EXHIBIT A
FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

Public Resources Code section 21002 states that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" Section 21002 further states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects."

Pursuant to section 21081 of the Public Resources Code, a public agency may only approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been completed that identifies any significant environmental effects if the agency makes one or more of the following written finding(s) for each of those significant effects accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

As indicated above, section 21002 requires an agency to "avoid or substantially lessen" significant adverse environmental impacts. Thus, mitigation measures that "substantially lessen" significant environmental impacts, even if not completely avoided, satisfy section 21002's mandate. (*Laurel Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521 ["CEQA does not mandate the choice of the environmentally best feasible project if through the imposition of feasible mitigation measures alone the appropriate public agency has reduced environmental damage from a project to an acceptable level"]; *Las Virgenes Homeowners Fed., Inc. v. County of Los Angeles* (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 300, 309 ["[t]here is no requirement that adverse impacts of a project be avoided completely or reduced to a level of insignificance . . . if such would render the project unfeasible"].)

While CEQA requires that lead agencies adopt feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts, an agency need not adopt infeasible mitigation measures or alternatives. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002.1(c) [if "economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate one or

more significant effects on the environment of a project, the project may nonetheless be carried out or approved at the discretion of a public agency"]; see also State CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(a) [an "EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible"].) CEQA defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1.) The State CEQA Guidelines add "legal" considerations as another indicia of feasibility. (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15364.) Project objectives also inform the determination of "feasibility." (*Jones v. U.C. Regents* (2010) 183 Cal. App. 4th 818, 828-829.) "'[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) "Broader considerations of policy thus come into play when the decision making body is considering actual feasibility[.]" (*Cal. Native Plant Soc'y v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1000 ("*Native Plant*"); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081(a)(3) ["economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations" may justify rejecting mitigation and alternatives as infeasible] (emphasis added).)

Environmental impacts that are less than significant do not require the imposition of mitigation measures. (*Leonoff v. Monterey County Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337, 1347.)

The California Supreme Court has stated, "[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 576.) In addition, perfection in a project or a project's environmental alternatives is not required; rather, the requirement is that sufficient information be produced "to permit a reasonable choice of alternatives so far as environmental aspects are concerned." Outside agencies (including courts) are not to "impose unreasonable extremes or to interject [themselves] within the area of discretion as to the choice of the action to be taken." (*Residents Ad Hoc Stadium Com. v. Board of Trustees* (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 274, 287.)

SECTION II: FINDINGS REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS NOT REQUIRING MITIGATION

The City Council hereby finds that the following potential environmental impacts of the Project are less than significant and therefore do not require the imposition of Mitigation Measures.

A. AESTHETICS

1. Scenic Vistas

Threshold: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.1.5.1.)

Explanation: The Santee General Plan Community Enhancement Element describes numerous topographic features in the City and the surrounding vicinity as providing distinctive views and vistas from developed portions of the City. Although the Santee General Plan does not designate specific scenic vistas in the City, the major ridgeline and hillside systems provided by undeveloped areas of the northern portion of the City, including the project site, present a large portion of the views and vistas in the City. Jurisdictions outside of the City surrounding the project site, such as the County's Lakeside Community Plan, do not designate scenic vistas in the viewshed of the project site.

To show the changes in key views and describe the visibility of the proposed project from surrounding areas and potential scenic vistas, visual simulations were prepared using photographs of the project site and computer-generated, three-dimensional project modeling (Visual Impact Group 2020).

Sixteen key vantage points were analyzed and the proposed project's design would retain most of the major ridgelines and landform features on the project site visible from public viewpoints, and the surrounding topography would be retained. This would allow for the continued screening of views into much of the proposed project from throughout the City and adjacent public view areas. Additionally, the proposed project would comply with the design recommendations set forth by the City through the development review process, which ensures development projects adhere to the City's design principles. Further, there are no designated scenic vistas on or around the project site. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not obstruct or detract from a designated scenic vista. Impacts would be less than significant.

2. Scenic Resources

Threshold: Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.1.5.2.)

Explanation: SR-52 is a state designated scenic highway which runs in an east–west direction approximately 1.8 mile south of the southern project

site boundary. The approximately 3.5-mile segment from Santo Road east to Mast Boulevard within the City of San Diego was officially designated as a state scenic highway in February 2016 (Caltrans 2017). Due to its distance and intervening topography, future project development would not be seen from this location. To demonstrate this, three locations were studied along this designated segment as part of the visual simulation effort for the proposed project. As part of that effort, all three locations were determined to have no view of the project site. Consequently, the proposed project would not alter views from within the rights-of-way of a designated or eligible state scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant impact associated with views from scenic highways.

3. Visual Character

Threshold: In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public view of the site and its surroundings?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.1.5.3.)

Explanation: Visual Character. Sixteen key vantage points (KVPs) were analyzed depicting various existing and proposed condition views surrounding the project site and the off-site improvement areas. The proposed project would alter the existing aesthetic characteristics of the project site from a variety of vantage points within the City and adjacent areas. As demonstrated by the representative KVPs, changes in the project site's aesthetic appearance would be visible from public vantage points located adjacent to the project site on the south, west, and east; recreational areas such as Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve and Stowe Trail; and major roadways such as SR-125, Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue.

As illustrated with the KVPs, some existing residences and user groups would be affected by the proposed landform alteration and site development. The KVP that displays the largest potential change in visual character is KVP-15, which shows a view looking south onto the project site from the Stowe Trail. This KVP shows the proposed Active Adult neighborhood and, due to close proximity to the existing trail, reveals considerable views of the development. However, the proposed landscaping and revegetated slopes would screen much of this development and allow it to blend in with the surrounding existing environment. In addition, the proposed project proposes to grade this area in accordance with Hillside Development Guidelines (Policy 1.3 of the Conservation Element of the Santee General Plan [City of Santee 2003]), which require contour grading and clustering

of development to minimize the grading footprint. The resulting revegetated slopes would blend in with the native landscape and further act as wildfire buffers to the community.

Due to uneven topography and the far distances from the proposed village development area to the nearest off-site receptors, it is difficult to distinguish the proposed development along most ridgelines. In addition, the proposed project's design would retain most of the major ridgelines and landform features on the project site's periphery, which would allow for the continued screening of views into much of the proposed project from throughout the City and adjacent areas. The changes in views due to the extension of Fanita Parkway, and the off-site improvements to Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue have been anticipated as part of the Santee General Plan Circulation Element roadway improvements. These improvements would be enhanced through the use of natural vegetation, landscaping, and revegetated manufactured slopes. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on the visual character or quality of the area.

Landform Alteration. Sensitive landforms are natural landforms that are unique or contribute to the character of a site. The Santee General Plan Conservation Element (City of Santee 2003) identifies two main topographic landforms that exist in the City, one being the Peninsular Range, which traverses much of the project site. Policies within the Conservation Element call for significant natural landforms to be maintained during development whenever possible. To protect and wisely manage hillsides and topographic resources, the City lays out specific hillside development guidelines.

