

**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: Williams Ranch Tentative Tract Map Revision and Lee Residence, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) 19-004 and Minor Development Review Application (MDRA) 18-014
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, Associate Planner, (858)668-4661
4. Project Location: Vacant lot at the west end of Del Poniente Road, APN 314-840-10
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Elan Lee, 13035 Pomerado Road Suite B, Poway, CA 92064
6. General Plan Designation: Rural Residential-A
7. Zoning: Rural Residential-A
8. Description of Project: This is a request to construct a 6,982 square-foot, single-family home and 2,492 square feet of garage, workshop and storage area on Lot 10 of the Williams Ranch Subdivision, a vacant lot at the west end of Del Poniente Road located in the Rural Residential A (RR-A) zone. The project includes grading, installation of a septic system, connection to a public water system, habitat removal, and landscaping. The proposed project would require that mitigation measure(s) included in the Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted for the Williams Ranch subdivision (TTM 89-09) and included as condition(s) of approval for TTM 89-09 be modified to allow a two-story home to be constructed on Lot 10 when a condition of approval and a mitigation measure requires that the home on Lot 10 be limited to one-story for view aesthetic purposes. In order to provide required fire fuel management zones for the new home, the applicant also proposes to modify the boundary of a 3.67 acre open space easement established by the TTM and exchange the open space encroachment area with another area on the property.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The 13.55-acre project site is located in a rural setting and surrounded by low-density single-family residential development (lot size 4 acres or greater) to the east and north and natural open space to the west and south.

The site is a hillside property with a varied terrain and contains substantial slopes. Topographical elevations range from approximately 874 feet above mean sea level (MSL) toward the northwest corner of the property, to an elevation of 1,090 feet above MSL consisting

EIS and Checklist

of a knoll located along the west property line on the southern portion of the lot. The property is traversed by a ridgeline in an east-westerly direction near the center of the property having three on-site knolls. The highest knoll peaks along the west property line at 1090 feet above MSL and the easterly two knolls are at 1084 feet and 1066 feet above MSL. A partially paved access drive ascending from Del Poniente Road provides access to a relatively level area at 937 feet above MSL between the two easterly knolls. From the ridgeline, the property slopes downward to 874 feet above MSL to the north and to 964 feet above MSL to the south. The terrain continues to slope downward off-site in a westerly and southerly direction through open space land until it reaches single-family residential neighborhoods along Pomerado Road north of Twin Peaks Road at approximately between 600 and 700 foot above MSL. The off-site topography to the north and east is similar in elevation to the project site.

The project site is covered with natural vegetation consisting primarily in equal parts of Coastal Sage Scrub and Southern Mixed Chaparral.

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? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(b), the Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians and Barona Band of Mission Indians tribes, which are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area within the City of Poway's jurisdiction, requested formal notice of and information on proposed projects within the City of Poway. On January 17, 2020, in compliance with California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, the City of Poway, as Lead Agency, sent a letter to the Tribal Representatives notifying the tribes of the proposed project. Responses to the AB 52 consultation notices were received as discussed in this document.

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

EIS and Checklist

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 checked="" 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural /Forestry Resources <input 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"/> Wildfire	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Energy <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 R. Audish
 City of Poway

 April 30, 2020
 Date

EIS and Checklist

C. EIS and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Code Section 21099, 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. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				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.				
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,				X

EIS and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a. Convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance (farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				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 district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable				X

EIS and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?				
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely 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 state or federally protected wetlands (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				X

EIS and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
policy or ordinance?				
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?				X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				X
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				X
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
I) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special				X

EIS and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
Publication 42.				
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	
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 direct or indirect 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
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X

EIS and Checklist

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.				
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				X
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.				
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				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
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working within the project area				X
f. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
g. Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving			X	

EIS and Checklist

wildland fires?				
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?				X
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				X
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?				X
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a matter which would result in flooding on- or offsite;				X
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				X
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?				X
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X

EIS and Checklist

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.				
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?				X
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
XII. 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
XIII. NOISE.				
Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient, noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b. Generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?			X	
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.				
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other				X

EIS and Checklist

infrastructure)?				
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services.				
i. Fire protection?			X	
ii. Police protection?				X
iii. Schools?				X
iv. Parks?				X
v. Other public facilities?				X
XVI. RECREATION.				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
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?				X
XVII. TRANSPORTATION Would the project:				
a. Conflict with program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				X
b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				X
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g.: sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses				X

