Residential: *Units*_____ *Acres*_____
- ☐ Office: *Sq.ft.*_____ *Acres*_____ *Employees*_____
- ☐ Commercial: *Sq.ft.* _____ *Acres*_____ *Employees*_____
- ☐ Industrial: *Sq.ft.* _____ *Acres*_____ *Employees*_____
- ☐ Educational _____
- ☐ Recreational _____
- ☐ Water Facilities: *Type*_____ *MGD*_____
- ☐ Transportation: *Type*_____
- ☐ Mining: *Mineral*_____
- ☐ Power: *Type*_____ *Watts*_____
- ☐ Waste Treatment: *Type*_____
- ☐ Hazardous Waste: *Type*_____
- ☐ Other:_____

Funding (approx.): Federal $_____ State $_____ Total $_____

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

- ☐ Aesthetic/Visual
- ☐ Agricultural Land
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Archeological/Historical
- ☐ Coastal Zone
- ☐ Drainage/Absorption
- ☐ Economic/Jobs
- ☐ Fiscal
- ☐ Flood Plain/Flooding
- ☐ Forest Land/Fire Hazard
- ☐ Geologic/Seismic
- ☐ Minerals
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Population/Housing Balance
- ☐ Public Services/Facilities
- ☐ Recreation/Parks
- ☐ Schools/Universities
- ☐ Septic Systems
- ☐ Sewer Capacity
- ☐ Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading
- ☒ Solid Waste
- ☐ Toxic/Hazardous
- ☐ Traffic/Circulation
- ☐ Vegetation
- ☐ Water Quality
- ☐ Water Supply/Groundwater
- ☐ Wetland/Riparian
- ☐ Wildlife
- ☐ Growth Inducing
- ☐ Landuse
- ☐ Cumulative Effects
- ☐ Other _____

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

N/A

Project Description:

This is the first update of the Countywide Siting Element of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan. In compliance with AB 939 requirements, the Siting Element describes the facilities and strategies necessary to provide 15 years of solid waste disposal capacity for all jurisdictions within San Diego County, when other alternatives, such as additional waste diversion programs and waste export are included.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Form A, continued

KEY
S = Document sent by lead agency
X = Document sent by SCH
✓ = Suggested distribution

_____**Resources Agency**
_____Boating & Waterways
_____Coastal Commission
_____Coastal Conservancy
_____Colorado River Board
_____Conservation
_____Fish & Game
_____Forestry & Fire Protection
_____Office of Historic Preservation
_____Parks & Recreation
_____Reclamation Board
_____S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission
_____Water Resources (DWR)

Business, Transportation & Housing
_____Aeronautics
_____California Highway Patrol
_____CALTRANS District #_____
_____Department of Transportation Planning (headquarters)
_____Housing & Community Development

_____**Food & Agriculture**

Health & Welfare
_____Health Services _____

State & Consumer Services
_____General Services
_____OLA (Schools)

Environmental Protection Agency
_____Air Resources Board
_____California Waste Management Board
_____SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
_____SWRCB: Delta Unit
_____SWRCB: Water Quality
_____SWRCB: Water Rights
_____Regional WQCB #_____ (_____)

Youth & Adult Corrections
_____Corrections

Independent Commissions & Offices
_____Energy Commission
_____Native American Heritage Commission
_____Public Utilities Commission
_____Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
_____State Lands Commission
_____Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

_____Other _____

Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date April 22, 2004 Ending Date May 24, 2004

Signature _____ Date _____

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: _____
Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____
Contact: _____
Phone: (_____) _____

Applicant: _____
Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____
Phone: (_____) _____

For SCH Use Only:

Date Received at SCH _____
Date Review Starts _____
Date to Agencies _____
Date to SCH _____
Clearance Date _____
Notes:

PROOF OF PUBLICATION
(2010 & 2011 C.C.P.)

