

**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 a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project.

B. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: McKee Orchard (TTM21-003/DR21-002)
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Poway, Development Services
13325 Civic Center Drive, Poway, CA 92064
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Austin Silva, 858-668-4658
4. Project Location: 13667 Twin Peaks Road, located on the south side of Twin Peaks Road between the Midland Road and Budwin Lane intersections, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 314-192-02
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Jack Robson, Cornerstone Communities
1241 Cave Street, Suite 200, La Jolla CA 92037
6. General Plan Designation: Residential Single Family-4 (RS-4)
7. Zoning: Residential Single Family-4 (RS-4)
8. Description of Project: The proposed project would consist of the redevelopment of a 4.77-acre residential parcel at 13667 Twin Peaks Road with a 20-lot single-family residential subdivision that would be accessed from an extension of the existing cul-de-sac of Holly Oak Way. The project would require the demolition of an existing single-family residence, removal of 44 mature trees present on the site, mass grading, and the construction of a 20-lot subdivision with one- and two-story residences that range in size from 3,465 square feet (sf) to 3,900 sf. The residential development would contain one affordable housing unit by applying State of California density bonus laws. To accommodate the additional unit, the project would require concessions including the reduction of the minimum lot size requirement and a reduction of side yard setbacks. The minimum lot size for the RS-4 zone is 10,000 sf. The project proposes lots ranging from 7,012 sf to 13,485 sf. The requested side yard setback reduction would reduce the side yard setback from 10 feet for the RS-4 zone to 5 feet for the project. Parking would be provided, as required by City code, with two garage spaces per residence, resulting in 40 total garage spaces provided for the project.

The proposed development would include four single-story residences and sixteen two-story residences. The development would include four plan types and each plan would feature two architectural schemes with four different color scheme options. Exterior building elevations of the residences would be Craftsman style, consistent with the Old Poway Specific Plan Architectural Standards and Design Guidelines. The exteriors would feature cement tile roofs, overhanging eaves, wood accents, patterned windowpanes, and various combinations of board and batten, lap siding, stone, and brick. The exterior colors would be earth tones, including green, brown, and taupe shades.

The project would require an extension of Holly Oak Way by approximately 600 feet to provide access to the subdivision. The extension of Holly Oak Way would be a continuation of a public road, maintained by the City. Public utilities, including City water and sewer would also be

extended to the site. A six-foot-high, concrete masonry unit (CMU) decorative block wall would be constructed along the rear property line of the homes that would back up to Twin Peaks Road and would provide noise attenuation. A pedestrian easement would extend from Holly Oak Way and connect to the pedestrian trail along Twin Peaks Road. The Holly Oak extension streetscape improvements would include new pedestrian sidewalks, street, trees, and decorative Old Poway street lights consistent with the existing street lights on Holly Oak Way. The project includes 39 street trees along the extension of Holly Oak Way.

Project construction would require the excavation of 5,900 cubic yards (cy) of soil, with 7,000 cy of fill. Approximately 1,100 cy of soil would be imported to the site to accomplish grading of the site. Construction would occur in four phases of approximately five homes each over a period of several years.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Surrounding land uses include institutional uses and single-family residential uses. The Diroma Estates subdivision is located off Midland Road to the south/southwest of the project site along Holly Oak Way and is also zoned RS-4. Living Way Church and a single-family residence at the end of Outlook Drive are located west of the project site; these properties are also zoned RS-4. Administrative offices, Poway adult school, and a bus fleet storage lot for the Poway Unified School District are located across Twin Peaks Road, north of the project site. St. Gabriel Catholic Church is located just east of the school district property. The Kent Hills subdivision with access off Twin Peaks Road is located east of the project site along Kent Hill Way and is also zoned RS-4. Traffic signals operate along Twin Peaks Road at the intersections with Midland Road and Budwin Lane, while a stop sign controlled intersection occurs along Midland Road at the intersection with Holly Oak Way. The project site is surrounded by land within the Old Poway Specific Plan area.

Elevations on the project site range from approximately 550 to 560 feet above mean sea level. The project site was historically used for farming and now contains a residence that was constructed in the late 1950s. The existing residence is surrounded by mature trees. The remainder of the parcel is vacant and has been disturbed by previous orchard activities. The project site contains developed, disturbed, and ornamental vegetation communities.

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.?
City staff contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a consultation list of tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project. The NAHC provided a consultation list of 16 tribes. On April 19, 2022, 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 Assembly Bill (AB) 52 consultation notices were received, as discussed in this document (refer to the Tribal Cultural Resources impact discussion).

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.

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

Determination (to be completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case 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.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the 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.

City of Poway

Date

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 Resources 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 that 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, 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

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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 that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				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 net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X	
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	

Environmental Initial Study and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife 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 Wildlife 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 policy or ordinance?			X	
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

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to 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 Publication 42.				X
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv. Landslides?				X

Environmental Initial Study and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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 off-site 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
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	
XIX. 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

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				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 that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				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 wildland fires?				X
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	

Environmental Initial Study and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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 that would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;			X	
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a matter that would result in flooding on or off site;			X	
iii. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; 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	
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

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of 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:				
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 groundborne vibration or groundborne 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 infrastructure)?				X
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Environmental Initial Study and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
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 that 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	

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
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 Public Resources Code section 5024.1(c)? In applying the criteria set forth in Public Resource Code section 5024.1(c), the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X		

Environmental Initial Study and Checklist

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water wastewater treatment or stormwater 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 development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?			X	
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

ISSUE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples 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 that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly?			X	

D. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

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

I. AESTHETICS

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The City does not specifically designate scenic vistas. However, the project site is located within the Old Poway Specific Plan. The Old Poway Specific Plan identifies the segment of Midland Road between Hilleary Road and Twin Peaks Road as a scenic roadway. While the project site is not directly adjacent to Midland Road, the site is located approximately 450 feet east of Midland Road and portions of the project site would be briefly visible from some locations along the designated segment of Midland Road. The project site would include a vinyl fence along the western portion of the site. This fence would obstruct views of much of the development from Midland Road. The rooftop and second story portions of the residences would be visible above the fence. The project would include four single-story residences and sixteen two-story residences. The development would include four plan types, and each plan would feature two architectural schemes, with four different color scheme options. Exterior building elevations of the residences would be Craftsman style, consistent with the Old Poway Specific Plan. The exteriors would feature cement tile roofs, overhanging eaves, wood accents, and patterned windowpanes, with various combinations of board and batten, lap siding, stone, and brick. The exterior colors would be earth tones, including green, brown, and taupe. Street lights on the extension of Holly Oak Way would include decorative Old Poway street lights, consistent with the existing street lights on Holly Oak Way. The proposed residences would be developed consistent with the architectural standards identified in the Old Poway Specific Plan, would be consistent with surrounding development, and would maintain the character of the Old Poway Specific Plan area. With the incorporation of architectural design, as required by the Old Poway Specific Plan, the project would not result in significant visual impacts associated with the nearby scenic roadway portion of Midland Road. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **No Impact.** The project site is not located within or adjacent to a designated state scenic highway. The nearest designated state scenic highway is a portion of State Route 52, located approximately 9 miles south of the project site (California Department of Transportation 2022). As such, no impact associated with scenic resources within a state scenic highway would occur.
- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See response I.a. The project would result in the development of the project site with 20 single-family residences. The single-family residential use would be consistent with the General Plan and zoning designations for the site. The project would implement the architectural standards required by the Old Poway Specific Plan to provide a development that is visually consistent with the character of the Old Poway Specific Plan area. Visual changes at the project site would occur as a result of the project; however, with the exception of the two zoning concessions (reduction in minimum lot size and reduction in side yard setbacks) provided consistent with the Poway Municipal Code and State bonus density laws, the project would be developed consistent with the Old Poway Specific Plan and zoning requirements. Therefore, impacts associated with visual changes to the project site would be less than significant.
- d. **No Impact.** The project would result in minor sources of new lighting associated with single-family uses that would be consistent with the City's Municipal Code and

Old Poway Specific Plan. Proposed lighting would be similar in nature to the lighting in the surrounding area. No impact would occur.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

- a. **No Impact.** The project site is designated as “Other Land” by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (Department of Conservation 2022). The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. No impact associated with the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** The project site was farmed from the late 1880s until 1958 (ASM Affiliates 2021a). However, since 1958, the project site has been vacant except for the residence located in the southwest portion of the site. The project site is zoned for single-family residential uses (RS-4). As such, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. 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 discussed in response II.c, the project site is not located in an area containing forest land. As such, the project would not convert forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** The project would not result in impacts to agricultural or forest lands, nor would it introduce elements that would convert agricultural use to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest land 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 the 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 (RAQS) (1994; jointly developed by the APCD 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 RAQS. 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 regional emissions projected in the RAQS. No impact would occur.
- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See response II.a above. Project implementation would produce temporary pollutant emissions during construction and long-term operational emissions. Project construction activities would generate combustion

emissions from the operation of on-site heavy duty construction vehicles and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew and necessary construction materials. Exhaust emissions generated by construction activities would generally result from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment that may include excavation equipment, forklift, skip loader, and/or dump truck. Total daily construction emissions are a function of the level of equipment activity, length of construction period, number of pieces and types of equipment in use, site characteristics, weather conditions, number of construction personnel, and the amount of materials being transported on or off-site. Fugitive dust emissions generally represent 30 percent of all particulate matter and are generally associated with land clearing and grading operations. Standard City requirements include implementation of dust control measures and the construction activities would be subject to SDAPCD standards, including dust control measures. Based on the small size of the project, construction emissions would be minor and temporary in nature, and impacts would be less than significant.

Operational air pollutant emissions would include those associated with stationary sources, energy sources, and mobile sources. Stationary sources associated with the project would come from landscape equipment, general energy use, and solid waste. Energy emissions would come from electricity and natural gas use. Mobile source emissions would be generated due to personal vehicles use from residents (estimated to be 200 average daily trips (ADT)). Based on the small project size, project-related long-term operational emissions are expected to be minor and would result in less-than-significant impacts.

- c. **No Impact.** Sensitive receptors include schools, hospitals, resident care facilities, day care centers, or other facilities that may house concentrations of individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. Adjacent land uses include residential and institutional (consisting of a church, and administrative offices and a bus fleet storage lot for the Poway Unified School District across Twin Peaks Road). Twin Peaks Middle School and Terra Bonita Elementary School are situated more than 0.25-mile northeast of the project site. Therefore, the project site does not have adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors. Based on the small project size, temporary nature of the construction emissions, and minor amount of operational emissions, and the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants. No impact would occur.
- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Odors would be temporarily generated from equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment and architectural coatings. Such odors are temporary, localized and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect a substantial number of people. No sources of odor would be associated with long term residential use of the site. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant odor impact.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site has been historically disturbed by development and prior agricultural activities. No special status plants or animals were observed at the project site during a biological survey, and none are expected based on the disturbed nature of the project site (Alden Environmental 2021). No active bird nests were observed on the project site during the general biological survey or during the focused nesting survey conducted

for the project. Three inactive raptor nests were observed in the pine trees on site during the surveys. Raptors and potentially other bird species would likely utilize these nests for breeding in the future. Thus, the project would result in potentially significant impacts to migratory or nesting birds, and mitigation is required. Implementation of mitigation measure **BIO-1** would reduce potentially significant impacts to migratory or nesting birds to a less-than-significant level.