EIS and Checklist

(e.g.: farm equipment)?				
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
a. 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:				
i. 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
ii. 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
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future				X

EIS and Checklist

development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				
c. 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
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
e. Comply with federal, state and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XX. WILDFIRE If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X	
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X	
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			X	

EIS and Checklist

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
<p>a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples or the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>		<p>X</p>		
<p>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)?</p>				<p>X</p>
<p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly?</p>				<p>X</p>

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 with Mitigation Measure.** The City does not specifically designate scenic vistas. However, the project site is located in the City's designated Hillside Ridgeline Areas which is subject to grading and structural design strategies contained in Policy C of the Community Development Element of the Poway General Plan. These strategies were established to protect significant natural hillside landforms, make development blend in with natural landforms and preserve scenic views of higher lying areas.

The project site is located on a hillside covered in native vegetation and is within a portion of the Twin Peaks mountain ridgeline area. The property is traversed by a ridgeline in an east-westerly direction near the center of the property having three on-site knolls. The General Plan contains a number of policies and standards intended to preserve and minimize impacts to "prominent" and "intermediate ridgelines." While the General Plan does not contain a definition of a prominent versus intermediate ridgeline, staff would classify the proposed home site as being on an intermediate ridgeline because there is a higher, more prominent ridgeline located to the southeast of the site.

The proposed development will be located in a relatively level area currently at 1037 feet above MSL between two knolls. The knoll to the west of the development area peaks is at 1084 feet above MSL. The knoll to the east has a gentler slope and peaks at 1066 feet above MSL. The project site is visible from Pomerado Road near Twin Peaks Road and adjoining residential neighborhoods which are to the southwest of the project site and are 400 to 450 feet lower in elevation compared to the project site.

In 1990, the City approved TTM 89-09, a ten-lot single-family residential development known as the Williams Ranch subdivision. The subject site is Lot 10 of this subdivision. TTM 89-09 called out the general location of each building pad. The subdivision is traversed by a significant ridgeline through Lots 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10 identified in the General Plan. A secondary ridgeline traverses Lots 5 and 6. The review and analysis of TTM 89-09 included efforts to preserve the two ridge lines. It also analyzed potential visual impacts associated with the future development of the Lots 3, 5, 8, 9, 10 in the subdivision as seen from the surrounding lower lying areas. The analysis consisted of a topographic cross section from lower-lying neighborhood areas to the west and south through the designated building pads of these lots. The analysis did not show the actual home development.

To reduce the potential for visual impact caused by future development, the approval of TTM 89-09 and the associated MND included mitigation measures and conditions of approval (Site Development #6 of Resolution P-90-87A) limiting future development on Lots 3, 5, 9, and 10 to one-story. No limit was set

for building height which is the same for single-story and two-story homes at 35 feet maximum although single-level homes are typically lower. The approval of TTM 89-09 also contained a mitigation measure and condition of approval (General Requirements and Approvals #8 of Resolution P-90-87A) which established various open space easement on lots within the subdivision for protection of biological resources, land formations and rock out-croppings, and/or scenic views of the project site. Lot 10 is subject to the one-story limitation and also has an open space easement.

The applicant proposes a two-story structure and a modification to the boundary of the open space easement with no net loss to the area of the open space easement. The topics are analyzed below and show that with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the aesthetic impacts associated with the construction of a two-story home and modification of the limits of the open space easement on Lot 10 can be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Two-Story Home.

The applicant is requesting that the mitigation measure and condition of approval limiting home development on Lots 3, 5, 9, and 10 to be revised to remove Lot 10 from this requirement, citing that the proposed two-story structure will not create an adverse aesthetic impact.

Consistent with TTM 89-09, the proposed development will be created in the designated recessed development area ("saddle") between the two knolls peaking at 1084 feet above MSL to the west and 1066 feet above MSL to the east. Up to nine feet of fill will be added to the natural grade to create a split pad with a main building pad at 1046-foot elevation and a lower and smaller pad at 1035-foot elevation. The smaller pad will be located on the southwest corner of the main building pad and 11 feet lower than the main pad. Fill-slopes measuring up to 26 feet in height will support the south side of the two building pads.

The upper and main building pad will contain the majority of the proposed home, patio, garden, and a pool. The lower pad will contain the two-story element of the proposed home consisting of a habitable walkout basement and non-habitable basement storage rooms located below the westerly portion of the upper level of the house. The lower level can be accessed internally from the main house and also from the exterior. The lower pad will also contain a secondary patio and garden area as well as a storm water treatment facility.

