

**CITY OF POWAY
ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY
AND CHECKLIST**

A. INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Initial Study and Checklist, along with information contained in the public record, comprise the environmental documentation for the proposed project as described below pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Based upon the information contained herein and in the public record, the City of Poway has prepared Mitigated/Negative Declaration for the proposed project.

B. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Tentative Tract Map (TTM) 17-003 and Development Review (DR) 18-003:
Aria Estates
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Poway, Development Services
13325 Civic Center Drive, Poway, CA 92064
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Oda Audish (858) 668-4661
4. Project Location: Westerly Terminus of Danes Road, City of Poway APN 317-534-20
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Mostafa Panah, P.O. Box 5000 – PMB 502
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
6. General Plan Designation: Rural Residential-A and Residential Single-Family - 7
7. Zoning Rural Residential-A and Residential Single-Family - 7
8. Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or offsite features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary).

The property owner is proposing an eight-lot subdivision consisting of seven residential lots and one open space lot and the construction of seven single-family homes, one on each of the new residential lots. The project site is a vacant approximately seven-acre parcel located at the terminus of Danes Road. The westerly approximate 2/3 of the property consists primarily of a large knoll that is covered in Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub and rises 80-100 feet in elevation above the surrounding development. The easterly 1/3 of the property is relatively level terrain, partly due to excavation in the early 1960s when nearby home tracts were developed. A portion of the more level area is covered by Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub but most of the area has been disturbed due to the aforementioned excavation.

The proposed residential lots would be created within the easterly, more level portion of the property. The lots would range in size from approximately 6,000 to 30,500 square feet and the proposed homes would range in size from approximately 2,860 to 3,725 square feet. The proposed 5.2-acre open space lot would consist of the knoll and would serve as a passive recreational area for the subdivision.

The proposed subdivision would be accessed through the existing residential neighborhood to the east via a public street (Danes Road) that terminates at the easterly boundary of the project site. A private road connecting to Danes Road would be constructed to serve each of the new lots.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The project site is located in an urban setting surrounded by existing development and borders Pomerado Road, a major arterial, to the west. The property is bordered by single-family residential to the north and east. A senior multi-family residential complex is located to the west across the street on Pomerado Road. Commercial development is located to the south.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g.: permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): None
11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 Yes If so, has consultation begun? Yes

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

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.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resource <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural /Forestry Resources <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Noise <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
|--|---|--|

Determination (To be completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Oda Audish
 City of Poway

August 23, 2018
 Date

C. EIS and Checklist

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| I. AESTHETICS. Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | X | |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | | | | X |
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | | | X | |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | | | X |
| II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. | | | | |
| <p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p> | | | | |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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? | | | | X |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | | X |
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | | | | X |
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land? | | | | X |
| e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | X |
| 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 applicable air quality plan? | | | | X |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | | X |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable | | | | X |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | | | |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | X | |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | | X |
| 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? | | X | | |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | X | | |
| 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? | | | | X |
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | X | | |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | | | X |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? | | | | X |
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the Project: | | | | |
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? | | | | X |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? | | X | | |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | | X |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | | X | | |
| 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. | | | X | |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | X | |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | | X |
| iv) Landslides? | | | | X |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | | X | |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | | | | X |
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risk to life or property? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | | | X | |
| b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | | X | |
| VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | | | | X |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | | | X |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | | | X |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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? | | | | X |
| 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 within the project area | | | | X |
| f. For a project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | X |
| g. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | | X | |
| b. 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. | | | | X |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite? | | | X | |
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite? | | | X | |
| e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of pollute runoff? | | | X | |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | X | |
| g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | X |
| h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | | X |
| i. Exposing 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? | | | | X |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | X |
| X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Physically divide an established community? | | | | X |
| b. Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an | | | | X |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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? | | | | |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. | | | | X |
| XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| XII. 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? | | | | X |
| b. Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? | | | X | |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | | X |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | X | |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two | | | | X |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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? | | | | |
| 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? | | | | X |
| XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Induce substantial 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)? | | | | X |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | X |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | X |
| XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. | | | | |
| a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services. | | | | X |
| i. Fire protection? | | | | X |
| ii. Police protection? | | | | X |
| iii. Schools? | | | | X |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| iv. Parks? | | | | X |
| v. Other public facilities? | | | | X |
| XV. 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? | | | | X |
| a. 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? | | | | X |
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel, and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | | | | X |
| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g.: sharp curves | | | | X |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g.: farm equipment)? | | | | |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | | X |
| f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | | | | X |
| XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: | | | | |
| a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | | | | X |
| b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | | | | X |