This space is for the County Clerk's Filing Stamp

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
County of San Diego

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid: I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of

North County Times

Formerly known as the Blade-Citizen and The Times-Advocate and which newspapers have been adjudicated newspapers of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of San Diego, State of California, for the City of Oceanside and the City of Escondido, Court Decree number 171349, for the County of San Diego, that the notice of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than nonpariel), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to-wit:

April 22, 2004

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at SAN MARCOS, California

this 25th day of April, 2004

Tiffany Guevara
Signature

Tiffany Guevara
NORTH COUNTY TIMES
Legal Advertising

Proof of Publication of

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION
April 22, 2004

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the County of San Diego intends to adopt a Negative Declaration in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act for the following project. The proposed Negative Declaration can be reviewed at the Department of Public Works ("DPW"), Environmental Services Unit, 5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305, San Diego, California 92123 and the public libraries listed below. Comments on the proposed Negative Declaration must be sent to the DPW address indicated above, adding MS O385 to the street address line, and should reference the project name. If you wish to bring a legal challenge to the County's proposed action on the Negative Declaration, you may be limited to raising only those issues that you, or someone else, have raised in written correspondence.

Siting Element Update of 2004 (UJ0004): This is the first update of the Countywide Siting Element ("Siting Element") of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan. In compliance with Assembly Bill 939 requirements, the Siting Element describes the facilities and strategies necessary to provide 15 years' worth of solid waste disposal capacity for all the jurisdictions within San Diego County, when other alternatives, such as additional waste diversion programs and waste export, are included. An update of the Siting Element was made necessary by a number of changes in San Diego County solid waste management, including: (i) County divestiture of its public landfills; (ii) increased state solid waste diversion requirements; (iii) the mandatory deletion of several potential landfill sites classified as "tentatively reserved" in the prior Siting Element; (iv) a new landfill expansion suggested since adoption of the first Siting Element; and (v) revision of the landfill siting criteria for new or expanded landfills. The update also includes the mandatory reclassification of the Gregory Canyon landfill from "tentatively reserved" to "proposed," as required under applicable law. The Siting Element can be reviewed at http://www.sdcdpw.org/siting/.

Comments on the proposed Negative Declaration may be submitted beginning on Thursday, April 22, 2004, and must be received no later than May 24, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. (a 30-day public review period).

This proposed Negative Declaration can also be reviewed at the following Libraries: Alpine, 2130 Arnold Way, Alpine, California 91901; Bonita-Sunnyside, 5047 Central Ave., Bonita, California 91902; Borrego Springs, 500 Palm Canyon Dr., Borrego Springs, California 92004; Casa de Oro, 9805 Campo Rd., Spring Valley, California 91977; Crest, 105 Juanita Lane, El Cajon, California 92021; Descanso, 9545 River Dr., Descanso, California 91916; Fallbrook, 124 South Mission Rd., Fallbrook, California 92028; Jacumba, 44605 Old Hwy 80, Jacumba, California 91934; Julian, 2133 4th St., Julian, California 92036; Lakeside, 9839 Vine St., Lakeside, California 92040; Lincoln Acres, 2725 Granger Ave., National City, CA 91950; Campo-Morena Village, 31466 Highway 94, Campo, California 91906; Otay Mesa, 3003 Coronado Ave., San Diego, California 92154; Pine Valley, 28804 Old Hwy 80, Pine Valley, California 91962; Potrero, 24883 Potrero Valley Road, Potrero, California 91963; Ramona, 1406 Montecito Rd., Ramona, California 92065; Rancho San Diego, 11555 Via Rancho San Diego, El Cajon, CA 92019; Rancho Santa Fe, 17040 Avenida de Acacias, Rancho Santa Fe, California 92067; Spring Valley, 836 Kempton St., Spring Valley, California 91977; and Vista, 700 Eucalyptus Ave., Vista, California 92084. All documents referenced in the proposed Negative Declaration are available for review at the County of San Diego Department of Public Works, Office of Environmental Services, 5469 Kearny Villa Road, San Diego, California.

For additional information, please contact Wayne T. Williams at (858) 874-4108, fax (858) 874-4058 or bye-mail at Wayne.Williams@sdcounty.ca.gov.

NCT-I-1630310
April 22, 2004

Affidavit of Publication

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

5469 KEARNY VILLA RD., STE. 305

SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

ATTN: ORELIA DEBRAAL

STATE OF CALIFORNIA} ss
County of San Diego}

The Undersigned, declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California: That....She is a resident of the County of San Diego. THAT....She is and at all times herein mentioned was a citizen of the United States, over the age of twenty-one years, and that .....She is not a party to, nor interested in the above entitled matter; that ....She is..... Chief Clerk for the publisher of .....