The house will be 24 feet high as measured from the upper building pad and 35 feet from the lower pad. The highest portion of the proposed residence will be at 1070 feet above MSL, four feet above the lower of the two adjacent knolls. The home would comply with the 35-foot height limit.

Strategy 15 pertaining to Hillside Developments in the Poway General Plan states that "Buildings should be sited so as not to project above the natural landform when possible." Of the four lots in Williams Ranch that are subject to the one-story limitation, Lot 10 is the only lot with a designated development

area that is recessed between two knolls, within the saddle. The development areas of the other three lots are located more prominently near the ridgeline. The potential visual impact resulting from development on Lot 10 is associated with views of the development as seen from Pomerado Road and adjacent neighborhoods located to the southwest of the project site. The property is also visible from Ted Williams Parkway located further south on Pomerado Road.

The applicant has provided a visual analysis for Lot 10 consisting of two photo simulations of the existing hillside area and overlain with a to-scale rendering of the proposed residence and associated grading as seen from vantage points along Pomerado Road and the neighborhood located east of Pomerado Road and north of Twin Peaks Road as well as Ted Williams Parkway located further south on Pomerado Road. The applicant has also submitted a closer-up illustrated perspective of the home development. As shown in the visual analysis, the building with its maximum elevation at 1070 feet above MSL would be lower than the 1084-foot knoll to the west. The analysis also shows that the four feet which the building extends above the nearest 1066-foot peak to the east will be minimally noticeable. The additional 4 feet will be even less visible in the context of the ridgeline gradually increasing off-site in an easterly direction to 1074 feet above MSL.

With the implementation of a mitigation measures listed below, the potential impacts of the two-story structure on scenic views, visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, and consistency with General Plan Strategies would be reduced to less than significant.

Modifying the Boundary of an Open Space Easement

A 3.67-acre open space easement covers the majority of the westerly portion of Lot 10 which includes the above-described 1084-foot knoll to the west of the proposed building pad. From the records of TTM 89-09 and as reflected by the shape of the open space easement, it is apparent that the intent of the open space easement was to protect both biological resources on Lot 10 and the knoll formations.

The project site is located in the Very High Fire Hazard Areas (VHFHA) of the City. In 1990, when TTM 89-09 was approved, there were no VHFHA designated areas and there were no requirements for providing a fire fuel management zone (FMZ) zones for structures or access roads. Therefore, at that time a residential development could easily be accommodated in the designated development area (saddle) on Lot 10 without impacting the open space easement. Considering the 100-foot FMZ currently required to be provided on-site around the entire house and the designated building pad location shown on the TTM plans, it would be challenging to design a home comparable to the estate homes in the neighborhood that could avoid encroaching into the open space easement with the required FMZ. The applicant has requested to modify the boundary of the open space easement to provide the required 100-foot FMZ.

The 0.12-acre area of the open space easement requested to be vacated includes the eastern slope of the knoll directly to the west of the proposed

building pad. The applicant proposes to swap the 0.12 acres of the open space easement with a 0.12-acre extension of the northerly boundary of the open space easement, still on Lot 10. Based on a biological report the habitat has similar biological value as discussed below in Section IV (Biological Resources).

The vacation of the open space easement designation over the 0.12 acre of the eastern slope of the knoll area could potentially result in a significant impact to scenic views of the knoll formation and ridgeline view by no longer having restrictions prohibiting vegetation removal, grading and placement of structures. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed below to be included in a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, the potential impacts of scenic vista would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the building plans shall call out the colors of the home to be muted earth-tone colors that visually blend in with the natural setting to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Services.
2. Prior to the issuance of a Grading Permit or Administrative Clearing Permit, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall record a Fire Fuel Management Zone Easement over the area to be vacated from the existing Open Space Easement on Lot 10. A legal description and plat of the easement 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 Fire Fuel Management Zone Easement shall allow the modification of vegetation as required by the Fire Marshall by mowing, thinning, and planting of new vegetation that visually blends in with the surrounding natural vegetation to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Services as shown on the approved landscape plan. The easement shall prohibit grading and any other land alterations as well as installation of any structures and fencing.

3. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, landscape and irrigation plans shall be submitted and the plans shall be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit. The project site shall be landscaped and irrigated in compliance with the City of Poway Landscape and Irrigation Design Manual, Chapter 17.41 PMC, and all other applicable standards in effect at the time of landscape and irrigation plan check submittal.