EIS and Checklist
 TTM 17-003 and DR 18-003

| ISSUE | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable <u>Regional Water Quality Control Board</u> ? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | X | |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | | | | X |
| e. Result in the 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? | | | | X |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | | X |
| g. Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | | X |

| XIX. 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 or the major periods of California history or prehistory? | | X | | |
| b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulative 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)? | | | | X |
| c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly? | | | X | |

D. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

Please refer to the Environmental Initial Study Checklist Form above when reading the following evaluation.

I. AESTHETICS

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is undeveloped and contains a substantial knoll that is visible from the surrounding lower lying areas. The majority of the knoll is covered in Diegan Coastal Scrub. The base of the natural knoll formation, however, has previously been disturbed/modified in connection with the widening of Pomerado Road, a major arterial, to the west and in connection with the development of the surrounding residential subdivisions to the north and east. The previously disturbed areas have minimal aesthetic value. The home development would be concentrated along the existing disturbed areas along the east side of the knoll and would include landscaping similar to existing landscaping within the adjacent residential neighborhood. The proposed approximately 5.2-acre open space lot along the west side of the property would cover over 2/3 of the site and would encompass the majority of the knoll. The applicant proposes to retain the existing topography and vegetation within the open space lot except for

recontouring the existing slopes along Pomerado Road to allow for landscaping to be added and thereby improve the street scape appearance. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

- b) **No Impact.** There are no State scenic highways in the area. No impact would occur.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response I.a.
- d) **No Impact.** The project will result in new lighting associated with single-family uses that will be similar in nature to the lighting in the surrounding area. No impact would occur.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

- a) **No Impact.** The project site is currently vacant with approximately half of the site in a natural state and the other half disturbed as a result of the construction of the adjacent Pomerado Road or the surrounding residential tract home development. The site is not identified as important farmland. Thus, the project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farm-land of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses. No impact would occur.
- b) **No Impact.** The project site is not being used for agricultural production and does not contain Williamson Act contract land. No impact would occur.
- c) **No Impact.** The project site does not contain, and is not zoned for, forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impact would occur.
- d) **No Impact.** As stated in response II.c, the project site is not located in an area containing forest land. Accordingly, the project would not convert any forest land to non-forest use, and no impact would occur.
- e) **No Impact.** The project would not directly impact agriculture or forest lands, nor introduce new elements into the landscape that would contribute to future conversion of agricultural use to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

III. AIR QUALITY

- a) **No Impact.** The City of Poway is part of the San Diego Air Basin and air quality in the area is administered by the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). An air quality management plan (AQMP) describes air pollution control strategies to be taken by a City, County or region classified as a non-attainment area to meet the Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements. The main purpose of an AQMP is to bring the area into compliance with the requirements of federal and state air quality standards, and to coordinate regional and local governmental agencies to achieve air quality improvement goals. A San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategies Plan – 1994 (jointly developed by the Air Pollution Control District and the San Diego Association of Governments-SANDAG) exists for the San Diego area and provides strategies for pollution control to improve air quality in the region. Land use plans and build out projections of the General Plans of jurisdictions within the San Diego area were considered in establishing the strategies of the Regional Air Quality Strategies Plan. The Poway General Plan includes strategies that are directed toward reducing air emissions through land use patterns, transportation planning, regional

agency cooperation, energy conservation, and construction. The project is consistent with the Poway General Plan strategies, in that the General Plan envisioned this type of development on the project site, therefore it is also consistent with the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategies Plan. There will be no impacts.