The San Diego Union-Tribune

a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and which newspaper is published for the dissemination of local news and intelligence of a general character, and which newspaper at all the times herein mentioned had and still has a bona fide subscription list of paying subscribers, and which newspaper has been established, printed and published at regular intervals in the said City of San Diego, County of San Diego, for a period exceeding one year next preceding the date of publication of the notice hereinafter referred to, and which newspaper is not devoted to nor published for the interests, entertainment or instruction of a particular class, profession, trade, calling, race, or denomination, or any number of same; that the notice of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following date, to-wit:

APRIL 22, 2004

Chief Clerk for the Publisher

Affidavit of Publication of

Legal Classified Advertisement

Ad # 8956687

Ordered by: ORELIA DEBRAAL

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

April 22, 2004

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the County of San Diego intends to adopt a Negative Declaration in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act for the following project. The proposed Negative Declaration can be reviewed at the Department of Public Works ("DPW"), Environmental Services Unit, 5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305, San Diego, California 92123 and the public libraries listed below. Comments on the proposed Negative Declaration must be sent to the DPW address indicated above, adding MS 0385 to the street address line, and should reference the project name. If you wish to bring a legal challenge to the County's proposed action on the Negative Declaration, you may be limited to raising only those issues that you, or someone else, have raised in written correspondence.

Siting Element Update of 2004 (UJ0004): This is the first update of the Countywide Siting Element ("Siting Element") of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan. In compliance with Assembly Bill 939 requirements, the Siting Element describes the facilities and strategies necessary to provide 15 years' worth of solid waste disposal capacity for all the jurisdictions within San Diego County, when other alternatives, such as additional waste diversion programs and waste export, are included. An update of the Siting Element was made necessary by a number of changes in San Diego County solid waste management, including: (i) County divestiture of its public landfills; (ii) increased state solid waste diversion requirements; (iii) the mandatory deletion of several potential landfill sites classified as "tentatively reserved" in the prior Siting Element; (iv) a new landfill expansion suggested since adoption of the first Siting Element; and (v) revision of the landfill siting criteria for new or expanded landfills. The update also includes the mandatory reclassification of the Gregory Canyon landfill from "tentatively reserved" to "proposed," as required under applicable law. The Siting Element can be reviewed at:
http://www.sdcdpw.org/siting/.

Comments on the proposed Negative Declaration may be submitted beginning on Thursday, April 22, 2004, and must be received no later than May 24, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. (a 30-day public review period).

This proposed Negative Declaration can also be reviewed at the following Libraries: Alpine, 2130 Arnold Way, Alpine, California 91901; Bonita-Sunnyside, 5047 Central Ave., Bonita, California 91902; Borrego Springs, 500 Palm Canyon Dr., Borrego Springs, California 92004; Casa de Oro, 9805 Campo Rd., Spring Valley, California 91977; Crest, 105 Juanita Lane, El Cajon, California 92021; Descanso, 9545 River Dr., Descanso, California 91916; Fallbrook, 124 South Mission Rd., Fallbrook, California 92028; Jacumba, 44605 Old Hwy 80, Jacumba, California 91934; Julian, 2133 4th St., Julian, California 92036; Lakeside, 9839 Vine St., Lakeside, California 92040; Lincoln Acres, 2725 Granger Ave., National City, CA 91950; Campo-Morena Village, 31466 Highway 94, Campo, California 91906; Otay Mesa, 3003 Coronado Ave., San Diego, California 92154; Pine Valley, 28804 Old Hwy 80, Pine Valley, California 91962; Potrero, 24883 Potrero Valley Road, Potrero, California 91963; Ramona, 1406 Montecito Rd., Ramona, California 92065; Rancho San Diego, 11555 Via Rancho San Diego, El Cajon, CA 92019; Rancho Santa Fe, 17040 Avenida de Acacias, Rancho Santa Fe, California 92067; Spring Valley, 836 Kempton St., Spring Valley, California 91977; and Vista, 700 Eucalyptus Ave., Vista, California 92084. All documents referenced in the proposed Negative Declaration are available for review at the County of San Diego Department of Public Works, Office of Environmental Services, 5469 Kearny Villa Road, San Diego, California.