The landscape and irrigation plan submittal is a separate submittal from other project plan check submittals and is made directly to the Planning Division. Landscape and irrigation plan review fees are required and are the responsibility of the applicant.

EIS and Checklist

- i. Incorporate trees and shrubs in compliance with the Landscape and Irrigation Design Manual which provide a visual transition from the vertical element of the home to the nearby natural knolls and ridgeline to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Services and the Fire Marshall.
 - ii. The plans shall call out the location of the Fire Fuel Management Zone Easement and the method by which the vegetation can be modified in accordance with the Easement. Existing vegetation should be retained and trimmed to comply with FMZ regulations when feasible.
 - iii. In accordance with Poway General Plan requirement for hillside development, the landscaping shall utilize materials similar in appearance to the existing native vegetation.
 - iv. The plans shall show septic fields located within open space easement to be revegetated with native habitat in accordance with the Master Mitigation Agreement established for Williams Ranch.
 - v. The plans for landscaping shall, at minimum, show irrigation, and sizes and species for Fire Fuel Management Zones and all manufactured slopes steeper than 5:1.
 - vi. A note shall be added to the plans that if construction of the residence does not commence within 90 days of completion of grading, all manufactured slopes steeper than 5:1 shall be landscaped and irrigated to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Services.
- b. **No Impact.** The project site is not located in the vicinity of any State scenic highway, the proposed project would not damage any scenic resources within a State scenic highway. No impact would occur.
- c. **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measure.** See response and Mitigation Measures in I.a.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The site is currently vacant and located on a hillside. The proposed project would result in a new single-family home that would include installation of exterior lighting. There are no lighting standards for single-family residential development other than for exterior recreational courts. However, per the lighting standards of the Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), any exterior lighting shall be directed away from protected habitat areas, i.e. within a Biological Conservation Easements or Open Space Easement. Therefore, a less-than significant impact would occur.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY_RESOURCES:

EIS and Checklist

- a. **No Impact.** The project site is covered with native vegetation and is not identified as important farmland. Thus, the project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland 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. No impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** See response III.a above.
- c. **No Impact.** Grading of the project will likely result in the creation of dust and can affect the surrounding residential area. Standard City best management practice requirements include implementation of dust control measures and the

EIS and Checklist

operations are subject to San Diego Air Pollution Control District standards. No impacts would occur.

- d. 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 generally in an undeveloped, natural condition. The 13.55-acre site supports Southern Mixed Chaparral (SMC) and Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) and is located within the Mitigation Area of the Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan (Poway HCP). Lot 10 also is subject to a 3.67-acre open space easement which was established as a mitigation measure and condition of approval of TTM 89-09 for the protection of biological resources, land formation and rock out-croppings, and scenic views of the project site. No structures, grading, or disturbance of any vegetation is allowed within the open space area. Although the standard open space easement language for Poway allows for hand brush clearing of vegetation within the open space easement as directed by the Poway Fire Department, it does not apply to new development in the subdivision. New development is to be designed so not to impact the open space easement.

Habitat impacts in Williams Ranch are subject to habitat impact limits and mitigation requirements outlined in a Master Mitigation Agreement for TTM 89-09 – Williams Ranch negotiated between California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the City of Poway and the developer and signed in August 2003. The Master Mitigation Agreement was established because the approval of TTM 89-09 in 1990 pre-dated the Poway HCP adopted in 1996. Because the final map did not get approved until December 2000 after the adoption of the Poway HCP, the wildlife resource agencies determined it necessary to establish a maximum allowance for habitat impact and habitat mitigation requirements specific to the entire Williams Ranch subdivision in the context with the Poway HCP.

The Master Mitigation Agreement allows up to two acres of habitat impact and requires the remaining habitat on the lot be placed in a Biological Conservation Easement. Per the agreement the existing partially paved driveway shall count towards the two-acre limit. It allows septic fields to not count against the two acres provided that they be revegetated with native vegetation matching the surrounding habitat.

A biological report titled “Report of a Biological Assessment over APN 314-840-10, Williams Ranch Lot 10 City of Poway, California” was prepared for the property on September 26, 2018 and revised June 20, 2019, by Cummings Environmental, Inc. The report found that the 13.55-acre project site is covered with 7.08 acres of Southern Mixed Chaparral (SMC) and 6.3 acres of Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) habitat. The remaining 0.17 acres of the site is developed with a driveway leading to the proposed development site. The proposed project would result in the loss of approximately 0.42 acres of SMC and approximately 1.43 acres of CSS. Combined with the approximately 0.17 acres of impact associated with the existing driveway, the total habitat impact proposed for the project is two acres.