- b) **No Impact.** See response II.a above.
- c) **No Impact.** See response II.a above.
- d) **Less Than Significant.** Grading of the project will likely result in the creation of dust and can affect the surrounding residential area. Standard City requirements include implementation of dust control measures and the operations are subject to San Diego Air Pollution Control District standards. Impacts will be less than significant.
- e) **No Impact.** The project will not result in the creation of objectionable odor. No impact would occur.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- a) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The subject site is vacant, characterized by moderate to steep topography, and with a majority of the site in an undeveloped, natural condition. The site supports 4.8-acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub (DCSS) but it is not eligible for on-site mitigation because it is not located within the Mitigation Area of the Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). A Biological Report (updated, October 5, 2017) was prepared for the project by Cummings and Associates. In the report, the project's compliance with the HCP is demonstrated and project impacts/mitigation are specified. Overall, the project will impact 0.9 acres of DCSS. The habitat impact is associated with development of the seven residences, which includes the building pads and driveways, manufactured slopes, landscaping, and the project road. Given the disturbed nature of the in-fill parcel and that no sensitive species were found within the habitat area, the habitat impact mitigation requirement is 1:1 ratio or 0.9 acres. The applicant has the option to mitigate the habitat impact by recording an off-site Biological Conservation Easement within the HCP-designated Mitigation Area or paying into the City's habitat impact in-lieu fee fund as described further below. The project will include establishing an open space lot along the western portion of the site which would include 3.9-acres of DCSS habitat remaining on site. The site also supports three coast live oaks which would be preserved since the project has been designed to avoid grading impacts to these trees. Project impacts will be less than significant with incorporation of the following Mitigation Measures:
 1. Prior to approval of Final Map, Grading Permit or Administrative Clearing Permit, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall mitigate impacts to natural habitat as specified in the project Biological Report on file with the City. The mitigation requirement will be achieved by recordation of an off-site Biological Conservation Easement over 0.9 acres of similar habitat located within the Mitigation Area of the Poway Subarea HCP or through payment into the City's Habitat In-Lieu Fee account. The current rate is \$17,000 per acre. If an off-site easement is the selected mitigation method, a legal description and plat of the BCE area shall be prepared and stamped by the project engineer and submitted to the Planning and Engineering Divisions for review. Easement review fees are required and are the responsibility of the applicant.

The BCE shall be approved by the City Attorney and shall be notarized and recorded with the County of San Diego. In compliance with the HCP, the City shall subsequently re-zone the mitigation land to Open Space-Resource Management to ensure its permanent preservation. The BCE limits shall be shown on the grading plan and on the Final Map. The applicant shall be responsible for installing City-issued signs to be posted on the site identifying the limits of the BCE upon establishment of the BCE.

2. In accordance with Condition H of the Poway HCP Incidental Take Permit, a take of active California gnatcatcher nests, which includes harassment of the bird due to grading noise and vibrations from February 15 through July 1, is not permitted. Therefore, grading and removal of habitat during this time frame will only be permitted subject to the following conditions having been met to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Services.

The applicant is hereby advised that, during grading, if active nests are found within 500 feet of the grading, the grading activity shall be stopped until such time as mitigation measures, to the satisfaction of the City and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS,) are implemented. There is no guarantee that grading will be allowed to resume during nesting season.

Before issuance of a Clearing/Grading Permit, if grading or clearing is to occur between February 15 and July 1, the applicant shall provide to the Planning Division a letter from a qualified biologist retained by the applicant, with a scope of work for a CSS habitat and Gnatcatcher Survey, and a report for the area to be cleared and/or graded and CSS habitat areas within 500 feet of such area. The biologist shall contact the USFWS to determine the appropriate survey methodology. The purpose of the survey is to determine if any active gnatcatcher nests are located in the area to be cleared or graded, or in CSS habitat within 500 feet of such area. To be considered qualified, the biologist must provide the City with a copy of a valid Gnatcatcher Recovery Permit from the USFWS.

The scope of work shall explain the survey methodology for the biological survey and the proposed gnatcatcher nest monitoring activities during the clearing/grading operation. Should the report show, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Services, that gnatcatcher nests are not present within the area to be graded/cleared, or within CSS habitat located within 500 feet of said area, approval may be granted to commence clearing/grading within the gnatcatcher nesting season from February 15 through July 1.

If gnatcatchers are nesting within the area to be graded/cleared, or within CSS habitat located within 500 feet of said area, no grading will be allowed during this time until such time as mitigation measures, to the satisfaction of the City and the USFWS are implemented.

The biologist must attend the City's pre-construction meeting for the project and must be present onsite during all clearing/grading activities to monitor that the clearing/grading activities stay within the designated limits. During this period, the biologist shall also monitor and survey the habitat within the area to be cleared/graded and any habitat within 500 feet of said area for any evidence that a gnatcatcher nest(s) exists or is being built. Weekly monitoring summaries shall be submitted to the

Planning Division. Should evidence of a gnatcatcher nest(s) be discovered, the grading operation shall cease in that area and be directed away from the gnatcatcher nest(s) to a location greater than 500 feet away from the nest(s).