Construction of the proposed project would involve extensive excavation and grading into the native terrain. Earthwork would involve approximately 27 million cubic yards of cut and fill materials, which would be balanced on site (Figure 3-16, Conceptual Cut and Fill Plan, in Chapter 3, Project Description). Construction would include cuts up to 165 feet and fills up to 142 feet. The site would be graded into development pads using a maximum 2:1 slope ratio for fill slopes and a maximum 1.5:1 for cut slopes, which is a requirement of the Santee Municipal Code, Section 11.40.320, and to closely mimic the interval of the natural contours. The Special Use area has been previously graded and no significant grading or introduction of water into the soil is proposed.

While the proposed project would generally preserve the existing contours of the landforms where feasible for development, the proposed project includes considerable grading into steeply sloped areas. Some of the largest differences from the existing grade would

occur with the development of a Neighborhood Park and multi-family residences in the central area of Orchard Village and Low Density Residential in southern and central areas of Vineyard Village. The prominent hilltop in Fanita Commons would be preserved within the planned Community Park. These large cut and fill slopes, as identified on the Vesting Tentative Map, that are visible from the public rights-of-way would utilize landform grading techniques to recreate and mimic the flow of natural contours and drainages within the natural surroundings. Where development is proposed on hillsides, grading would be efficient to minimize the grading footprint. Special contour grading techniques would be utilized at edges and transitions in landform. In addition, the proposed extensions of Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street into the village development area would be designed to preserve natural hillsides and rock outcroppings and follow the existing slopes and landforms to the extent possible.

Manufactured slopes along the edges of the development footprint, primarily visible along the northern village development area of Vineyard Village and at the proposed extensions of Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue, would be revegetated with natural vegetation to restore the native habitat and blend with the existing environment, further limiting the visibility of the landform alteration of these areas. These slopes, some of which are highly visible from public rights-of-way, are identified in the Fanita Ranch Development Plan as “public interest” slopes. During construction, these slopes would be temporarily devoid of vegetation; however, they would be revegetated and landscaped in compliance with the Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 12.26, Landscape and Irrigation Regulations, and the Guidelines for Implementation of the City of Santee Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (2017). Therefore, by complying with the policies in the Santee General Plan and the requirements of the Santee Municipal Code, as well as adhering to the guidelines set forth in the Fanita Ranch Development Plan, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact associated with landform alteration.

4. Lighting and Glare

Threshold: Would the proposed project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.1.5.4.)

Explanation: Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of new structures that would have the potential to increase sources of light or glare. The proposed new development

would take place in currently undeveloped areas, and potential new sources of light would include exterior building illumination, sports field lighting, Special Use area security lighting, residential lighting, parking lots, new landscaped areas, and new roadway lighting. New sources of glare could result from reflective building surfaces or the headlights of vehicular traffic.

During the day, lighting has limited potential to impact views. Potential impacts from glare would primarily occur from the sun reflecting off reflective building surfaces. Daytime views that are subject to a substantial amount of new glare may be significantly impacted. However, the proposed project would not include the implementation of large, uninterrupted expanses of glass or any other highly reflective material. The Special Use area would include space for approximately 18.4 acres of photovoltaic solar panels atop an RV/boat storage area, which could result in potential glare impacts to surrounding residents. However, photovoltaic solar panels are designed to absorb light, not reflect it, and would be coated with anti-reflective materials to maximize light absorption. In addition, solar panels face upward resulting in a small likelihood of directly affecting nearby residents on the ground. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial glare that would adversely affect daytime views in the area.

Sensitive views of the night sky could be impacted from new light and glare in a previously undeveloped area. The proposed project would include 2,949 residences with a school, or 3,008 residences without a school, commercial uses, parks, open space, agriculture uses, and a network of streets with off-site roadway improvements. In addition, yellow flashing beacons with advisory speed signs would be situated along the proposed extension of Magnolia Avenue to alert drivers of steep roadway grades and to reduce speed. These lighted beacons would be directed away from existing residences and comply with the standards in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices Chapter 4L (Caltrans 2014). The increase in light and glare from the implementation of the proposed project would have a potentially significant impact to views of the night sky. The proposed project would be replacing a natural backdrop with a large residential development with exterior building illumination, sports field lighting, residential lighting, parking lots, new landscaped areas, and new roadway lighting.

To minimize the impacts of lighting and glare as a result of new development, the proposed project has prepared a Conceptual Lighting Plan as part of the Fanita Ranch Development Plan. The Conceptual Lighting Plan provides general lighting design guidance for streets, pathways, common open space, recreation areas,

buildings, special accent lighting, and sign illumination. One of the primary goals of the Conceptual Lighting Plan is to reduce or eliminate light pollution by utilizing low glare and full cutoff light fixtures, lower wattage luminaires, and lighting controls to create a "Dark Sky" friendly community. This would be achieved by designing lighting according to use; prohibiting certain types of light sources; using appropriate shielding and direction of lighting sources; and enforcing lighting curfews for certain uses. Outdoor lighting would be designed and placed to efficiently direct light downward, particularly lighting for streets and parking areas. All outdoor lighting would be shielded to confine light within the site and prevent glare onto adjacent properties, the Habitat Preserve, riparian areas, and streets.

The Conceptual Lighting Plan for the proposed project states specific requirements for lighting within or adjacent to the Habitat Preserve and other environmentally sensitive areas. These requirements would prohibit lighting in or adjacent to conserved habitat, except where essential for roadway use, facility use, safety, or security purposes; use of low-pressure sodium illumination sources or other similar technology; would not use low-voltage outdoor or trail lighting, spotlights or bug lights; and would shield light sources adjacent to conserved habitat so that the lighting is focused downward. Proposed Streets "V" and "W" would traverse the Habitat Preserve to connect Fanita Commons and Orchard Village with Vineyard Village. These streets would be designed to include wildlife crossings and use retroreflective pavement markers and touch-activated lighted bollards, instead of conventional lighting, to allow for the safe crossing of automobiles and wildlife while minimizing excessive light pollution on adjacent uses.

In addition, the anticipated development of the proposed project would be required to comply with the lighting guidelines of the Santee General Plan and the City Zoning Ordinance (Title 13 of the Santee Municipal Code) to assure that the proposed project would not include nuisance lighting. Therefore, by complying with the City Zoning Ordinance, guidelines in the Santee General Plan, and adhering to the requirements set forth in the Conceptual Lighting Plan designed for the proposed project, the proposed project's potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area would be less than significant.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

1. Farmland Conversion

Threshold: Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide significance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Finding: No impact. (EIR, § 5.1.1.)