The biology report also discusses that the two-acre habitat impact for the site includes a proposal to extend a portion of the required 100-foot FMZ into 0.12

acres of the on-site open space easement on the south/southeast-facing slope of the knoll directly to the west of the development area. This area contains large boulders with sparse vegetation. Since the proposed impact is thinning of vegetation within the outer 60-feet of the FMZ (Zone B) around the residence, very little change will actually occur on the hillside. Nevertheless, the existing open space easement over this area needs to be vacated.

An area equal in size, habitat and function is proposed to be exchanged (“swapped”) for this impacted area by placing an open space easement over 0.12-acre contiguous to the northern boundary of the existing easement. This area was recommended by the biologist due to its contiguity with the existing open space easement and having similar habitat with the same function and biological values as the area to be vacated. Although the habitat in the proposed easement area is categorized as Southern Mixed Chaparral and the area to be vacated is categorized as Coastal Sage – Chaparral Scrub habitat, the plant species composition of the two habitats is quite similar and both habitats are suitable for being utilized by the California Gnatcatcher as evidenced by historic mapping of this species. The historic presence of Gnatcatchers in both types of habitat was confirmed during a federal protocol survey conducted over Lot 10 of Williams Ranch under permit from the US Fish and Wildlife Service during the 2018 breeding season. The report, “An Assessment of the California Gnatcatcher over Lot 10 of Williams Ranch, City of Poway, California” prepared by Cummings Environmental, Inc and dated May 22, 2018 discusses visual or audible evidence of Gnatcatchers being present on both the northern and southern portion of Lot 10. Rather than recording a new 3.67-acre open space easement to reflect the 0.12 acre swap, the 3.67 acres will be included in the BCE required by the Master Mitigation Agreement to be recorded over habitat areas remaining outside the impact area. The BCE will provide a greater protection value over the 3.67 acres than the existing open space easement language.

With the implementation of mitigation measures listed below to be included in a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, the potential impacts to Biological Resources would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

1. Prior to approval of the Grading Permit or Administrative Clearing Permit, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall record an Open Space Easement (OSE) over septic fields and related appurtenances and located outside the approved two-acre habitat impact area. The OSE shall allow for the temporary disturbance of habitat in connection with the installation and maintenance of a septic system and require that the area be revegetated with native habitat following the temporary disturbance.

A legal description and plat of the OSE 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 OSE shall be approved

by the City Attorney, and shall be notarized and recorded with the County of San Diego.

2. Prior to approval of the Grading Permit or Administrative Clearing Permit, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall mitigate impacts to natural habitat. The mitigation requirement will be achieved by recordation of a Biological Conversation Easement (BCE) over habitat on Lot 10 located outside the approved two-acre habitat impact area and the open space easement established for septic fields and associated appurtenances. The BCE shall include the existing Open Space Easement with the exception of 0.12 acres shown on approved project plans to be vacated from the open space easement in order to allow for the establishment of Fire Management Zones for the proposed residence.

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. 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.

3. 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

EIS and Checklist

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 on-site 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).

The applicant shall be required to provide erosion control, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

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

EIS and Checklist

gnatcatcher nests were present during clearing and grading activities within the area and any habitat within 500 feet of said area.

This mitigation measure must be included as a note on the cover sheet of the clearing/grading plan.

- b. **No Impact.** See IV.a.
- c. **No Impact.** The site and adjoining areas do not contain any wetlands. No impact would occur.
- d. **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** See IV.a.
- e. **No Impact.** See IV.a.
- f. **No Impact.** See IV.a.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

- a. **No Impact.** The subject site is vacant and does not contain any historical resources. No impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** An archaeological reconnaissance and report dated January 1990 and prepared by Roth and Associates was submitted in connection with the City's review and approval of TTM 89-09. The report is on file at the Planning Division. The reconnaissance found that a rock shelter structure existed on what is now known as Lot 2 of Williams Ranch. In addition, test excavation and surface collections throughout the entire 10-lot subdivision but resulted in the discovery of only limited subsurface artifacts of little research potential. Therefore, the archaeologist determined that no archaeological monitoring or preservation was merited during the development of the Williams Ranch subdivision except for preserving the rock shelter on Lot 2, which was subsequently accomplished with the recordation of an archaeological open easement. Therefore, no impacts would occur as a result of the proposed development on Lot 10.
- c. **No Impact.** See V.b.