If grading is required to stop due to the presence of active nests, the applicant shall be required to provide erosion control, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This paragraph must be included as a note on the cover sheet of the clearing/grading plan.

At a minimum, all protected biological areas, as shown on the grading plan, shall be staked by a licensed surveyor and delineated with lathe and ribbon. The applicant shall have said staking inspected by the Engineering Inspector prior to any grading, clearing or grubbing. A written certification from the engineer of work, or a licensed surveyor, shall be provided to the Engineering Inspector stating that all protected areas are staked in accordance with the approved project plans.

The biologist shall provide the City with written confirmation that the limits of clearing/grading are in accordance with the project's Biological Resource Assessment.

Upon completion of the clearing/grading activities, the applicant's biologist shall submit to the Director of Development Services a biological monitoring report summarizing the observations of the biologist, including whether any gnatcatchers or evidence of active gnatcatcher nests were present during clearing and grading activities within the area and any habitat within 500 feet of said area

- b) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** See response IV.a.
- c) **No Impact.** The project site does not support any wetlands, nor would the project propose any activity that could result in substantially adverse effects on wetlands. No impact will occur.
- d) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** See response IV.a.
- e) **No Impact.** The project has been designed in compliance with all standards and mitigation requirements specified in the Poway HCP. No impacts will occur.
- f) **No Impact.** See response IV.e.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) **No Impact.** According to the Prehistoric and Historic Resources Element of the Poway General Plan, the project site is located in an area with a moderate probability that historic sites are present (Poway 2002). The site is not on the City's list of historic sites and structures. No impact would occur.
- c) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** According to the Prehistoric and Historic Resources Element of the Poway General Plan, the project site is located in an area with a moderate probability that archeological resources are present (Poway 2002). A Cultural Resources Study was conducted for the project by Brian Smith and Associates (dated May 2016). The study and site survey did not result in the identification of any historic or prehistoric resources on site. Based on the moderate frequency of prehistoric archaeological site surrounding the project area and the potential to encounter

buried or masked archaeological resources during grading, archaeological monitoring is recommended. Impacts will be less than significant with incorporation of the following Mitigation Measures:

1. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide written verification that a qualified archaeologist has been retained to implement the monitoring program. This verification shall be presented in a letter from the project archaeologist to the lead agency.
2. The certified archaeologist shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program.
3. The consulting archaeologist shall direct the field monitor during the initial brushing of the parcel and any grading of the upper levels of soils disturbance of all areas identified for development.
4. During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor shall be on-site, as determined by the consulting archaeologist, to perform inspections of the excavations. The frequency of inspections may vary from full time to part time depending upon the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, exposure of formational soils and bedrock, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features.
5. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field, so the monitored grading can proceed.
6. In the event that unidentified historic resources are discovered, the archaeologist shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground-disturbance operation in the area of discovery to allow for the evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The archaeologist shall contact the lead agency at the time of discovery. The archaeologist, in consultation with the lead agency, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The lead agency must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources that are discovered, and which will be destroyed by grading, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the consulting archaeologist and approved by the lead agency before being carried out using professional archaeological methods. If any human bones are discovered, all grading at that location must stop and the county coroner and lead agency shall be contacted. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the NAHC, shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
7. Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the location of any discovered significant cultural deposits, the artifacts shall be recovered, and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The archaeological monitor(s) shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis.

8. All cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated according to the current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
 9. A report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the lead agency prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include DPR Primary and Archaeological Site Forms.
- c) **No Impact.** The project does not propose any significant ground excavation activities that could affect potentially present and unknown paleontological resources or unique geologic features. Grading primarily consists of imported material for home pad development. No impact would occur.
- d) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** See response V.b above.