BIO-1: Removal of the trees on site shall occur outside of the breeding season for nesting birds (February 1 to September 15). If removal of the pine trees must occur during the breeding season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds or raptors protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 3 calendar days prior to the start of construction activities (including removal of vegetation) and shall include the limits of disturbance and an additional 100 feet (300 feet for raptors) from the area of disturbance. The applicant shall submit the results of the pre-construction survey to the City of Poway for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities.

- 1) If nesting birds are detected, a mitigation plan (pre-construction survey) in conformance with applicable state and federal law (e.g., appropriate follow-up surveys, monitoring schedules, construction, noise barriers, and/or buffers up to 300 feet) shall be prepared and include proposed measures to be implemented to ensure that take of birds or eggs, or disturbance of breeding activities, is avoided. The mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. The recommendations contained in the mitigation plan shall be implemented prior to and during construction, to the satisfaction of the City.
- 2) If nesting birds are not detected during the pre-construction survey, no further mitigation is required.
- 3) If nesting birds are detected and construction activities are to occur during the breeding season, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented prior to and during construction:
 - a) No vegetation clearing shall occur within 300 feet of an active raptor nest and 100 feet of an active nest of a non-listed bird species until a biologist has determined that the young have fledged from the nest or that the nest is inactive (i.e., abandoned).
 - b) Active nests shall be monitored on a daily basis to determine the effectiveness of the avoidance measures being implemented. The biologist shall monitor all active nests until all young have fledged or until the nest is determined inactive.
 - c) A minimum 300-foot buffer between the location of an active raptor nest and the nearest construction activity shall be maintained until the young have fledged from the nest or until the nest is determined inactive. For nests of non-raptor birds, a buffer of 100 feet shall be maintained.
- 4) While no specific noise thresholds have been established for raptors or other non-listed bird species, construction activities that are expected to generate noise levels above the ambient noise level shall be measured

by an acoustician technician. The active nest shall also be monitored by a biologist to determine if there is any effect on the breeding behavior of the particular species from the elevated noise levels. If it is determined that the elevated noise level is having an effect on the breeding behavior of the nesting bird species, then the noise generating construction activity shall be suspended in the vicinity of the active nest until such time as all of the young birds have fledged or until the nest is determined inactive.

- b. **No Impact.** The project site is completely disturbed and supports non-sensitive developed, disturbed, and ornamental vegetation communities/land cover types (Alden Environmental 2021). The project site does not contain riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. As such, the project would not result in adverse effects to such resources and no impact would occur.
- c. **No Impact.** No wetland or riparian vegetation communities were observed on the site during the biological survey conducted for the project (Alden Environmental 2021). There was no evidence of channels, basins, swales, streambeds, or other features that would suggest water conveyance and/or the presence of jurisdictional features observed during the biological survey. No impact to state or federally protected wetlands would occur.
- d. **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site contains pine trees with inactive raptor nests. While no birds were present during biological surveys for the project, the presence of the trees and inactive nests could support migratory or nesting birds, as discussed in response IV.a above. Therefore, the project would have a potentially significant impact on the movement of migratory wildlife species, such as migratory or nesting birds. Implementation of mitigation measure **BIO-1**, as described above, would reduce these potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- e. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project would comply with the City of Poway's Urban Forestry Ordinance. The project would include the removal of 46 private trees on the project site, including oak, pine, toyon, date palm, American beech, and California pepper trees. These trees are generally located in the southwestern portion of the project site, near the existing residence. Trees would be removed consistent with the requirements of Poway's Municipal Code section 12.32.150, *Private Tree Removal Permit*. The removed trees would be replaced consistent with the requirements of Poway Municipal Code section 12.32.170, *Replacement of Trees*. The removal of trees exceeding 8 inches diameter at breast height (DBH) would require replacement at a ratio of two 48-inch box specimen trees per one tree removed. Other trees would be replaced at a one-to-one ratio consistent with the requirements of the Municipal Code. The project would require the replacement of six Coast Live Oak trees with 8-inch or greater DBH at a two-to-one ratio. Additionally, 33 other trees that have 8-inch DBH or greater would require replacement at a two-to one ratio. Four Coast Live Oak trees and two other trees with DBH of less than 8 inches would be replaced at a one-to-one ratio. There are 11 trees along the northern project boundary, within the public right-of-way that would remain in place as part of the project. The removal of trees at the project site and the installation of replacement trees would be conducted consistent with the requirements of the City of Poway's Urban Forestry Ordinance. The replacement trees would be planted throughout the project site as street trees or private trees within front or rear yards. Impacts would be less than significant.