VI. ENERGY

- a. **No Impact.** The project involves the construction of a single-family residence. Construction of the project would create temporary increased demands for electricity and vehicle fuels compared to existing conditions. Construction of the project would require electricity use to power construction equipment. Electricity use during construction would vary during different phases of construction. The majority of construction equipment would be gas powered. Adequate electrical infrastructure capacity is available to accommodate the electricity demand during construction. There is sufficient electricity infrastructure in the region for the increase in electricity demand by the proposed single-family residence and the project would not require expanded

electricity supplies. Therefore, there would be no impacts from energy use during short-term construction activities of the single-family residence and subsequent use of the property.

- b. **No impact.** Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations contains energy efficiency standards for residential and nonresidential buildings based on a state mandate to reduce California's energy demand. Specifically, Title 24 addresses a number of energy efficiency measures that impact energy used for lighting, water heating, heating, and air conditioning, including the energy impact of the building envelope such as windows, doors, skylights, wall/floor/ceiling assemblies, attics, and roofs. Part 6 of Title 24 specifically establishes energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings constructed in the State of California in order to reduce energy demand and consumption. The proposed project would comply with Title 24, Part 6, per state regulations. In accordance with Title 24 Part 6, the proposed project would have: (a) sensor-based lighting controls—for fixtures located near windows, the lighting would be adjusted by taking advantage of available natural light; and, (b) efficient process equipment—improved technology offers significant savings through more efficient processing equipment. Title 24, Part 11, contains voluntary and mandatory energy measures that are applicable to the proposed project under the CALGreen Code. In accordance with Title 24, Part 11, mandatory compliance, the applicant would have: (a) 50 percent of its construction and demolition waste diverted from landfills; (b) mandatory inspections of energy systems to ensure optimal working efficiency; (c) low pollutant-emitting exterior and interior finish materials, such as paints, carpets, vinyl flooring, and particle boards; and, (d) a 20 percent reduction in indoor water use. Compliance with all of these mandatory measures would decrease the consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum. Because the proposed project would comply with Title 24, Part 6 and Part 11, no conflict with existing energy standards and regulations would occur. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

- a.i) **No 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 on-site 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. No impact would occur.

EIS and Checklist

- a.ii) **No 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 building 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 residence will be designed and constructed to accommodate projected seismic loading, pursuant to these existing guidelines. No impact would occur.
- 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 would occur.
- 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. The building pad and access for the proposed residence will be graded according to City requirements and fill material which 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. No impact would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** The project site will be served by a private septic system that has been preliminarily approved by the San Diego County Environmental Health Department and will receive final approval prior to building permit issuance. No impact would occur.
- f. **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. Therefore, no impact to paleontological resources would occur.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

- a & b. **No Impact.** Greenhouse gases (GHG), 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." GHG impacts that attributable to this proposed project are emissions associated with construction activities and operations related to traffic and energy use.

Many lead agencies have adopted the threshold as recommended by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), *CEQA and Climate Change – Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act* as a guidance on screening when a project would generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment and would warrant further analysis. 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, 900 metric tons represents the emission that would be generated by 50 single-family residences annually. Since the project is a residential development for one new residence, the CO₂ emission would be well below any significance level. Furthermore, the emissions associated with the project will be further reduced to a level that is consistent with the goals of AB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions through the implementation mobile source emission regulations, Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, and renewable portfolio standards adopted by the State of California. No impact to cumulatively considerable global climate change would be caused by the proposed project.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

- a - c. **No Impact.** The project involves the construction of a new single-family residence. No transport, storage or use of hazardous materials beyond that which typically occurs with a residential use will occur. No impact would occur.
- d. **No Impact.** The site is not on the established lists of hazardous wastes site. No impact would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** The closest airports to the project site are Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, located approximately 9 miles southwest of the project site, and Gillespie Field, located approximately 8 miles east of the project site. The project site is located within the designated Review Area 2 Airport Influence Area of the Marine Corps Air Station Miramar. According to the Section 2.6.2(a)(2) of the Airport Land Use Commission Policies, the proposed project

does not include features that require review by the Airport Land Use Commission. The project site is not located within the influence area of the Gillespie Field. The project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area and no impact would occur.