VI. GEOLOGY/SOILS

- a) i. **Less Than Significant Impact.** No active known faults traverse the project site or are near the site. The nearest known fault is an unnamed fault located approximately three miles west of the project site. Murphy Canyon Fault is the nearest main southern California fault, located approximately ten miles southwest of the project site. Three major fault systems within the project vicinity include the Elsinore, San Jacinto and Rose Canyon faults. The active Elsinore fault trends northwest and is about 22 miles northeast of Poway. The San Jacinto fault is also an active northwest-trending fault about 45 miles northeast of Poway. The Rose Canyon fault is located about 16 to 20 miles west of Poway in the Pacific Ocean and is considered potentially active. There is potential for some local damage in the event of a major earthquake along one of these fault systems which could result in significant impacts to project facilities. While the potential for onsite rupture cannot be completely discounted (e.g. unmapped faults could conceivably underlie the site), the likelihood for such an occurrence is considered low due to the absence of known faulting within or adjacent to the site. As a result, impacts related to fault rupture are assessed as less than significant.
- a) ii. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located in seismically active southern California and is likely to be subjected to moderate to strong seismic ground shaking. Seismic shaking at the site could be generated by events on any number of known active and potentially active faults in the region, including several unnamed faults, larger faults such as Murphy Canyon Fault, and major fault systems such as Elsinore, San Jacinto and Rose Canyon. An earthquake along any of these known active fault zones could result in severe ground shaking and consequently cause injury and/or property damage in the project vicinity. This could potentially result in significant impacts to project facilities. The buildings will be designed and constructed to incorporate measures to accommodate projected seismic loading in compliance with current construction codes. These codes are produced through joint efforts by industry groups to provide standard specifications for engineering and construction activities. They are widely accepted by regulatory authorities and are regularly included in related standards such as municipal building and grading codes, and they include measures to accommodate seismic loading parameters. The buildings will be designed and constructed to accommodate projected seismic loading,

pursuant to these existing guidelines. Accordingly, potential impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

- a) iii. **No Impact.** No impacts resulting from seismically related ground failure would occur.
- a) iv **No Impact.** The project site is not underlain by formations identified as susceptible to seismically induced landslides. No impact is identified.
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Grading activities will comply with City requirements, including implementation of standard erosion control measures, and will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Impacts are less than significant.
- c) **No Impact.** The project site is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project. Any fill materials will be compacted in compliance with City standards and inspected for adequacy before the issuance of any building permits. No impact would occur.
- d) **No Impact.** Expansive soils change in volume (shrink or swell) due to changes in moisture content of the soil. The buildings will be constructed in accordance with geotechnical recommendations that incorporate California Building Code (CBC) standards, as required by the City of Poway. Thus, potential expansion would be unlikely. No impact would occur.
- e) **No Impact.** The project site will be served by the public sewer system. No septic tanks or other alternative waste water disposal systems are proposed. No impact would occur.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Greenhouse gases (GHGs), allow solar radiation (sunlight) into the Earth's atmosphere, but prevent radiative heat from escaping, thus warming the Earth's atmosphere. GHGs are emitted by both natural processes and human activities; and the accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere regulates the Earth's temperature. Emissions of GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are thought to be responsible for the enhancement of the greenhouse effect and contributing to what is termed "global warming."

The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) prepared a white paper (the CAPCOA white paper) that provided guidance on when a project would generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. In that document, CAPCOA proposed a quantitative threshold of 900 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent emissions as a threshold below which no significant impacts on the environment would be anticipated. According to the CAPCOA white paper, 900 metric tons represents the emission that would be generated by 50 single-family residences annually. Since the project is a residential development for 7 new residences, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response VII.a above.

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- a) **No Impact.** The project involves an eight-lot subdivision and construction of seven homes on seven residential lots. The eighth lot would be reserved for open space. No transport, storage or use of hazardous materials beyond that which typically occurs with a single-family home will occur. No impact would occur.
- b) **No Impact.** See response VIII.a above. No impact would occur.
- c) **No Impact.** See response VIII.a above. No impact would occur.
- d) **No Impact.** The site is not on the established lists of hazardous waste sites. No impact would occur.
- e) **No Impact.** The closest airports to the project site are Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, located approximately 6.5 miles southwest of the project site, and Gillespie Field, located approximately 8 miles southeast of the project site. The project site is not located within the Airport Influence Area of either of these airports. Thus, operation of the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area and no impact would occur.
- f) **No Impact.** See Item VIII.e above. The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area and no impact would occur.
- g) **No Impact.** The project would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Operation of the project would not interfere with people's ability to utilize roadways for evacuation purposes. Accordingly, no impact would occur.
- h) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within Poway's designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) area (CAL FIRE VHFHSZ map 2009). The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. No impact would occur.