- f. **No Impact.** The project site is located within the Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP). The project site is mapped as disturbed habitat on Figure 1 (Vegetation Communities) of the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP. The project site is not included within mapped preserve areas shown on Figure 3 of the Poway Subarea HCP/NCCP. This is due to the highly disturbed and developed nature of the project site and surrounding properties. Therefore, implementation of the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP/NCCP. No impact would occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The existing residence on the project site, which was constructed between 1953 and 1958, was evaluated for eligibility for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), as a City of Poway historic resource or Historic Landmark, and as a historic resource under CEQA. As part of the evaluation, an on-site survey of the home and property, archival research, and a review of building records were conducted (ASM Affiliates 2021b). The evaluation determined that the single-family residence at the project site is not eligible for listing under the CRHR and the City of Poway criteria; therefore, the residence does not meet the definition of a historical resource under CEQA. However, the project site is located within the boundary of the prehistoric Village of Paguai (CA-SDI-4606), as discussed further in response V.b below. This site is presumed eligible for inclusion in the CRHR and would require mitigation measures **CUL-1** through **CUL-5**, as discussed below, to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- b. **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site is located within the boundary of the prehistoric Village of Paguai (CA-SDI-4606), and archaeological resources have been identified on the project site in the past, and recently during the archaeological survey conducted for the project (ASM Affiliates 2021a). A total of 35 cultural resources have been recorded within 1-mile of the project site, with one resource (CA-SDI-4606) covering the entire project site. CA-SDI-4606 has been previously recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR, which indicates that it has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of a local area, California, or the nation (CRHR Criterion 4). During the pedestrian field survey conducted as part of the archaeology survey, 135 artifacts were recorded on the surface of the project site, including 59 pieces of brownware potsherds, 67 pieces of debitage, two granitic hand stone fragments, two volcanic cores, one possible polishing stone, and four retouched flakes. Artifacts were scattered on the surface primarily along the eastern half of the project site; however, several of the artifacts were observed in the animal burrow tailings suggesting a possible buried component of the project site. Based on the known presence of CA-SDI-4606 on the project site, and the identification of a large number of artifacts on the project site, the presence of an intact subsurface deposit is possible. This site is presumed eligible for listing in the CRHR. As such, a CRHR-eligible resource is present on the project site and implementation of the project would result in potentially significant impacts to known and unknown archaeological resources. The implementation of mitigation measures **CUL-1** through **CUL-4** would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

CUL-1: A treatment plan for the archaeological data recovery program and construction monitoring shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist prior to issuance of a grading permit. The treatment plan shall identify the project site and take into consideration the vertical and horizontal extent of proposed

grading and ground disturbing activities within the project site. The plan shall describe how archaeological data would be scientifically and systematically collected from the project site, and how this data would be used to address research issues.

CUL-2: Prior to excavation and ground disturbing activities, a data recovery program shall be completed by a qualified archaeologist. The data recovery phase shall focus on recovering archaeological data sufficient to mitigate the destruction of CA-SDI-4606 within the project site. The amount of excavation and the locations of the excavation shall be determined through a Ground Penetrating Radar study as well as surface observations. Standard hand-excavated archaeological 1-x-1-m test units can be used during this phase, although these may be expanded if features are discovered or to cover a larger part of the project site. The units shall be excavated by hand using arbitrary 10-cm levels unless cultural stratigraphy is identified. Hand tools potentially including shovels, picks, trowels, brushes, and probes, shall be used in the excavation. All soils shall be passed through 1/8-inch mesh screen (or smaller if column samples are taken and processed), using a water-screening technique. Following completion of excavation, all cultural materials shall be washed, cataloged, and analyzed. Technical analyses shall include lithic artifact analysis, shellfish analysis, chronometric studies, faunal studies, and other analyses as needed to describe the cultural materials and address the research issues. A data recovery report shall be prepared and submitted to the City of Poway for approval.

CUL-3: At the completion of the data recovery program, an updated State of California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 site form shall be prepared and submitted to the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC). The form shall provide revised site boundaries, as determined by the archaeological investigations, and shall include a description of the artifacts and deposits found at the site.

CUL-4: At the completion of the data recovery program, an archaeological resources monitoring program shall be implemented during excavation and ground disturbing activities and include the following:

- 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 City of Poway.
- 2) The qualified archaeologist shall attend the pre-construction meeting with the contractors and City staff to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program.
- 3) The qualified archaeologist shall direct the field monitor during grading of all areas identified for development.
- 4) Native American monitoring will be required during grading, unless the certified archaeologist determines that the potential for cultural resources has been exhausted. The Native American monitors shall be invited to participate in the monitoring program and will be directed by the project archaeologist.
- 5) During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor and Native American representative shall be on

site, as determined by the qualified archaeologist, to perform inspections of the excavations. Full- or part-time inspections may be needed depending upon the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features.

- 6) Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field so the monitored grading can proceed.
- 7) In the event that previously unidentified cultural 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 City of Poway at the time of discovery. The archaeologist, in consultation with the City of Poway, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The City of Poway must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area.
- 8) 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.
- 9) 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.
- 10) 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 City of Poway prior to the issuance of any building permits.

- c. **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** See response V.b. Mitigation measure **CUL-5** would reduce potentially significant impacts associated with the discovery of human remains to a less-than-significant level.

CUL-5: If human remains are discovered, they shall be treated with respect. If human remains are found during any ground disturbance associated with project development activities, including the archaeological data recovery programs, the archaeological monitor and the construction contractor shall comply with PRC 5097.98. Details of this law are summarized below for this project:

- 1) The discovery location shall be protected and secured from further disturbance.
- 2) The construction contractor shall contact the San Diego County Medical Examiner to identify any possible human remains.
- 3) If the remains are determined by the Medical Examiner or an authorized representative to be Native American, the Medical Examiner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).
- 4) The NAHC shall contact the Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

- 5) The Project proponent shall provide the MLD with access to the discovery location, which shall have been protected from damage.
- 6) The MLD shall make a recommendation for treatment of the remains within 48 hours. Possible options for treatment include:
 - a) Preservation in place and avoidance.
 - b) Removal by a qualified archaeologist. Analysis by an osteologist or physical anthropologist may or may not be possible.
 - c) Repatriation of the remains to the MLD following the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) process.
 - d) Reburial of the remains on the property.
- 7) If the MLD does not make a recommendation within 48 hours, or if the recommendations are not acceptable to the project proponent following extended discussions and mediation, the project proponent shall reinter the remains and burial items with appropriate dignity on the property, in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance. The location of reinterment shall be protected by one of the three following measures:
 - a) Record the location with the NAHC or the SCIC.
 - b) Utilize an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement.
 - c) Record a document with San Diego County.
- 8) If multiple human remains are found, extended discussions shall be held with the MLD. If agreement on the treatment of these remains is not reached, they shall be reinterred in compliance with PRC 5097.98(e).