For additional information, please contact Wayne T. Williams at (858) 874-4108, fax (858) 874-4058 or by e-mail at: Wayne.Williams@sdcounty.ca.gov

CITY OF SANTEE

MAYOR
Randy Voepel

CITY COUNCIL
Jack E. Dale
Brian W. Jones
John W. Minto
Hal Ryan

CITY MANAGER
Keith Till

May 24, 2004

Wayne T. Williams, PhD
Recycling Coordinator
County of San Diego
Department of Public Works
5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305
San Diego, CA 92123

RE: City of Santee Comments on Negative Declaration for Siting Element 2004

Dear Mr. Williams,

The City of Santee ("City") appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Negative Declaration for the 2004 Integrated Waste Management Plan Countywide Siting Element for San Diego County. The City understands the Siting Element must evaluate and demonstrate the adequacy of the County's permitted solid waste storage capacity through existing or planned facilities or alternative methods for the next fifteen years. In turn, the Initial Study and Negative Declaration are to evaluate potential environmental impacts of the Siting Element, if any, under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA").

Project Description - Tentatively Reserved Sites

Of particular concern to the City is the proper characterization and consideration of certain facilities or expansions that are now only in the proposal stage. Specifically, the City is concerned that the Siting Element relies too definitively upon the proposed expansion of the Sycamore Canyon Landfill. The Negative Declaration properly identifies the Sycamore Canyon expansion as a "tentatively reserved" site. However, it is essential that the Siting Element treat it as such and not consider the capacity of the expansion at all in its projections.

From the description of the project in Section 8.A of the Initial Study, it is not clear whether or not any revisions to the Siting Element as a result of the CEQA process will count the proposed expansion capacity. Rather the Initial Study merely states that "[e]ach tentatively reserved site will receive complete environmental evaluation by the

local land use authority if it is found to be necessary to meet community landfill capacity needs and proposed for actual development."

This statement seems to assume the expansion project will occur, even before environmental review is completed for the Sycamore Landfill project. Instead, the Siting Element should evaluate the existing capacity and all alternatives, including but not limited to recycling and exportation.

This point should be clarified in the CEQA document project description. Further, if the Siting Element relies on an expansion project for which environmental impacts have not yet been evaluated, then the CEQA document for the Siting Element should analyze the environmental impacts of including the expanded site in the Siting Element, including but not limited to visual impacts, air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise, recreation and traffic.

Land Use and Planning

Again, the basis for the achievement of the Siting Element goals seems to be improperly based on the Sycamore Landfill expansion, and such consideration is inappropriate because the site is "tentatively reserved," as well as inconsistent with existing land use plans. In addition to the clarifications requested above in the project description section of the Initial Study, the CEQA document should analyze this point in the Land Use and Planning Section of the Initial Study. Particularly, the Sycamore Landfill expansion is not consistent with the Community Plan of the City of San Diego for the East Elliot area or, therefore, the City of San Diego San Diego General Plan. The CEQA document and the Siting Element should consider this point.

A project is consistent with a general plan only if it satisfies three specific requirements, two of which the Sycamore Landfill expansion does not presently meet. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 41702(b), the area reserved for the expansion must be located in, or coextensive with, a land use area designated or authorized for solid waste facilities in the applicable general plan. Also, the establishment or expansion of a project, i.e. solid waste facility, must be compatible with adjacent land uses authorized under the existing general plan. (Pub. Res. Code § 41702(c).) In the case of the Sycamore Landfill expansion, neither of these requirements is met—the expansion is not within the area designated for solid waste management in the City's General Plan, and the areas adjacent to the proposed expansion are not compatible with the proposed expansion. Therefore, the proposed expansion is inconsistent with the City of San Diego's General Plan. The CEQA document and the Siting Element should consider this point.

Alternatives

For the reasons stated above, it is important that the Siting Element and CEQA document not rely upon the Sycamore Landfill expansion to meet future capacity demands. To the contrary, both documents should evaluate alternatives such as recycling, exportation and other waste management options in the event the expansion project fails. The City believes these documents are deficient in their identification and analysis of alternatives to the expansion.