Explanation: Pursuant to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the project site is designated as Grazing Land. Grazing Land is defined as "land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock" (DOC 2020). California Public Resources Code, Section 21060.1, defines agricultural land as "prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or unique farmland." Soils on the project site have been mapped by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (2020) and consist predominantly of portions of three soil series: Redding, Diablo, and Linne. The Redding and Diablo soils are the most common on site. The Linne soil is generally limited to smaller areas throughout the project site. Redding soil is composed of gravelly loamy soils that have a gravelly clay subsoil and a hardpan, while Diablo and Linne soils consist chiefly of deep clay loams derived from soft, calcareous sandstones and shale. The above soils do not meet the criteria for prime farmland or soils of statewide importance outlined in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's land inventory and monitoring program for San Diego area (2020). The project site does not support prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact classified farmland, either directly or indirectly, or result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. As such, no impact would occur to prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance.

2. Agricultural Zoning

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Finding: No impact. (EIR, § 5.1.1.)

Explanation: As shown on the City's Zoning District Map (2017), no lands zoned for agricultural use are on the project site. The project site is zoned as Planned Development (PD). Further, the project site is not in the vicinity of any lands zoned for agricultural use. No lands affected by the proposed project are currently under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on a Williamson Act contract property or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use.

3. Forest Land

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

Threshold: Would the Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Threshold: Would the Project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Finding: No impact. (EIR, § 5.1.1.)

Explanation: The project site does not support prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance and would not involve other changes in the existing environment, which would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. In addition, the City has no designated forest land or timberland within its boundaries. The project site is not zoned for timberland production and is not in proximity to any lands zoned as Forest Land. The land area affected by the proposed project does not support forest land or timberland resources or operations. Therefore, no impact would occur from project implementation with regard to conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland, and the proposed project would not result in the potential loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

C. AIR QUALITY

1. Other Adverse Emissions

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

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.2.5.4.)

Explanation: Heavy-duty equipment on the project site during construction would emit odors, primarily from equipment exhaust. However, the construction activity would cease to occur after individual construction is completed in a given area. Generally, construction would be separate from existing receptors by hundreds of feet due to the distance of the nearest off-site residences to the village development areas. Additionally, emissions of SO_x, the pollutant

most associated with odors, would be minimal. Therefore, impacts during construction would be less than significant.

Following construction, operation of the proposed agricultural areas (specifically the Farm) could release localized odors. However, localized odors would generally be confined to the Agriculture Overlay zone on the project site and would dissipate quickly beyond the limits of the Farm based on typical agricultural operations. An extensive animal husbandry operation is not proposed and would not be accommodated within the Farm; therefore, the potential to generate odors would be low. The remaining proposed commercial and residential uses are not typical sources of nuisance odors.

Although not an impact under CEQA, as an impact of the environment on the proposed project, it is noted that operation of the proposed project would require implementation of Conditional Use Permit measures at the Padre Dam Municipal Water District (PDMWD) Ray Stoyer Water Recycling Facility (WRF) located on Fanita Parkway west of the project site. The existing Conditional Use Permit for the PDMWD Ray Stoyer WRF contains measures that require implementation once the proposed project is constructed. These measures include the use of an odor scrubber to limit hydrogen sulfide, the replacement of the existing primary clarifier system with a chemical scrubbing system, the covering of all zones of the biological nutrient removal basins, the installation of additional chemical scrubbers, and the installation of an additional SO_2 neutralization system at the dechlorination building (Helix 2015).

Therefore, objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people would not occur because of the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Local Policies and Ordinances

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.3.5.5.)

Explanation: The City of Santee's Urban Forestry Ordinance contains tree-related policies, regulations, and generally accepted standards for planting, trimming, and removing trees on public property and public rights-of-way (Santee Municipal Code, Section 8.06 [City of Santee 2020]). The ordinance gives the City control of all trees, shrubs, and other

plantings in any street, park, public right-of-way, landscape maintenance district or easement, or other City-owned property. City review of development plans for the City-owned and maintained property would ensure that the proposed landscaping and maintenance requirements conform to the Urban Forestry Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with the Urban Forestry Ordinance, and impacts would be less than significant.

In the Conservation Element of the Santee General Plan, biological resources are discussed and specific objectives and policies are presented. The proposed project does not conflict with any objectives or policies as presented in the Conservation Element of the Santee General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

2. Habitat Conservation Plans

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.3.5.6.)

Explanation: The City is actively preparing its Draft MSCP Subarea Plan. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan would implement the MSCP Subregional Plan and is intended to result in issuance to the City of federal and state authorizations (permits) for the take of certain listed threatened or endangered species. These authorizations would be granted to the City by USFWS and CDFW pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act and Section 2835 of the California Natural Community Conservation Planning Act, respectively. The City, in turn, may then extend the take authorizations to public and private projects within its jurisdiction, as long as those biological resources are adequately conserved by the Santee MSCP Subarea Plan and the projects are consistent with and covered by the provisions of the Santee MSCP Subarea Plan.

The proposed project design is consistent with the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan through specific adherence to conditions of coverage and mitigation/conveyance requirements for hardline Covered Projects as defined in the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan (City of Santee 2018). The proposed project would not compromise continued implementation of the MSCP in the County or other cities because their Subarea Plans do not rely on the City of Santee for coverage of any species. Furthermore, the current project footprint has been reduced from the previous development hardline footprint identified in the approved 1998 MSCP Plan (City of San Diego 1998).

A large development bubble in the southern portion site from the 1998 project design was removed, increasing the size of the current Habitat Preserve by more than 200 acres. Development of the proposed project would contribute 1,650.4 acres to the targeted 171,917 acres within the MHPA for conservation (City of San Diego 1998). Therefore, implementation of the current project design would be consistent with the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan and would not compromise future implementation of the MSCP Subarea Plan within the City of Santee because the current project meets all requirements and provides a greater level of conservation than required for the Santee MSCP Subarea Plan pursuant to the MSCP Plan.

The proposed project comprises the Fanita Ranch Subunit of the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan. The Santee General Plan, including its Conservation Element, and the NCCP Enrollment Agreement executed by the City require that any development in the City comply with the Draft MSCP Subarea Plan. This requirement applies to the proposed project and all other development that would impact biological resources in the City.

Therefore, the proposed project's consistency with the MSCP Subarea Plan would be ensured by the City, and impacts related to consistency with habitat conservation plans (HCPs) would be less than significant.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Historical Resources

Threshold: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.4.5.1.)

Explanation: The Cultural Resources Phase I Survey Report evaluated one potential historic resource, the Stowe Trail, which runs through the very western edge of the area of potential effect (APE) and connects the City of Santee with the City of Poway. Atkins was unable to locate any documentation specifying the precise length or boundaries of the Stowe Trail. However, historical U.S. Geological Survey maps suggest it is quite short, extending approximately 1 mile north of Stowe to intersect with other trails. The dirt road was of local importance to Stowe, a small ranching community in northern Sycamore Canyon (north of the project site), in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The dirt road had likely fallen out of use by 1942.