VI. ENERGY

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Project construction would result in temporary energy demands for electricity, vehicle fuel, and equipment fuel. Electricity use during construction would vary during different phases of construction; however, the majority of energy usage would be associated with the consumption of fossil fuels as a result of on-road vehicles for worker commutes, materials delivery, and the operation of construction equipment and vehicles.

The project's operational energy usage would be minimized through compliance with the California Building Code Standards (i.e., California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 24) and California Green Building Standards Code, as applicable to the project. Therefore, the project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** To minimize its energy demand, the project would comply with CCR Title 24 and California Green Building Code Standards, as described above in response VI.a. Because the project would integrate design features to comply with the applicable regulations pertaining to energy efficiency, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, including the California Energy Commission's Integrated Energy Policy Report. Impacts would be less than significant.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- a.i. **No Impact.** The project site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No known active faults are mapped within the project site. The nearest active fault is the San Diego Section of the Newport-Inglewood-Rose Canyon fault zone, located approximately 15.8 miles to the southwest. The nearest active strand of the Elsinore fault zone lies approximately 25 miles to the northeast of the project site. Based on the geotechnical analysis conducted for the project (NOVA 2020), due to the lack of known active faults on the site, the potential for surface rupture at the site is considered to be very low. Shallow ground rupture due to shaking from distant seismic events is not considered a significant hazard. As such, no impact would occur.
- a.ii. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Like most of Southern California, the project site is located within a seismically active area, and there is potential for strong ground motion due to seismic activity at the project site during the design life of the proposed structures. Based on the site-specific geotechnical evaluation (NOVA 2020), the project site may be subjected to a Magnitude 7 seismic event. The project would be designed to comply with local and state standards for seismic and geologic conditions. Compliance with these standards, including construction consistent with the California Building Code would ensure impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.
- a.iii. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Potential ground movement associated with earthquakes include liquefaction, dry sand settlement, and lateral spreading. Liquefaction refers to the loss of soil strength during a seismic event and is often observed in areas that include geologically younger soils, shallow water table, and cohesionless soils of loose consistency. Based on an analysis of soil borings from the project site, the dense weathered tonalite at the project site would be resistant to liquefaction. Due to the limited potential for liquefaction, the potential for lateral spreading is identified as very low at the project site. Additionally, the worst-case settlement is estimated at 0.5 inch of settlement at the ground surface, with a more typical settlement estimate at about 0.2 inch at the ground surface. As identified in the project geotechnical report (NOVA 2020), the analysis of liquefaction, settlement, and lateral spreading at the project site indicates these hazards are not a constraint to the development of the project site with single-family residences. Impacts would be less than significant.
- a.iv. **No Impact.** The project site and immediately surrounding area consists of level ground. As such, the potential for landslide hazards at the project site are considered negligible (NOVA 2020). No impact associated with landslides would occur.
- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project would be required to comply with all erosion control regulations, including implementation of standard erosion control measures in accordance with the City Municipal Code. As such, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Refer to responses VII.a.iii and VII.a.iv. Liquefaction, settlement, lateral spreading, and landslides are not identified as significant hazards for the project site. Additionally, the project would not result in instability associated with embankments, based on the existing flat nature of the site and adjacent areas (NOVA 2020). Additionally, soils at the project site are not

potentially hydro-collapsible (NOVA 2020). Impacts associated with geologic units or soils that are unstable would be less than significant.

- d. **No Impact.** The cohesionless (“sandy”) alluvial soils and sandy weathered granitic rock at the project site are not expansive (NOVA 2020). As such, no impact associated with expansive soils would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** The project does not propose the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. As such, no impact associated with soils adequate for supporting alternative wastewater systems would occur.
- f. **No Impact.** Geologic units encountered on site consist of Quaternary-aged young alluvial flood-plain deposits from tributaries of Rattlesnake Creek and Cretaceous-aged weathered tonalite (NOVA 2020). No fossils are known from Quaternary alluvial deposits and their relative youthfulness would suggest that none would probably be found (Deméré and Walsh 1993). These alluvial deposits are assigned a low paleontological sensitivity. Granitic-type rocks of the southern California batholith, such as tonalite, are not known to have yielded fossils, owing to the fact that plutonic rocks are formed by crystallization of magmas several miles below ground surface (Deméré and Walsh 1993). These rocks are classified as zero sensitivity for paleontological resources. Based on the designated sensitivity of geologic units at the site, which range from zero sensitivity to low sensitivity, the project is not expected to result in impacts to paleontological resources. No impact would occur.