Specifically, the City believes alternatives including, but not limited to, the following alternatives should be more thoroughly considered and addressed:

- Out of county transport of solid waste;
- Recycling;
- Waste deduction; and
- Reuse of construction debris.

In addressing future capacity issue, the County should focus on and analyze options such as these, rather than to presume to expand an existing landfill site such as Sycamore Landfill.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Initial Study and Negative Declaration. The City reserves its right to comment further at any upcoming public hearing relating to the project. We look forward to continuing to participate in the planning process.

Respectfully,

Douglas Williford, AICP
Director of Development Services

cc: Hon. Members of Santee City Council
Keith Till, Santee City Manager

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

Jan Sci
Acting Director

May 26, 2004

Wayne T. Williams
San Diego County Department of Public Works
5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305
San Diego, CA 92123

Subject: Siting Element Update of 2004
SCH#: 2004041115

Dear Wayne T. Williams:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on May 25, 2004, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

Post-it® Fax Note 7671	Date 9-9-04	# of pages ▶ 2
To Orelia DeBraal	From Sheila Brown	
Co./Dept. San Diego County	Co. OPR	
Phone # 858 874 4038	Phone # 916 445-0613	
Fax # 858 874 4058	Fax # 916 323-7482	

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2004041115

Project Title	Siting Element Update of 2004
Lead Agency	San Diego County Department of Public Works

Type	Neg Negative Declaration
Description	This is the first update of the Countywide Siting Element of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan. In compliance with AB 939 requirements, the Siting Element describes the facilitates and strategies necessary to provide 15 years of solid waste disposal capacity for all jurisdictions within San Diego County, when other alternatives, such as additional waste diversion programs and waste are included.

Lead Agency Contact

Name	Wayne T. Williams		
Agency	San Diego County Department of Public Works		
Phone	858-874-4105	*Fax*	
email			
Address	5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305		
City	San Diego	*State* CA	*Zip* 92123

Project Location

County	San Diego
City	San Diego
Region	
Cross Streets	Entire County of San Diego
Parcel No.	
Township	*Range* *Section* *Base*

Proximity to:

Highways	
Airports	
Railways	
Waterways	
Schools	
Land Use	

Project Issues Solid Waste

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; California Coastal Commission; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 11; Air Resources Board, Major Industrial Projects; Integrated Waste Management Board; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 9; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission

Date Received 04/26/2004 *Start of Review* 04/26/2004 *End of Review* 05/25/2004

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

26 October, 2004

Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan

Siting Element Amendment

Negative Declaration for Environmental Impacts

Comments from the City of Santee and the State Clearinghouse with Responses from the County of San Diego

PROJECT NAME: Siting Element Update of 2004 WA# UJ0004
SCH#2004041115

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: April 22, 2004 to May 24, 2004

During the public review period for this project, two letters of public comment were received. The letters are attached, and the responses to comments are provided below.

A. LETTER FROM GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH, STATE CLEARINGHOUSE DATED May 26, 2004.

State Clearinghouse Comment 1: The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on May 24, 2004, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

County of San Diego Response 1: The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the record of the project for review and consideration by the appropriate decision makers.

B. LETTER FROM DOUGLAS WILLIFORD, CITY OF SANTEE, DATED MAY 24, 2004.

All comments in this appendix from the City of Santee are actual quotes from the city's original letter of 24 May, or are accurate iterations fit into the context of answerable separate comments.

City of Santee Comment 1. The City (of Santee) is concerned that the Siting Element relies too definitively upon the proposed expansion of the Sycamore Canyon landfill.

County of San Diego Response 1. In calculating the landfill capacity for the California Integrated Waste Management Board -required period, the Siting Element includes landfill capacities from all landfills in the County except two military sites on Camp Pendleton. The landfills available to the public are: Miramar, Otay, Sycamore Canyon, Ramona, and Borrego. At the current rate of disposal, given daily permitted disposal rates, the permitted annual throughput of in-county landfills would be inadequate by the year 2007 (mean value). Because Allied Waste, Inc, had already proposed that expansion be implemented at Sycamore Canyon, and initiated the environmental analysis process working with the City of San Diego, the tentative capacity was included as one possible option for meeting the 15-year capacity.