Although this dirt road was locally important for several decades, no historic artifacts were observed during the pedestrian survey. It is likely that modern activity, including road maintenance, entirely replaced the original road surface and has disturbed or obscured any subsurface historic or prehistoric cultural materials. For these reasons, this section of the dirt road is unlikely to contain cultural deposits and was recommended not eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or any local designation because it lacks the integrity necessary to convey its historic significance. Therefore, the proposed project's impact to this site would be less than significant.

No other historic resources were observed on site or identified through records searches or archival research. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Impacts are less than significant.

F. ENERGY

1. Wasteful Use of Energy

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

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.5.5.1.)

Explanation: Construction. Construction of the proposed project would result in temporary energy consumption and one-time, non-recoverable energy costs associated with construction of structures, utilities, and roadways. Energy consumption as a result of construction of the proposed project would primarily consist of the consumption of fossil fuels as a result of use of off-road construction equipment, movement of soil, and use of on-road vehicles for worker commuting and vendors.

As shown in EIR Tables 4.5-5 and 4.5-6 of the EIR, peak total daily energy consumption from on- and off-road sources would be approximately 1,855 MMBtu per day and would occur during Phase 1. The transportation fuel consumption in California is approximately 2.9 billion MMBtu per year, or approximately 7.8 million MMBtu per day. The proposed project would result in an increase in temporary indirect energy consumption compared to energy consumption without project construction. However, this level of energy consumption would be negligible at the regional level (approximately 0.03 percent of statewide transportation fuel consumption) and

would be a one-time use during project construction. Construction of the proposed project would not include unusual construction practices that would result in wasteful or inefficient consumption of energy compared to typical construction. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would not cause a significant temporary energy impact during construction. This impact would be less than significant.

Operation:

Electricity. The proposed project's estimated electricity consumption and renewable energy generation were calculated for project operation. EIR Table 4.5-7 provides estimated energy consumption with and without implementation of the mitigation measures required to reduce air quality and GHG emissions in Sections 4.2 and 4.7, respectively. Specifically, Mitigation Measure AIR-8 would reduce energy use, and Mitigation Measure GHG-1 requires generation of renewable energy on the project site. The annual electricity consumption of the proposed project with Mitigation Measures AIR-7, GHG-4, and GHG-6 would be higher than without mitigation measures due to the electricity consumption by electric vehicles (EVs) and all-electric residences. However, mitigation would include on-site renewable electricity generation (Mitigation Measure GHG-1) that would offset the higher electricity consumption of the proposed project.

The U.S. Census Bureau reported that, in 2017, the total population in the County was 3,325,468 (U.S. Census Bureau 2020). The proposed project is anticipated to generate a service population of approximately 8,424 people under the preferred land use plan with school, or 8,345 people under the land use plan without school, which is equal to approximately 0.3 percent of the County's total population. The proposed project would be home to approximately 0.3 percent of the County's population but would consume approximately 0.15 percent of the County's total electricity consumption without any mitigation and 0.06 percent of the County's total electricity consumption when on-site renewable generation is taken into account. Therefore, before mitigation, the proposed project's electricity consumption per person would be efficient compared to its proportion of the County's population and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. The implementation of the air quality and GHG mitigation measures further improves the proposed project's energy efficiency by decreasing its proportion of energy consumption in the County.

Additionally, with implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1, the proposed project would generate renewable energy on site. By buildout, the proposed project would generate approximately 20,472,039 kilowatt-hours (kWh) and 20,378,877 kWh of electricity per year from distributed photovoltaic solar electric generation on site, under the preferred land use plan with school and land use plan without school, respectively, which is equal to approximately 63 percent of the total electricity demand. The on-site generation of renewable energy would reduce the project's percent of County 2017 energy consumption to 0.06 percent. Therefore, the proposed project's operational electricity impacts would be less than significant.

Natural Gas. Natural gas consumption was estimated for the preferred land use plan with school and the land use plan without school and with and without implementation of the mitigation measures required to reduce air quality and GHG emissions. Specifically, Mitigation Measure GHG-4 requires all-electric residences, which would substantially reduce natural gas consumption. These mitigation measures are not required to reduce energy consumption but would have the added benefit of reducing natural gas consumption. EIR Table 4.5-8 of the EIR provides estimated natural gas use at project buildout with and without mitigation measures required for air quality and GHG impacts.

At full buildout, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in an annual natural gas consumption of approximately 60,889 MMBtu and 62,329 MMBtu under the preferred land use plan with school and the land use plan without school, respectively, which is approximately 0.13 percent of the County's total natural gas consumption of 48,000,000 MMBtu in 2017. Because the population of the proposed project would be approximately 0.3 percent of the County's total population, and its natural gas consumption would be 0.13 percent, the proposed project's natural gas consumption would be efficient compared to its population. This impact would be less than significant prior to implementation of mitigation measures for air quality and GHG emissions impacts. However, with implementation of all-electric residences (Mitigation Measure GHG-4), natural gas use on the project site would be further reduced to approximately 0.04 percent of the County's total consumption under the preferred land use plan with school and 0.03 percent for the land use plan without school. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant environmental impact due to the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of natural gas. This impact would be less than significant.

Petroleum. EIR Table 4.5-9 of the EIR shows the annual petroleum demand at full buildout of the proposed project under the preferred land use plan with school and the land use plan without school and with and without the transportation demand management mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure AIR-6). The mitigation measure is not required to reduce energy use but would have the added benefit of reducing fuel consumption. The petroleum consumption estimate at the state level is available for comparison to the proposed project's petroleum consumption estimate. The proposed project would consume approximately 0.01 percent of the state's total petroleum consumption. The U.S. Census Bureau reported that, in 2018, the total population in California was 39,557,045 (U.S. Census Bureau 2020). The proposed project is anticipated to generate a service population of approximately 8,424 people under the preferred land use plan with school, or 8,345 people under the land use plan without school, which is equal to approximately 0.02 percent of the state's total population. Therefore, the proposed project's petroleum consumption would be efficient compared to its proportion of the state population and would not result in a significant environmental impact due to the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts related to petroleum consumption would be less than significant.

2. Energy Efficiency Plans

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.5.5.2.)

Explanation: Energy use on the project site during construction would be temporary, and energy use associated with operation of the proposed project would be relatively small in comparison to the state's and County's available energy sources. It would also be efficient compared to the proposed project's estimated proportion of the state's and County's population. In addition, on-site renewable energy generation (Mitigation Measure GHG-1) combined with all-electric residences (Mitigation Measure GHG-4) would significantly reduce the energy usage associated with operation of the proposed project. Because the proposed project's per capita energy consumption would be less than the state or County level for the same resource, the proposed project would not conflict with California's energy conservation plans as described in the California Energy Commission's (CEC) 2019 Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. This impact would be less than significant.

G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Fault Rupture, Seismic Groundshaking, and Seismic-Related Ground Failure

Threshold: Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction; or landslides?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.6.5.1.)