VIII. 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 GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. In that document, CAPCOA proposed a quantitative threshold of 900 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) emissions as a threshold below which no significant impacts on the environment would be anticipated. According to the CAPCOA white paper, 900 MT CO₂e represents the emission that would be generated by 50 single-family residences annually. Since the project is a residential development of 20 residences, and a net of 19 new residences after the demolition of the existing residential structure, project GHG impacts would be less than significant.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See response VIII.a above. Emissions associated with the project would be reduced to a level that is consistent with the goals of AB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions through the implementation of mobile source regulations, CCR Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, and renewable portfolio standards adopted by the State of California. As such, GHG impacts associated with the project would be less than significant.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- a. **No Impact.** The project would result in the construction of 20 single-family residences. No transport, storage, or use of hazard materials beyond that which typically occurs with a single-family home would occur. No impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** See response IX.a above. No impact would occur.
- c. **No Impact.** See response IX.a above. No impact would occur.
- d. **No Impact.** Based on a review of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database, neither the project site nor directly adjacent properties are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 (DTSC 2022). Items observed on the project site that could be potential sources of contamination include: two 5-gallon containers of hydraulic oil; minor amounts of pesticides, paints, cleaning chemicals, and other chemicals; a well and associated equipment; small containers of unidentified substances; and waste materials (Ninyo & Moore 2020). A review of historical resources, a search of the environmental databases, and records request from various agencies did not yield evidence of known contamination (Ninyo & Moore 2020). The former use of the project site for agricultural uses was identified as a recognized environmental condition, based on the potential for organochlorine pesticide use and arsenic to be present in shallow soil at elevated levels; however, soil sampling and testing revealed that organochlorine pesticides and arsenic were not present at the project site above their respective laboratory reporting limits or human health/background screening levels (Ninyo & Moore 2021). Therefore, no impact would occur.
- e. **No Impact.** The airports closest to the project site are Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, located approximately 8 miles southwest of the site, and Ramona Airport, located approximately 7.5 miles northeast of the project site. The project site is not located within the Air Installations Compatible Use Zones for Marine Corps Air Station Miramar (Marine Corps Air Station Miramar 2020) or within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan area for the Ramona Airport (San Diego County Airport Land Use Commission 2011). Thus, the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise associated with airports. No impact would occur.
- f. **No Impact.** The project would not impact 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.
- g. **No Impact.** According to the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) map for Poway (CAL FIRE 2009), while the project is adjacent to land within the VHFHSZ, the project site is not located within the VHFHSZ. As such, no impact associated with the significant risk or loss, injury, or death involving a wildfire would occur.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project would comply with all storm water quality regulations or waste discharge requirements for 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 would require a grading permit and

a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would be ensured as part of the project improvements plan review and building permit process. The project would incorporate infiltration trenches and trees wells for storm water treatment and hydromodification management plan controls (SB&O 2021a) and would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. **No Impact.** The project does not propose construction activities that would directly affect groundwater, contribute to the depletion of groundwater supplies, or interfere with groundwater recharge. Infiltration trenches and tree wells would capture runoff produced on site and assist in the replenishment of groundwater resources. No impact would occur.
- c.i.–iv. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project has been designed such that there is no increase in the amount of storm water runoff beyond that which currently exists at the site. The project would incorporate infiltration trenches and trees wells for storm water treatment and hydromodification management plan controls. The storm water management facilities are required to be maintained throughout the life of the project as outlined in Poway Municipal Code section 16.104. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **No Impact.** The project site is designated as Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Zone X, which is an area of minimal flood hazard (FEMA 2012). The project site is located approximately 13 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean, and as such, would not be subject to inundation from a tsunami. The project site is over 2.25 miles southwest of Lake Poway and, therefore, not located near a body of water that could generate a seiche (NOVA 2020). The project is not located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone, and no impact associated with the risk of pollutant release due to project inundation would occur.
- e. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See responses X.a and X.b above. Impacts would be less than significant.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- a. **No Impact.** The project site is located within a developed area, with residential uses adjacent to the east and southwest. A church is located adjacent to the west of the project site, and school district buildings are located to the north, across Twin Peaks Road. The construction of single-family residences on the site would be consistent with existing zoning and the existing surrounding uses. The project would occur on an infill location and not result in physically division of an established community. No impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** The project site is zoned for and designated by the Poway General Plan for residential uses. The proposed project would be consistent with the existing General Plan and zoning designations for the site, with the exception of the minimum lot size and side yard setback reductions requested as concessions to accommodate an affordable housing unit. The project has been designed to be consistent with architectural design standards identified in the Old Poway Specific Plan. As such, the project would not result significant environmental effects due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation. No impact would occur.

XII. 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 3 miles south of the site. No impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** See response XII.a above. No impact would occur.

XIII. NOISE

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Noise from the project would be that typical of residential uses in the neighborhood and would not result in impacts to adjacent uses. During project construction, temporary or periodic increase in noise levels would occur. Per City standards, the noise generating construction activities are limited to certain times of the day and days of the week. Compliance with City requirements related to construction activities would ensure that temporary increases in noise levels associated with construction would remain less than significant.

In regard to permanent increases in noise levels, the primary source of noise in the project vicinity is vehicular traffic on Twin Peaks Road. Existing ADT occurring on area roadways include 21,475 ADT on Twin Peaks Road between Midland Road and Budwin Lane, and 4,753 ADT on Midland Road between Twin Peaks Road and Holly Oak Way (Intersection Metrics 2021a). As discussed in more detail in Section XVII, the project would generate 200 ADT. A 3 dB change in noise levels is the minimum level required for a perceptible change in noise levels for the general population. In order to increase ambient road noise by 3 dB, a project would have to double the amount of traffic on a road. The project would introduce a small increase in traffic trips to area roadways but would not result in doubling of traffic on these roadways. As such, the project would not result in a discernable permanent increase in traffic noise and impacts associated with the project's contribution to traffic noise increases would be less than significant.

Based on sound level measurements taken as part of the project noise analysis (dBF Associates 2021), sound levels at the northern project property line were measured at approximately 68 A-weighted decibels equivalent continuous sound pressure (dBA Leq). Existing worst-case exterior noise levels at the proposed residential parcels would range from below 60 dBA community noise equivalent level (CNEL) at lots 1 and 20 (at the southern edge of the project site) to approximately 72 dBA CNEL at the northern edge of the project site, on proposed lots 10 and 11. The project includes the construction of a continuous 6-foot-high CMU wall along the northern property boundary. This wall would provide an approximately 9 dBA noise reduction from Twin Peaks Road traffic noise. With the wall, future exterior noise levels at all project outdoor use areas would be below 65 dBA CNEL. As such, permanent noise impacts to future residents of the project would be less than significant.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Project grading and construction activities may result in temporary generation of groundborne vibration associated with the operation of construction equipment. The generation of groundborne vibration associated with the operation of construction equipment would be temporary, during the construction period and would occur in different locations on the site.