Chapter Eight of the Siting Element identifies additional strategies for disposing of solid waste that could be explored to help meet the region's 15-year disposal needs. These strategies were developed because the approval of proposals for new and expansion of existing landfills is uncertain at this time. CCR Sections 18755(c) and 18756.5 contain the specific requirements for this chapter. These include increases in the annual rates of throughput at existing landfills as submitted by landfill operators, additions of new landfills, and other solutions, including better technologies at existing landfills, out-of-county transportation, diversion, source reduction, and transformation. Separate models were developed for each of these strategies.

City of Santee Comment 2. It is essential that the Siting Element treat (Sycamore Canyon tentative expansion) as a "tentatively reserved site" and not consider the capacity of the expansion at all in its projections.

County of San Diego Response 2. The Sycamore expansion is treated as a "tentative expansion." The tentative expansion is one option considered in projections as an objective integral part of the model of a mixed strategy to meet the 15-year capacity.

The statutory rules for preparation of a countywide siting element are set forth in Public Resources Code sections 41700 through 41721.5. Those statutes are supplemented by regulations set forth in California Code of Regulations, title 14, sections 18755 through 18756.7. Pursuant to those statutes and regulations, siting elements may discuss the following three classes of landfill sites when calculating landfill capacity: (i) existing; (ii) proposed; and (iii) tentatively reserved. Generally speaking, "existing" landfill sites are those landfills existing at the time the siting element is prepared, "proposed" landfill sites are those that are consistent with the applicable general plan but are not yet existing and "tentatively reserved" landfill sites are those proposed sites that are not yet existing nor consistent with the applicable general plan.

City of Santee Comment 3. The Siting Element should evaluate the existing capacity and all alternatives, including but not limited to recycling and exportation. This point should be clarified in the CEQA document project description.

County of San Diego Response 3. As stated in County Response 1, the Siting Element considered diversion and out-of-county transportation in detail, and also considered improved technology, including transformation in the mix of a strategic program to maintain the 15-year capacity. This information is included in the first paragraph under 8A of the *CEQA Initial Study-Environmental Checklist Form.*

In Chapter Eight, the Siting Element notes that the region recognizes that diversion of organics, paper, and construction and demolition materials is essential for decreasing the region's dependence on landfilling. The Siting Element recommends that a more thorough feasibility study be conducted to determine the best long-term strategy for the region. This strategy should include a combination of strategies including a cost/benefit analysis and recommendations on the diversion and market development programs necessary to preserve existing landfill capacity.

City of Santee Comment 4. If the Siting Element relies on an expansion project for which environmental impacts have not yet been evaluated, then the CEQA document for the Siting Element should analyze the environmental impacts of including the expanded site in the Siting Element, including but not limited to visual impacts, air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise, recreation and traffic.

County of San Diego Response 4. It is not the role or obligation of the Siting Element to analyze environmental impacts of proposed or tentative projects. An Environmental Impacts Report is being prepared for the Sycamore Landfill in fulfillment of the City of San Diego land use and CEQA requirements, which will determine potential impacts of expansion. Review and adoption of the Siting Element does not limit any jurisdiction or interested party's right to conduct a more in-depth review of each proposal through the individual project's EIR.

City of Santee Comment 5. The basis for the achievement of the Siting Element goals seems to be improperly based on the Sycamore Landfill expansion and such consideration is inappropriate because the site is "tentatively reserved" as well as inconsistent with existing land use plans.... the CEQA document should analyze this point in the Land Use and Planning Section of the Initial Study.

County of San Diego Response 5. The Siting Element Amendment is a planning document, written in requirement of State law, and has no possibility of environmental impacts. The Siting Element does not confer approvals to any land use project. The Siting Element proposes a strategy, but the elements of the strategy are subject to individual review, and inclusion in the document does not assume approval. The inclusion of the tentatively reserved Sycamore expansion is a valid part of the basis for determining whether or not the jurisdictions within the county of San Diego have adequate landfill capacity, with or without the project. Since it was demonstrated that there is not adequate landfill capacity on the basis of current permitted annual tonnages at existing landfills, it is valid to incorporate the existing formal application for tentative expansion of the Sycamore Canyon Landfill (See County Response 2).