Explanation: Fault Rupture. The geotechnical investigations prepared for the proposed project indicated that no known active, potentially active, or inactive faults are on the project site or in off-site improvement areas. In addition, the proposed project is not on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. The nearest known active faults are the Newport-Inglewood Fault and Rose Canyon Fault Zone, both located approximately 15 miles west of the project site. As a result, ground surface rupture is not likely to occur due to an earthquake or seismic event. Due to the distance of these faults from the project site, the proposed project is not anticipated to be at risk from ground surface rupture at these faults. In addition, all new structures associated with the proposed project would be constructed in compliance with the 2019 CBC or most current code at the time of construction. Therefore, because no active faults are located on or near the project site and project construction would comply with the CBC, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact associated with the rupture of a known earthquake fault.

Ground Shaking. The project site is located in a seismically active area that has the potential to experience strong ground shaking. Ground shaking has the potential to dislodge objects from walls, ceilings, and shelves and to damage and destroy buildings and other structures. People in the area would be exposed to these hazards. The proposed project would minimize hazards associated with damage or destruction to buildings and other structures through compliance with the CBC, which includes specific structural seismic safety provisions. Given the proposed project's compliance with the CBC, impacts associated with ground shaking would be less than significant.

Liquefaction. Soil liquefaction typically occurs when loose, saturated, and relatively cohesionless soil deposits found below the water table lose strength during strong seismic ground motions. Seismically induced soil liquefaction is a phenomenon in which loose to medium dense, saturated granular materials undergo matrix rearrangement, develop high pore water pressure, and lose shear strength due to cyclic ground vibrations induced by earthquakes. Due to the relatively high density and grain-size distribution characteristics of the fill and formational materials at the project site, and the absence of a permanent water table in the proposed development area, the risk of seismically induced soil liquefaction occurring at the project site is very low. In addition, due to the dense formational material encountered, lack of significant deposits of saturated soils that could be susceptible to liquefaction, and compliance with the CBC, liquefaction occurrence at the off-site improvement areas is also low. Therefore, impacts related to liquefaction would be less than significant.

Landslides. The stability and potential impacts of ancient landslides located on the project site and off-site improvement areas were evaluated in the geotechnical investigations prepared for the proposed project. The geotechnical investigations found that landslide instability due to seismic ground shaking is not anticipated and that there are no known ancient landslides within the Friars Formation in the County that have reactivated due to natural causes. Therefore, the potential for seismically induced landslides occurring on the project site is low. Impacts would be less than significant.

2. Septic Tanks

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

Finding: No impact. (EIR, § 4.6.5.5.)

Explanation: The proposed project proposes connections to existing sewer lines within the City. No septic systems or other alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed. Therefore, no impact would occur.

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Hazardous Materials

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

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.8.5.1.)

Explanation: Construction. Project construction activities could result in the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, grease, and lubricants for construction equipment and vehicle use, asphalt during roadway construction activities, and toxic solvents, pesticides, and herbicides during site clearing and landscaping activities. These materials would be used and stored in designated construction staging areas within the boundaries of the project site and in staging areas for off-site improvements. Activities associated with the temporary aggregate plant would include crushing rock and producing roadway subbase and other aggregate materials for use on the project site using electricity to power the plant. If electricity is not available, a diesel generator would be used to power the aggregate plant. Project construction activities would comply with all applicable local standards set forth by the City, as well as state and federal health and safety requirements that are intended to minimize hazardous materials risk to the public, such as the RCRA, CERCLA, SARA, Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, CCR Title 22 and Title 27, Cal/OSHA requirements, the Hazardous Waste Control Act, the California Accidental Release Protection (CalARP) Program, and the California Health and Safety Code. The construction contractor would be required to implement such regulations relative to the transport, handling, and disposal of any hazardous materials, including the use of standard construction controls and safety procedures to avoid a significant hazard to the public or environment. Standard construction practices would be observed such that any materials released are appropriately contained and remediated as required by local and state laws.

Operation: The types of uses proposed by the proposed project include residential units, Village Center buildings, potential school, agricultural uses, recreational and trails, sewer/water connections, and roadway improvements typical of residential community development. Without development of the school site, the potential sources of hazardous materials typically associated with schools would not contribute to the proposed project's potential impacts related to hazardous wastes.

Residential, Village Center, and Parks and Recreational Uses: Operation of the proposed project would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials typical of residential, commercial, agricultural, recreational, and civic uses including cleaning fluids, detergents, solvents, adhesives, sealers, paints, fuels/lubricants, and fertilizers or pesticides for landscaping. The proposed land uses would result in an increase in hazardous chemical waste generation at the site compared to the current baseline condition. However, these

materials would be transported, contained, stored, used, and disposed of in accordance with manufacturers' instructions, applicable standards, and federal, state, and local regulations. Compliance with applicable state and local regulations would serve to protect against a significant and irreversible environmental change that could result from the routine use of these hazardous materials.

Agricultural Uses: Implementation of the proposed project would include agricultural uses associated with the Farm and within the Agriculture Overlay area. This includes terraced vegetable fields, pasture lands, limited housing for employees, raised gardens, and pastures/facilities for farm animals. These uses are anticipated to involve the use of pesticides, fertilizers, and other hazardous materials. However, any use of fertilizers or pesticides as part of agricultural operations are required to comply with CalEPA's enforcement of pesticide laws and regulations in California. Additionally, animal raising would generate animal waste which could result in vectors, such as flies, and could be considered a hazard itself if not handled and disposed of correctly. However, standard housekeeping practices and best management practices are adequate for addressing the hazards of animal waste. Therefore, compliance with existing federal and state regulations and using standard housekeeping practices and best management practices would ensure that the routine transport, use, and dispose of hazardous materials related to agricultural uses would result in a less than significant impact.

School Use: The School Overlay reserves a school site for a potential K–8 public school or other educational uses on the project site. If acquired by the Santee School District, the site would be able to accommodate up to 700 students, including existing Santee students and new students on the project site. Schools throughout the state generate hazardous waste as a normal part of the operation and maintenance of each school. Typical wastes generated by the routine operation and maintenance of K–12 schools include the following: Electronic equipment (e.g., computer monitors), batteries, and copier or printer toners from school daily operation and administration; chemical and biological hazardous wastes from chemistry and science labs; used oil, antifreeze, solvents, degreasers, and auto batteries from auto repair shops and classrooms or compressors; pesticides, cleaning solvents, detergents, and oil-based or latex paint wastes from school maintenance and housekeeping or janitorial functions.

In California, on-site and off-site storage of hazardous waste is a regulated activity that requires authorization under the Department

of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) five-tiered program for hazardous waste treatment or storage. School uses are required to comply with DTSC requirements for on-site and off-site collection and storage of hazardous wastes. This requires obtaining permits to manage and transport hazardous waste products. Therefore, compliance with state requirements and permitting under the DTSC would ensure that the routine transport, use, and dispose of hazardous materials associated with the potential school would result in a less than significant impact.