IX. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will comply with all storm water quality regulations, which will be ensured as part of the project improvements plan review. The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and impacts will be less than significant.
- b) **No Impact.** The project does not propose any construction activities that would directly affect groundwater, contribute to the depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. No impact would occur.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project has been designed such that the amount of storm water runoff beyond which currently occurs will be negligible. Runoff from the site will be treated to minimize pollutants in compliance with City standards. Treatment will

occur within on-site desiltation basins and other site design features that will be implemented with the project. Impacts will be less than significant

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response IX.c above.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response IX.a and response IX.c above.
- f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response IX.a above.
- g) **No Impact.** The project site is not in or near a designated flood prone area.
- h) **No Impact.** See response IX.g above.
- i) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within or adjacent to any mapped dam inundation areas. No impact would occur.
- j) **No Impact.** The project site is not near any water body. No impact would occur.

X. LAND USE/PLANNING

- a) **No Impact.** This issue generally relates to major roadways or other facilities that cut one part of a neighborhood off from another making it more difficult for individuals to access services and public amenities. The project does not have the potential to physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.
- b) **No Impact.** The project site is zoned and designated by the City of Poway General Plan for residential uses. No impact would occur.
- c) **No Impact.** See response IV.f above. No impact would occur.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

- a) **No Impact.** According to the Poway General Plan, the only known valuable mineral resource, as recognized by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, is construction quality sand and gravel located in the South Poway area of the City which is more than three miles south of the site. No impacts would occur.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to Item XI.a.

XII. NOISE

- a) **No Impact.** The project is a residential subdivision located adjacent to an area that is surrounded by existing residential and commercial uses. Noise associated with adjacent uses will not impact the project since noise associated with the adjoining uses will be minimal. Noise from the project will be that typical to residential uses and will not impact adjacent uses.
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The site is known to have some rock formation which may have to be broken up to accommodate improvements. There are several ways to break rock, some of which could cause noise or ground borne vibration. Any rock

blasting-activity would need to comply with the City's noise standards and would require a City Permit to ensure that City Codes are complied with. Impacts are Less than Significant.

- c) **No Impact.** See response XII.a above.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project construction activities will result in temporary or periodic increases in noise typically related to construction and may include some rock blasting. Per City standards, the noise generating construction activities are limited to certain times of the day and days of the week. The City's requirement for a blasting permit will ensure compliance with the City's noise ordinance in the event of rock blasting. Impact are less than significant.
- e) **No Impact.** The closest airports to the project site are Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, located approximately 5.5 miles southwest of the project site, and Gillespie Field, located approximately 8 miles southeast of the project site. The project does not currently contain, nor does it propose, habitable structures that would result in people being exposed to noise from these airports. In addition, the project site is not located within the Airport Influence Area of either of these airports. No impact would occur.
- f) **No Impact.** The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing in the project to excessive noise levels and no impact would occur.

XIII. POPULATION/HOUSING

- a) **No Impact.** The project will result in 7 new homes. The project is consistent with the density limitation of the underlying zoning and General Plan designation for the site. No impact would occur.
- b) **No Impact.** See response XIII.a above
- c) **No Impact.** See response XIII.a above.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) i Fire Protection. **No Impact.** The project site is served by the City of Poway Fire Department. The closest fire station to the project site is Station 1, which is located on Civic Center Road, approximately 1 mile east of the project site. Implementation of the project may result in an incremental increase in the demand for fire protection and emergency services. The site is already included within the Fire Department service area. Any specific service provided should there be an (unexpected) emergency call to this project is accounted for. No new or upgraded fire protection facilities would be required as a result of establishment of this project and no physical impacts resulting from construction of new facilities are identified. No impacts would occur.
- a) ii Police Protection. **No Impact.** The City of Poway contracts with the San Diego County Sheriff's Department for their services in law enforcement. The project site is currently served by the Poway Station, which is located at 13100 Bowron Road, approximately 1 mile east of the project site. The site is included within the Sheriff's service area. Any

specific service provided should there be an (unexpected) emergency call to this building is accounted for. No new or upgraded police protection facilities would be required as a result of establishment of this project and no physical impacts resulting from construction of new facilities are identified. No impacts would occur.