Adjacent residential uses would be subject to temporary impacts associated with groundborne vibration. However, the project would be required to adhere to City requirements that limit construction activities to certain times of the day and days of the week. Compliance with the City requirements related to construction activities would ensure that groundborne vibration impacts are less than significant.

- c. **No Impact.** The airports closest to the project site are Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, located approximately 8 miles southwest of the site, and Ramona Airport, located approximately 7.5 miles northeast of the project site. The project site is not located within the noise contours for Marine Corps Air Station Miramar (Marine Corps Air Station Miramar 2020) or the Ramona Airport (San Diego County Airport Land Use Commission 2011). Thus, the project would not result in the exposure of people working or residing in the area to excessive aircraft noise levels. No impact would occur.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- a. **No Impact.** The project is located on an existing lot zoned for development of single-family residential uses. The project would not induce growth directly as it would be located within a developed portion of the city, serviced by existing infrastructure within the project vicinity. The project would not induce substantial population growth in the area as it would be situated on an infill location surrounded by existing development. No impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** One existing residence would be removed from the project site. The project would not result in displacement of a substantial number of people or housing units and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a. Fire Protection – **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project site is served by the City of Poway Fire Department. Stations 1 and 3 are both located approximately 1.6 miles from the project site. The incremental increase in potential for an unexpected emergency call to this project can be accounted for as the site is already included in 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

Police Protection – **Less-than-Significant 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 project 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 the project and no physical impacts resulting from the construction of new facilities would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

Schools – **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project would result in the construction of 20 new homes. Children from the homes would be accommodated in existing schools located in close proximity to the project site. The RS-4 zoning designation for the site allows for 4 dwelling units per acre, or 15 units for the 3.91-

net-acre site. The increase in 5 units is expected to have a minimal impact on the Poway School District. Impacts would be less than significant.

Parks – Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would not result in the need for new or physically altered park facilities. The RS-4 zoning designation for the site allows for 4 dwelling units per acre, or 15 units for the 3.91-net-acre site. The increase in 5 units is expected to have a minimal impact on the City’s park facilities. Project residents would be able to utilize existing parks in the project area (Aubrey Park, Silverset Park, Old Poway Park, and Railroad, among others). The addition of project residents would result in a less-than-significant impact to parks.

Other Public Facilities – No Impact. The project would not result in the need for new or physically altered public facilities. No impact would occur.

XVI. RECREATION

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project would result in the construction of 20 new single-family residences. The residents associated with these new homes would utilize existing recreational amenities already existing in the city and project vicinity. The additional demand created by residents of 20 single-family homes would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks in such a manner that would result in substantial physical deterioration of these facilities. As such, impacts to existing recreational facilities would be less than significant.
- b. **No Impact.** The project does not include the construction of recreational facilities, nor would it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** A Traffic Operations Assessment (Intersecting Metrics 2021a) was prepared for the project. The estimated ADT associated with the 20 new homes is 200 daily trips, with 16 trips occurring in the a.m. peak hour and 20 trips occurring within the p.m. peak hour. The addition of project traffic to local roads would not result in significant impacts to roadway segments in the project area, as these roadways are operating well below design capacity. The City’s Transportation Element contains a policy prohibiting development that would result in levels of service exceeding D during the two highest peak hours at an intersection unless no feasible alternatives exist. Intersections within the project traffic study area (i.e., Midland Road/Twin Peaks Road and Budwin Lane/Twin Peaks Road) are anticipated to operate as acceptable levels of service (D or better under the “no project” and “with project” scenarios). The project would include the extension of Holly Oak Way to provide local access to the site. This road extension would be designed consistent with City requirements, and would include pedestrian sidewalks, street trees, and decorative Old Poway street lights consistent with the existing street lights on Holly Oak Way. The addition of 20 single-family residences, as proposed by the project, would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not be in conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). The City has not adopted guidelines for conducting either screening level or full vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis in accordance with Senate Bill 743. Therefore, the San Diego Region Guidelines prepared by the Institute for Traffic Engineers (ITE) were