2. Hazards Near Schools

Threshold: Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.8.5.3.)

Explanation: Sycamore Canyon Elementary School, is located on Settle Road, approximately 500 feet from the proposed Special Use area along the southwestern boundary of the project site in the Carlton Hills neighborhood. Approximately 350 students are currently enrolled in the elementary school. The Special Use area falls within the notification area for Gillespie Field and has a height restriction, thus limiting its development potential. It is also on landslide deposits, which further limits its development potential. Therefore, the Special Use area would allow for a limited range of uses, such as a solar farm, recreational vehicle and boat storage, aboveground agriculture without irrigation, and other similar uses. The types of hazardous materials that would be potentially emitted from the site could include gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, and grease from the recreational vehicle and boat storage and pesticides from the aboveground agriculture. However, due to the limited nature of development proposed, the Special Use area is not anticipated to emit or handle hazardous materials in quantities large enough to affect the nearby school. As such, the permitted uses for the Special Use area would not result in activities that emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste in quantities that would affect persons at Sycamore Canyon Elementary School.

In addition, existing residential uses and intervening topography provide a buffer from any hazardous materials that could be potentially emitted from the Special Use area. The applicant is required to include a minimum 50-foot buffer adjacent to the existing homes to the south and southwest and a minimum 100-foot buffer to the west to preserve neighbor privacy. This would also provide an additional buffer between the existing and permitted land uses. In the

event that agricultural uses are implemented in the Special Use area, the potential for pesticides to become airborne during application exists. However, they would be handled and disposed of in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials such that an impact would not occur.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15186(b), stipulates that before certifying an EIR for a project located within 0.25 mile of a school that involves the construction of a facility that might emit hazardous air emissions or handle an extremely hazardous substance, the lead agency is required to consult with and provide written notification to the school district no less than 30 days prior to the certification of the EIR. Sycamore Canyon Elementary School is located within 0.25 mile of the proposed Special Use area. However, as discussed previously, the Special Use area is not anticipated to emit hazardous air emissions or handle an extremely hazardous substance or a mixture containing extremely hazardous substances in a quantity equal to or greater than the state threshold quantity specified in the California Health and Safety Code. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would trigger the requirements of CEQA Guidelines, Section 15186(b), and consultation with and notification to the Santee School District would not be required.

The preferred land use plan with school includes a 15-acre school site with a School Overlay to allow for the development of a future school by the Santee School District. Land uses in the vicinity of the school would include residential, commercial, agricultural, recreational, and civic uses, which would require the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. However, these materials would be contained, stored, and used on site in accordance with manufacturers' instructions, applicable standards, and federal, state, and local regulations. While hazardous materials and waste would be handled within 0.25 mile of a proposed school associated with the proposed project, these materials would not exist in quantities large enough to pose a health risk to users of the nearby school. Additionally, these types of land uses do not typically constitute incompatible land uses near a school.

The PDMWD Ray Stoyer WRF is approximately 0.25 mile southwest of the 15-acre school site proposed in Fanita Commons under the preferred land use plan with school. The WRF handles hazardous materials, including chlorine and sulfur dioxide gas. The RMP for the WRF lays out a comprehensive plan for the protection of public health and addresses potential chlorine and sulfur dioxide spills at this facility. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15186(c)(2), notification is required in writing by the Santee School District to

consult with the San Diego Air Pollution Control District over the siting of the new school near a facility known to handle hazardous materials. The PDMWD Ray Stoyer WRF is within 0.25 mile of the proposed school site. This is a formal notification requirement that would be completed in accordance with Section 25502 of the California Health and Safety Code and would be necessary for the Santee School District to make a finding to approve the site.

The DTSC school siting requirements would not allow for development of a school adjacent to incompatible land uses or those that would release hazardous materials. In accordance with the California Education Code and California Code, Sections 17210.1 through 17213.2, as with all proposed school sites that would receive state funding for acquisition or construction, the Santee School District would be required to comply with CEQA for its acquisition of the proposed project's school site. The proposed school site has been reviewed in the Phase I ESA prepared for the proposed project. As concluded in the Phase I ESA, the project site is not a former waste disposal site and has not been identified by DTSC as a hazardous waste release site, and there are no pipelines carrying hazardous waste that traverse the project site. Therefore, there is no evidence of existing on-site RECs in connection with the proposed school site. Under the land use plan without school, no impact would occur.

The proposed project would comply with federal and state regulations pertaining to hazardous waste, such as proper handling, disposal practices, and cleanup procedures, to ensure that risks associated with hazardous emissions or materials to existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site would not result in a significant impact. Impacts would be less that significant.

3. Waste Sites

Threshold: Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.8.5.4.)

Explanation: As part of the Phase I ESA, a hazardous materials record search was conducted for the project site and surrounding properties from federal, state, and local databases. According to the government hazardous materials databases searched, no reported hazardous materials sites are located within the boundaries of the project site.

Pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, there is one facility located within one-quarter mile of the project site that was listed three times on LUST database. This facility is the 7-Eleven located at a facility at 9750 Cuyamaca Street. According to the findings in the Phase I ESA, all three LUST listings identified for the facility relate to a release of gasoline on three separate occurrences (March 1986, May 1991, and June 1994). Regulatory closure was granted in each case.

The Phase I ESA determined that based on distance from the project site, downstream position, and closed regulatory status, the facility located at 9750 Cuyamaca Street is unlikely to have caused a REC at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to the presence of hazardous materials sites identified pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, as it relates to annual updates to the Cortese List. Impacts would be less than significant.

4. Airport Safety

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

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.8.5.5.)

Explanation: The project site is located in the vicinity of two airports: MCAS Miramar (private federal) and Gillespie Field (public). The project site is east of MCAS Miramar. The portions of the project site proposed for development fall outside of any Overflight Zones and are not subject to overflight-related disclosure or notification requirements. According to the MCAS Miramar ALUCP, the entire project site is located within the Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 Outer Boundary, which establishes standards and Federal Aviation Administration notification requirements for potential hazards to use of navigable airspace. A small northerly portion of the project site falls within Review Area 2 of the AIA, which requires ALUC review for any proposed objects with a height greater than 35 feet above ground level. However, this portion of the project site would be dedicated as Habitat Preserve and would not be developed. The easterly portions of the project site are within a High Terrain zone but are not within Review Area 2; therefore, they do not require ALUC review. The remainder of the project site is located outside of the AIA. Thus, the proposed project would not be subject to any land use restrictions from MCAS Miramar.

The project site is also located north of Gillespie Field. Southerly portions of the project site are located within the Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Boundary and are proposed as Habitat Preserve and Special Use area. Within this boundary, the Federal Aviation Administration shall be notified of any proposed construction or alteration having a height greater than an imaginary surface extending 100 feet outward and 1 foot upward (slope of 100 to 1) from the runway elevation. The Special Use area also falls within the Gillespie Field Review Area 2, which requires limitations on the height of structures. Review Area 2 also requires overflight notification documents for residential uses; however, residential uses would not be permitted within the Special Use area, except for a caretaker unit. If a caretaker unit is proposed, the applicant is required to provide notification and compliance in accordance with the Gillespie Field Review Area 2 requirements. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant impact regarding airspace safety hazards or conflicts with the land use plans for MCAS Miramar or Gillespie Field.