City of Santee Comment 6. The Sycamore landfill expansion is not consistent with the Community Plan of the City of San Diego for the East Elliot Area and therefore, the City of San Diego General Plan. The CEQA document and the Siting Element should consider this point.

County of San Diego Response 6. The Environmental Impacts Report for the Sycamore Canyon Master Plan is progressing on schedule, and upon completion of the environmental review process, the City of San Diego will make the decision as to compliance with the San Diego General Plan.

A proposed new landfill, or the proposed expansion of an existing landfill, may be included in a siting element even if it is *not* consistent with the applicable general plan. In such case, however, the new or expanded facility must be considered a "tentatively reserved" site. Pub. Res. Code § 41710(a) provides:

> "A county may tentatively reserve an area or areas for the location of a new solid waste transformation or disposal facility *or the expansion of an existing transformation or disposal facility* even though that reservation of the area or areas is not consistent with the applicable city or county general plan. A reserved area in a countywide siting element is tentative until it is made consistent with the applicable city or county general plan." (*Emphasis added.*)

Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 18756.3(b) states that a proposed area that is not consistent with the applicable general plan "may be 'tentatively reserved' for future or expanded solid waste disposal facilities."

One important point regarding "tentatively reserved" sites is that, if such sites are not made consistent with the applicable general plan by the next five-year revision of the siting element, they *must* be removed from the siting element. *See, e.g.*, Pub. Res. Code §§ 41711-41712. Section 41711 states:

> "An area tentatively reserved for the establishment *or expansion* of a solid waste transformation or disposal facility *shall be removed* from the countywide siting element if a city or county fails or has failed to make the finding that the area is consistent with the general plan or has made a finding that the area should not be used for the location of a solid waste transformation or disposal facility." (*Emphasis added.*)

City of Santee Comment 7. The proposed (Sycamore Canyon) expansion is not consistent with the City of San Diego's General Plan (because):

- Pursuant to PRC 41702 (b), the area reserved for the expansion must be located in, or coextensive with, a land use area designated or authorized for solid waste facilities in the applicable General Plan.

- The establishment or expansion of a (solid waste facility) must be compatible with adjacent land uses authorized under the existing General Plan (sic PRC 41702 c).

- The expansion is not within the area designated for solid waste management in the City's General Plan and the areas adjacent to the proposed expansion are not compatible with the proposed expansion.

(Therefore)... the CEQA document and the Siting Element should consider this point.

County of San Diego Response 7. See County Response 5. This information will be examined in the Sycamore Canyon Master EIR and submitted by the developer to the City of San Diego, which is the local planning and land use agency for the project. The answers to these comments must be provided by the developer during the EIR CEQA process for the tentative expansion, and do not belong in the Siting Element.

City of Santee Comment 8. Alternatives.

- It is important that the Siting Element and CEQA document not rely upon the Sycamore Landfill expansion to meet future capacity demands.

- Both documents should evaluate alternatives such as recycling, exportation and other waste options in the event the expansion project fails. The City (of Santee) believes these documents are deficient in their identification and analysis of alternatives to the expansion.

- The City (of Santee) believes alternatives including but not limited to the following alternatives should be more thoroughly considered and addressed.

    1. Out of county transport of waste
    2. Recycling
    3. Waste reduction, and
    4. Reuse of construction debris.

County of San Diego Response 8. Since a formal proposal exists to expand the Sycamore landfill, it is valid to include the tentative expansion as one possible scenario in the model for predicting landfill capacity in the future.

Because the Siting Element is a planning document, the fundamental role of the document is to determine if the jurisdictions within the county of San Diego have sufficient landfill capacity for the next 15-year period and to describe what capacity or strategies will provide said capacity. In Chapter Eight, the Siting Element notes that the region recognizes that diversion of organics, paper, and construction and demolition materials is essential for decreasing the region's dependence on landfilling. The Siting Element recommends that a more thorough feasibility study be conducted to determine

the best long-term strategy for the region. This strategy should include a combination of approaches, including a cost/benefit analysis and recommendations on the diversion and market development programs necessary to preserve existing landfill capacity.