- a) iii Schools. **No Impact.** The project will result in 7 new homes as result of the subdivision. Children from the homes will be accommodated into existing schools which are in close proximity to the project site. The project is consistent with the density limitation of the underlying zoning and General Plan designation for the site. The proposed project would also require the payment of school fees. No impact would occur.
- a) iv Parks. **No Impact.** Project implementation would not require new or physically altered park facilities as the number of new homes is consistent with the density limits of the General Plan. Project residents can be accommodated in existing parks that area in close proximity to the site (i.e. Community Park, Starridge Neighborhood Park, Aubrey Park, Old Poway Park, Lake Poway Recreation area). The proposed project would also require the payment of park fees. No impact would occur.
- a) v Other Public Facilities. **No Impact.** Project implementation would not require new or physical alteration to other public facilities. No impact would occur.

XV. RECREATION

- a) **No Impact.** See XIV.a.iv Existing recreation facilities can accommodate the increased demand expected from the seven new homes. In addition, the proposed project includes the creation of an open space lot which contains an existing trail to the top of the knoll on site. This lot would be managed by the Home Owner Association and could be used as a passive park by the residents of the subdivision in its current state. No impact would occur.
- b) **No Impact.** See Item XV.a. No impact would occur.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- a) **No Impact.** The project will result in seven new homes as result of the proposed eight-lot subdivision (seven residential lots and one open space lot). The estimated average daily trips (ADT) associated with the net seven new homes is 70. The project is located at the terminus of Danes Road which has been designed to accommodate its extension for residential development. No impacts would occur.
- b) **No Impact.** The SANDAG Congestion Management Program (CMP) is intended to determine if a large project (greater than 2,400 ADT or more than 200 AM or PM peak hour trips) would adversely impact the CMP transportation system. A CMP analysis is not required for this project because the project is calculated to generate 70 ADT and fewer AM or PM peak hour trips. No impact would occur.
- c) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within an Airport Influence Area. Therefore, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that would result in substantial safety risks. No impact would occur.

- d) **No Impact.** The road that will serve the project has been designed to comply with City standards. No impact would occur.
- e) **No Impact.** The project would not involve any traffic improvements, land use changes or changes to the existing facilities that would result in inadequate emergency access. No impact would occur.
- f) **No Impact.** See response to item XVI.a above. No impact would occur.

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) **No Impact.** The project site is not listed, or eligible for, listing in the California Register of Historical Places, or the local register. Requirements for consultation have been followed, with no tribe indicating interest in the project. No impact would occur.
- b) **No Impact.** A Cultural Resources Study was prepared for the project by Brian Smith and Associates (dated May 2016). See Section V for a discussion on cultural resources on the project site. The Study does indicate the site is significant pursuant to the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. Requirements for consultation have been followed, with no tribe indicating interest in the project. No impact would occur.

XVIII. UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS

- a) **No Impact.** The project site is within an area identified to be served by the public sewer system. Because the project would not involve the construction of facilities that would generate significant amounts of sewage, it would not require the construction or expansion of any wastewater facilities or exceed applicable wastewater treatment requirements. Adequate wastewater treatment facilities and services are in place to serve future uses at the project site. No impact would occur.
- b) **No Impact.** See response XVIII.a.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response IX.c.
- d) **No Impact.** The project site is within an area identified to be served by the public water system and will generate an additional seven homes. Because the project would not generate significant amounts of water demand, it would not require the construction or expansion of any facilities. Adequate water facilities and services are in place to serve future uses at the project site. No impact would occur.
- e) **No Impact.** See response XVIII.a.
- f) **No Impact.** The project would be served by an existing waste disposal facility with sufficient capacity. No impact would occur.
- g) **No Impact.** The project residents will appropriately separate their waste so that recyclables and controlled wastes are separated from landfill trash in accordance with the City's waste reduction and recycling program. The project would comply with all federal, state and local regulations related to solid waste, including the California Integrated Waste Management Act. No impact would occur.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation.** See responses IV.a and V.b above.
- b) **No Impact.** The project, considered cumulatively with past and future projects, will not result in significant impacts. The project, as well as past projects and future projects have or will comply with the land use and density limitations of the City's General Plan. Infrastructure and services per the General Plan, are in place or are planned and will be provided to accommodate future growth.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See responses I, III, VI, VII, IX and XII above.