I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

1. Water Quality Standards

Threshold: Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.9.5.1.)

Explanation: Construction and operation activities associated with the proposed project could result in an increase in potential discharge of pollutants to receiving waters, including waters designated as impaired for certain conditions of concerns. Hydromodification could increase stormwater runoff and intensify erosion and the transport of sediments and other pollutants. Development of vacant land would introduce new types of pollutants in stormwater runoff.

Construction: During construction, the proposed project has the potential to produce pollutants such as sediment, nutrients, heavy metals, organic compounds, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, and pesticides/herbicides. Additionally, waste materials such as wash water, paints, wood, paper, concrete, food containers, and sanitary wastes may be discharged from the project site during construction. These pollutants could impact water quality if they were washed off site by stormwater or non-stormwater or are blown or tracked off site to areas susceptible to wash off by stormwater or non-stormwater. Pollutants are likely to drain into Sycamore Canyon Creek. Sycamore

Canyon Creek drains into the San Diego River, which then drains into the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, these water bodies are identified as the receiving waters of the proposed project. Impairments for these water bodies include dissolved oxygen, benthic community effects, cadmium, indicator bacteria, nitrogen, dissolved oxygen, phosphorus, total dissolved solids, and toxicity for the San Diego River. Under these impairments, the receiving water cannot assimilate or accommodate additional loading of pollutants, and any increases in pollutants would contribute to the impairment.

The proposed project would be subject to compliance with Construction General Permit requirements and with Chapter 9.06 of the Santee Municipal Code, which prohibits non-stormwater discharges and eliminates illicit discharges and illicit connections to the stormwater conveyance system, reduces the discharge of pollutants from the stormwater conveyance system to the maximum extent practicable in order to achieve applicable water quality objectives for surface waters in the County, and achieves compliance with TMDL regulations (City of Santee 2020).

Prior to project grading or construction, the Construction General Permit requires preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would include a series of specific BMPs to be implemented during construction in order to address erosion, accidental spills, and the quality of stormwater runoff. The SWPPP applies only to the time period in which construction activity is taking place, and is no longer operative once the soil on the project site has been stabilized and a Notice of Termination is completed. BMPs that must be implemented as part of a SWPPP can be grouped into two major categories: (1) erosion and sediment control BMPs and (2) non-stormwater management and materials management BMPs.

As part of project compliance with the General Construction Permit, a Notice of Intent would be prepared and submitted to the San Diego RWQCB providing notification and intent to comply with the General Permit. The Construction General Permit also requires that construction sites be inspected before and after storm events and every 24 hours during extended storm events. The purpose of the inspections is to identify maintenance requirements for BMPs and to determine the effectiveness of BMPs that are being implemented.

Operation: Operation of the proposed project land uses would have the potential to generate pollutants that could degrade the surface water quality of downstream receiving waters. Pollutant sources from operation of the proposed project would include landscaping, rooftops, parking and driveways, roadways, agricultural uses, general use areas, and trash storage areas. Pollutants from

operation of the proposed project would include sediment, nutrients, heavy metals, organic compounds, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, and pesticides. In addition, project implementation would require routine operation and maintenance activities, thereby increasing instances of accidental spills and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains, and non-stormwater connections (e.g., sewer connections) that could result in the potential discharge of pollutants to storm drainage systems and associated receiving waters.

Consistent with the City's Stormwater Management Ordinance, the proposed project is considered a priority development project and is required to identify and incorporate measures for hydromodification management to ensure that stormwater runoff rates and durations do not exceed pre-development conditions or result in adverse erosion or sedimentation effects. All priority development projects are required to implement structural BMPs for stormwater pollutant control. Additionally, projects subject to hydromodification management requirements must implement structural BMPs for flow control. Structural BMPs, such as biofiltration (basins and proprietary modular units) and combined pollutant control and hydromodification control measures, have been incorporated into the proposed project design.

Runoff from natural and sloped areas containing no impervious areas would be collected in separate storm drains and discharged through riprap energy dissipaters to avoid comingling of drainage and to allow any course sediment generated in the areas to pass through. The proposed project would extend and make improvements to Fanita Parkway and would include features in accordance with Green Streets design elements, including rock garden swales and tree wells, to address water quality. Street improvements would reset roadway widths, medians, utilities, and storm drain conveyance systems. The proposed storm drain system would be constructed to collect and convey on-site runoff as well off-site run-on from developed areas east of Fanita Parkway that confluences with the Fanita Parkway flows. However, instead of discharging into an open channel along the western side of Fanita Parkway as it currently does, confluence flows would be conveyed within a storm drain pipe within Fanita Parkway to an existing drainage. Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue would also be extended and improved to provide access to the project site. Similar to Fanita Parkway, these streets would also include Green Street design elements, such as rock gardens and tree wells.

Through changes in topography and land cover on the project site, the proposed project has the potential to result in impacts to

sedimentary transport to downstream channel areas, known as Potential Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas (PCCSYA), by altering the sediment producing areas on the project site. The alteration of PCCSYAs has the potential to negatively impact characteristics of sediment supply and delivery which can lead to water quality degradation of downstream receiving waters. To avoid impacts to PCCSYAs produced on the project site and resulting downstream water quality impacts, the discharges of the sediment producing areas would be diverted to adjust the sediment production as close as possible to the original conditions. As a result, the proposed project would not encroach into more than 5 percent of the proposed project's potential PCCSYAs areas off site and would have no net encroachment into on-site areas. In addition, the discharges of the project site would be adjusted by designing BMPs such that the erosion from the discharged flows is as close as possible to the pre-development conditions. The proposed project would avoid significant impacts to both on- and off-site PCCSYAs and water quality through redirecting sediment producing discharges, adherence to BMPs, and the protection of the remaining natural areas. Therefore, alteration of the drainage area on the project site would have less than significant impacts to PCCSYAs and would not result in the loss of sedimentary transport or decreased water quality to downstream channel areas.

The Stormwater Quality Management Plan identifies a number of site design BMPs to ensure that water quality is maintained during project operation. BMPs have been incorporated into the project design to minimize impacts from project-generated operational pollutant sources, which include sediment, nutrients, heavy metals, organic compounds, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, and pesticides.

Preparation of and compliance with the SWPPP, implementation of BMPs identified in the Stormwater Quality Management Plan, and compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations as discussed previously would protect water quality and ensure project compliance with applicable water quality standards. The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or WDRs. Additionally, the implementation of these BMPs would help treat runoff and decrease the amount of pollution entering receiving waters. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

2. Groundwater Supplies

Threshold: Would the Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the

Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.9.5.2.)