- f. **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. No impact would occur.
- g. **Less than Significant Impact.** According to the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) map for Poway (CAL FIRE 2009), the project site is located within the VHFHSZ. The proposed project includes the establishment of Fire Fuel Management Zones for access and the home development. The modification to the limits of the existing Open Space Easement established on Lot 10 by the TTM is in order to allow for the required fire fuel management zones to be provided for the new home. The proposed development would use required materials and construction methods to address wildfire exposure and meet other construction standards for development within the VHFHSZ established by the California Building Code and related City of Poway amendments. Accordingly, the exposure on people or structures either directly or indirectly would have less than significant impact on the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

- a. **No Impact.** The project will comply with all storm water quality regulations or waste discharge requirements surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the County of San Diego, and the City of Poway. The project will require a grading permit, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and a Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP), which will be ensured as part of the project improvements plan review and building permit process. The project incorporates stormwater basins and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No impact would occur.
- 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 through the installation and use of Storm Water Basin and Low Impact Development (LID) features. No impact would occur.
- c.i-iv) **No Impact.** The project has been designed such that there is no change in the direction of existing stormwater runoff on the site. Nor will there be an increase in the amount or rate of storm water runoff beyond which currently occurs. The project will implement LID features and will include the construction of storm water treatment facilities. The stormwater management facilities are required to be maintained throughout the life of the project as outlined in section 16.104 of the Poway Municipal Cod. No impact would occur.

EIS and Checklist

d. **No Impact.** The project is not located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone that would pose the risk of pollutants being released due to project inundation. No impact would occur.

e. **No Impact.** See X.a and X.b above. No impact would occur.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

a. **No Impact.** The project will result in the construction of a single-family residence on Lot 10 of the Williams Ranch subdivision and the modification of an open space easement boundary. The project will not divide an established neighborhood. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b. **No Impact.** See XI.a above. The project does not result in a significant impact. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES:

a & b. **No Impact.** Pursuant to the City of Poway Master Environmental Assessment prepared in conjunction with the update to the Poway General Plan in 1991, there are no known mineral resources on the site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XIII. NOISE:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact.** Noise from the project will be that typical to residential uses in the neighborhood and will not impact adjacent uses. The project construction activities will result in temporary or periodic increases in noise level and type typical for the neighborhood. Per City standards, the noise generating construction activities are limited to certain times of the day and days of the week. Impact are less than significant

b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project grading and construction activities may result in temporary or periodic increases in the generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels typically related to construction. However, considering that the nearest development is located more than 200-feet away and the noise generating construction activities per City codes are limited to certain times of the day and days of the week, the impact would be less than significant impact could occur.

b. **No Impact.** The closest airports to the project site are Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, located approximately 9 miles southwest of the project site, and Gillespie Field, located approximately 8 miles east of the project site. Thus, operation of the project would not result in a noise hazard for people working in the project area and no impact would occur.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

a & b. **No Impact.** The proposed project is located on an existing lot zoned for the development of a single-family residence. The proposed project would develop

EIS and Checklist

such residence. The project will not induce growth indirectly as it will be serviced by existing infrastructure within the project vicinity. Additionally, no people or housing will be displaced as the site is currently vacant. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

- a.i. Fire Protection – **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is served by the City of Poway Fire Department. The project site is located in the VHFHSZ and will be developed in accordance with construction standards for development within the VHFHSZ as established by the California Building Code and related City of Poway amendments. The incremental increase in potential for an unexpected emergency call to this project can be accounted for as the site is already included within the Fire Department service area. No new or upgraded fire protection facilities would be required as a result of this project and no physical impacts resulting from construction of new facilities are identified. Less than significant impact would occur.
- a.ii. Police Protection – **No Impact.** The City of Poway contracts with the San Diego County Sheriff's Department for law enforcement services. The project site is currently served by the Poway Station, which is located at 13100 Bowron Road. The site is included within the Sheriff's service area. Any specific service provided that should be an (unexpected) emergency call to the site 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 and increase in preschool student count are identified. A less than significant impact would occur.
- a.iii. Schools – **No Impact.** The proposed additional single-family home will not generate the need for additional school facilities. No impact would occur.
- a.iv. Parks – **No Impact.** The proposed additional single-family home will not generate the need for additional park space. No impact would occur.
- a.v. Other Public Facilities – **No Impact.** The project not would result new or physically altered public facilities. The project will be connected to an existing water main, will be served by a private septic system, and stormwater facilities will be provided on-site. No impact would occur.

XVI. RECREATION:

- a & b. **No Impact.** The recreational needs of proposed single-family residence with a private backyard can be met with the existing neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational facilities. No impact will occur.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION:

- a. **No Impact.** The proposed construction of a single-family residence would not be in conflict with program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation

EIS and Checklist

system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. No impact will occur.