utilized to determine if the project has the potential for VMT impacts (ITE 2019). Based on the ITE guidelines, a project that is consistent with the General Plan designation and generates less than 1,000 ADT would not require a VMT analysis. As the project is consistent with the General Plan designation for the site, and would generate 200 ADT, a VMT analysis is not required. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. **No Impact.** The project would include the extension of Holly Oak Way onto the project site to provide site access. Access from Twin Peaks Road was considered, but access at that location would not be feasible due to sight distance limitations and would not meet minimum corner or stopping sight distance requirements due to the horizontal curves in the roadway to the west of the project site (Intersecting Metrics 2021b). The approved final map for the adjacent Diroma Estates identifies a future easement that accommodates the extension of Holly Oak Way, as proposed for the project. The Holly Oak Way extension streetscape would be designed and constructed consistent with City requirements and would include new pedestrian sidewalks, street trees, and decorative Old Poway street lights consistent with the existing street lights on Holly Oak Way. Taking access to the proposed subdivision from Holly Oak Way would ensure the project would not result in impacts associated with increased hazards due to a geometric design feature by accessing the site from subdivision from Twin Peaks Road. No impact would occur.
- d. **No Impact.** The extension of Holly Oak Way would be constructed consistent with City and Fire Department requirements, including those associated with emergency access. The cul-de-sac would be constructed in such a manner as to provide the required turning radius for emergency vehicles. The construction of the project, consistent with City and Fire Department requirements related to emergency access would ensure that no impact would occur.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a.i. **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** See response V.b. The project site is located within the boundary of the prehistoric Village of Paguai (CA-SDI-4606), which is presumed eligible for CRHR. The project would be required to implement mitigation measures **CUL-1** through **CUL-5** to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource to a less-than-significant level.
- a.ii. **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** See responses V.b and V.c. The project would be required to implement mitigation measures **CUL-1** through **CUL-5** to reduce potentially significant impacts to on-site cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1(b), City staff contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a consultation list of tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project. The NAHC provided a consultation list of 16 tribes. On April 19, 2022, 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. The Barona Band of Mission Indians and La Posta Band of Mission Indians requested a Native American Monitor/Consultant be present during earth moving activities. The project would mitigate for potential impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources through the implementation of mitigation measures **CUL-1** through **CUL-5**. Therefore, less-than-significant impacts related to Tribal Cultural Resources would occur.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project site is within an area served by the public water and wastewater systems. The project site is designated for residential uses and is consistent with the General Plan. Public utility infrastructure would be extended onto the site and constructed to serve the proposed 20 single-family residences. Water, wastewater, storm water, electric power, natural gas, and electrical infrastructure would be connected to existing infrastructure in the project area. The provision of public utilities to the project site would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded infrastructure. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The resulting increase in water use associated with the development of 20 single-family residences would be considered insignificant. The project would be served by the City of Poway, which has sufficient water supply available to serve anticipated demands in the City (City of Poway 2021). As such, impacts associated with water supply would be less than significant.
- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed 20 single-family residences would result in an insignificant increase in wastewater generation. The project would be served by a new connection to the City's wastewater system. The City of San Diego's North City Water Reclamation Facility has adequate capacity to treat the incremental wastewater generated by the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Construction of the project would result in the generation of solid waste associated with construction activities, including waste associated with demolition of the existing residence. The project would be required to dispose of such materials according to a Construction Waste Management Plan. The 20 new single-family residences would result in the incremental generation of solid waste, which would be handled by the City's contracted waste hauler, similar to other residential uses nearby. The solid waste generated by the project is not anticipated to significantly impact the life expectancy of the landfill that serves the city. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. **No Impact.** The project would be required to comply with and meet all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste collection and disposal. The contracted waste hauler would separate waste so that recyclable waste is separated from landfill trash in accordance with the City's waste reduction and recycling program. No impact would occur.

XX. WILDFIRE

- a. **No Impact.** See response IX.f. The project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and no impact would occur.
- b. **No Impact.** See response IX.g. The project site is not located within the VHFHSZ. As such, no impact associated with the exposure of pollutant concentrations for a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire on project occupants would occur.
- c. **No Impact.** The project would include the extension of the Holly Oak Way cul-de-sac and would include the extension of utilities onto the project site. However, this roadway extension and the installation of utilities would not exacerbate fire risks. No impact would occur.

- d. **No Impact.** The project site is relatively flat, and the proposed residences would be placed on building pads that would be graded per an approved grading plan that includes verification of soil compaction and installation of on-site storm water treatment facilities based on site- and project-specific conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. No impact would occur.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** See responses IV and V. The project would have potentially significant impacts to migratory and nesting birds and to archaeological resources. Mitigation measures **BIO-1** and **CUL-1** through **CUL-5** would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- 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, VIII, IX, and XIII above. The project would not have any environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly, impacts would be less than significant.

E. REFERENCES

Alden Environmental, Inc.

- 2021 *Existing Biological Resources on the McKee Orchard Parcel*. July 15.

ASM Affiliates

- 2021a *Cultural Resources Technical Report for McKee Orchard Affordable Housing Project, City of Poway, San Diego County, California*. August 20.
- 2021b *Draft Historical Resource Evaluation Report for 13667 Twin Peaks Road, Poway, San Diego County, California*. October.

California Department of Conservation

- 2022 California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed April 1, 2022.
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE)

- 2009 Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA As Recommended by CAL FIRE.
<https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/5966/poway.pdf>.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

- 2022 EnviroStor Mapping database. Accessed April 4, 2022.
<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search>.

California Department of Transportation

- 2022 California State Scenic Highway System Map. Accessed April 1, 2022.
<https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>.

City of Poway

- 2021 *City of Poway Final Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- 1996 *Poway Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan*.
- 1988 *Old Poway Specific Plan (SP 88-01)*.

dBf Associates

- 2021 *Noise Analysis, McKee Orchard*. August 17.

Deméré, Thomas and Walsh, Steven

- 1993 *Paleontological Resources, County of San Diego, California*.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

- 2012 Flood Insurance Rate Map No. 06073C1117G. May 16.

Intersecting Metrics

- 2021a *McKee Orchard Traffic Operations Assessment*. June 7.
- 2021b *McKee Orchard – Twin Peaks Road Driveway – Sight Distance Study*. May 5.

Environmental Initial Study and Checklist

Institute for Traffic Engineers (ITE)

2019 *Guidelines for Transportation Impact Studies in the San Diego Region.* May.

Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California

2020 *Air Installations Compatible Use Zones Study 2020 Update.* June.

Ninyo & Moore

2021 *Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, McKee Orchards Property, 13667 Twin Peaks Road, Poway, California.* February 16.

2020 *Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, McKee Orchards Property, 13667 Twin Peaks Road, Poway, California.* November 11.

NOVA

2020 *Geotechnical Investigation, McKee Orchards Residential Development, 13667 Twin Peaks Road, Poway, California.* November 13.

San Diego County Airport Land Use Commission

2011 *Ramona Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.* December.

SB&O, Inc.

2021a *Priority Development Project – Stormwater Quality Management Plan, McKee Orchard, TTM 21-003/DR 21-002.* October 21.

2021b *Preliminary Drainage Report for McKee Orchard.* May 9.