- b. **No Impact.** The proposed project will not be in conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) in that the proposed project results in the development of a single-family residence on an existing legal lot that was created in conformance with TTM-89-09 and the associated MND which analyzed traffic generated by the proposed 10-lots. Therefore, the proposed project would cause less than a significant transportation impact. No impact will occur.
- c. **No Impact.** The proposed project would not affect the design of streets. The existing driveway will be used as access to the site. No impact will occur.
- d. **No Impact.** The project will not result in inadequate emergency access as the site will be accessed via the existing driveway from the public street. The project will include the installation of a hammerhead driveway to provide for a turn-around for emergency vehicles. No impact will occur.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

- a.i) **No Impact.** The project site is not on a “Local register of historical resources” and is not officially designated or recognized as historically significant by Poway. No impact would occur.
- a.ii) **No Impact.** See V.b and V.c.

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(b), the Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians and Barona Band of Mission Indians tribes, which are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area within the City of Poway’s jurisdiction, requested formal notice of and information on proposed projects within the City of Poway. On January 17, 2020, in compliance with California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, the City of Poway, as Lead Agency, sent a letter to the Tribal Representatives for those tribes requesting notification of the proposed project. Both tribes have replied that they do not need further consultation or monitoring for this project. No impact would occur.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

- a. **No Impact.** The proposed project, i.e. construction of a single-family home, the elimination of a one-story structure limit on Lot 10, and modification of the boundaries of an existing open space easement on Lot 10 will not impact an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** The resulting increased water use from the addition of one single-family residence would be considered insignificant. The project will be served by the City of Poway which has a sufficient water supply available to serve this project. No impact would occur.

EIS and Checklist

- c. **No Impact.** The proposed additional single-family residence would result in an insignificant increase in wastewater generation. The project includes on-site stormwater treatment facilities and will be served by an on-site septic system. The City of San Diego treatment plant has adequate capacity to treat the incremental wastewater generated by the project. No impact would occur.
- d. **No Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would result in the generation of solid waste such as scrap lumber, concrete, residual wastes, packing materials, and plastics. The project would be required to dispose of such materials according to a Construction Waste Management Plan. The use of the single-family residence will result in the incremental generation of solid waste which can be handled by EDCO who currently is contracted with the City of Poway to provide waste management services, including solid waste collection and disposal as well as sorting of recyclables. The solid waste generated by the project is not anticipated to significantly impact the life expectancy of the landfill that serves the city. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** This project will be required to comply with and meet all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste collection and disposal. The facility will appropriately separate its waste so that recyclable waste is separated from landfill trash in accordance with the City's waste reduction and recycling program. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XX. WILDFIRE:

- a. **No Impact.** See Section XV.a.i. (Public Services – Fire Protection).
- b. **Less than Significant.** According to the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) map for Poway (CAL FIRE 2009), the project site is located within the VHFHSZ. The proposed project includes the establishment of a 100-foot Fire Fuel Management Zones (FMZ) for structures and a 10-foot wide FMZ for the driveway to the home. The proposed revisions of the existing Open Space Easement established on the property by the TTM will allow for the required fire fuel management zones to be provided for the new home. The home will observe required setback from top of slope (edge of building pad) to the home to address fire risks associated with development near slopes. The proposed development would use required materials and construction methods to address wildfire exposure and meet other construction standards for development within the VHFHSZ established by the California Building Code and related City of Poway amendments. Accordingly, the exposure of pollutant concentrations for a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire on project occupants will be less than significant.
- c. **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed single-family residential development would require the installation or continuous maintenance of an FMZ for the home and driveway. Habitat impacts associated with the home development and establishment of the FMZ will be mitigated as discussed in Section IVa. The FMZ will be planted and otherwise maintained per an approved landscape plan to prevent ongoing impacts to the surrounding

EIS and Checklist

remaining natural habitat. Powerlines and other utilities will be placed underground. Therefore, the project will have less than a significant impact on fire risk and temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

- d. **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is located on a hillside and within a VHFHSZ area. The proposed single-family home will be placed on a building pad that will be graded per an approved grading plan that includes verification of a soil compaction and installation of on-site a stormwater treatment facilities based on-site- and project-specific conditions. Therefore, the proposed project will result in less than significant risk and impact related to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a. **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures.** See response IV.a above.
- b. & c. **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. The project would not have any environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.