Explanation: The City does not rely on groundwater sources for its water supply. No groundwater would be used for project construction or operation activities. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect or deplete groundwater supplies due to water demand generated by the proposed development.

Development of the proposed project would result in new impervious surfaces that may lead to a decrease in the amount of water recharged into the groundwater system within the project boundaries. To minimize potential effects on groundwater recharge, the proposed project would be designed to include pervious, landscaped areas, allowing groundwater recharge to continue to occur. Runoff from developed areas would drain into proposed on-site basin system designed to slow peak flow and discharge to rates equal to or less than existing conditions. Hydromodification management would occur through storage of stormwater within the basins, with outlets that regulate the flow rate and duration of stormwater released. Source control and low-impact development measures would be implemented to incorporate pervious surfaces and maximize the amount of open space, landscaping, and vegetated swales to slow and absorb runoff, allowing for groundwater recharge.

Further, the proposed project would include a total of approximately 2,022.6 acres of undeveloped area including 256 acres of Open Space, 1,650.4 acres of Habitat Preserve, and 116.2 acres of Agriculture and Parks (Community, Neighborhood, and Mini). As such, groundwater recharge in these areas would continue after project implementation.

The proposed project is not anticipated to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. No groundwater would be used for project construction or operation, and the proposed project would be designed to minimize potential effects to groundwater recharge through consolidation of impervious surfaces and the retaining of approximately 2,022.6 acres as Open Space, Habitat Preserve, and Agriculture and Parks. Impacts would be less than significant.

3. Erosion or Siltation

Threshold: Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flood flows?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.9.5.3.)

Explanation: Construction. Land-disturbing construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed project, such as vegetation clearing, grading, and excavation of project sites, and construction of new building foundations, streets, driveways, and trenches for utilities, could result in localized alteration of drainage patterns and temporarily increase erosion and sedimentation in the construction area.

Temporary ponding or flooding could also result from construction activities from temporary alterations of the drainage system (reducing its capacity of carrying runoff). Alterations may temporarily result in increased erosion and siltation if flows were substantially increased or routed to facilities or channels without capacity to carry the additional flow.

Construction phase activities implemented under the proposed project would be required to comply with the SWRCB General Construction Stormwater Permit, which requires preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP would include a series of specific BMPs to be implemented during construction to address erosion, accidental spills, and the quality of stormwater runoff, which have been developed in part to reduce the potential adverse effects associated with construction activities. In addition, construction phase activities implemented under the proposed project would be required to comply with Chapter 9.06 of the Santee Municipal Code, which mandates the implementation of a pollution control plan for each phase of construction and season of the year (City of Santee 2020). The pollution control plan would incorporate BMPs in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association's Construction BMP Handbook (2015).

Therefore, with the adherence to regulatory requirements, which include the implementation of erosion and sediment control BMPs, any short-term impacts resulting from alterations of drainage and hydrology during construction would be less than significant.

Operation. The proposed project would result in hydromodification from development of impervious surfaces in an area that is currently undeveloped. Hydromodification could increase stormwater runoff and intensify erosion and the transport of sediments and other pollutants. Changes to delivery of coarse sediment and transport of coarse sediment result in increased transport capacity and the potential for adverse channel erosion (City of Santee 2016). Additionally, impervious surfaces do not allow percolation of the water down into the soil. Water is instead forced directly into storm drain systems or streams, where increases in erosion and siltation could result, as well as increased flood risks. These alterations could also result in exceeding the existing capacity of stormwater facilities if substantial drainage is rerouted or stormwater flow or velocities are substantially increased. To avoid these types of impacts, the proposed project includes a drainage network designed to control and filter stormwater runoff in conformance with RWQCB and City's requirements, which call for retention first, then biofiltration. The proposed stormwater system would include the use of biofilters, on-site storage of stormwater in basins with outlets that regulate the flow rate and duration of stormwater released, and the use of both retention and detention basins to slow and sequester runoff.

The pre- and post-development conditions for the proposed project were evaluated to determine if the proposed biofiltration facilities are sized adequately to meet the current HMP requirements of the RWQCB. Hydromodification management would occur through storage of stormwater in proposed on-site basins, with outlets to regulate the flow rate and duration of stormwater released. Runoff would be collected in storm drain inlets from street surfaces and routed toward multi-purpose basins and treated for stormwater quality, flow control for hydromodification, and flood attenuation to maintain existing peak-flow rates during a 100-year storm event.

As indicated in the Master Drainage Study, the pre-development project 100-year flows are 3,312 cubic feet per second. Through project design, stormwater runoff upon project completion would result in 2,729 cubic feet per second 100-year flows. Thus, project design would help to reduce flows by approximately 583 cubic feet per second versus existing conditions.

The proposed project would construct a total of 19 stormwater basins and 3 vaults. Of the 19 stormwater basins, the proposed project would construct 15 on-site stormwater basins (BF-1-1 through BF-1-6, BF-1-17, HMP-17, HMP-18, and BF-1-RV1 through BF-1-RV6). Biofiltration basins BF-1-1 through BF-1-6, BF-1-17, and BF-1-RV1 through BF-1-RV6 would serve as combined water quality, hydromodification, and detention basins. Basins HMP-17 and HMP-

18 would serve as hydromodification and detention basins. In addition, the proposed project would construct four off-site stormwater basins (BF-1-10A, BF-1-10B, HMP-11, and HMP-12) and three vaults (HMP-13, HMP-15, and HMP-16). Basins BF-1-10A and BF-1-10B would serve as combined water quality, hydromodification, and detention basins. Basins HMP-11 and HMP-12 and vaults HMP-13, HMP-15, and HMP-16 would serve as hydromodification and detention facilities.

The system would collect stormwater through a series of swales, catch basins, and culverts that direct stormwater to detention/biofiltration basins. Runoff from the residential portions of the site would generally be collected by inlets and conveyed toward one of the proposed detention basins. Flows would outlet the basins and discharge into downstream conveyance channels consisting of storm drain pipes, constructed channels, or natural drainage ways. The proposed basins would also serve as detention for flow-control hydromodification and peak-flow attenuation. Peak-flow attenuation would be required not only due to the increase in imperviousness associated with the development but also because the site design proposes to divert acreage from areas that currently drain easterly and southerly to drain westerly toward Sycamore Canyon Creek.

Other areas along the roadway corridors of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue would include storage facilities such as underground vaults and aboveground basins to address local peak-flow attenuation. Each detention facility would be equipped with a riser designed to accomplish the various functions. Orifices placed along the height of the rise would regulate the lower flow rates to address flow-control hydromodification. The cross-sectional area of the riser would aid in regulating the higher flows to reduce flows below existing conditions. The basins would also include a second riser installed for redundancy and as an emergency outlet should the primary riser clog. Design of this secondary riser would be performed during final engineering. Depending on the accessibility of the riser structures, it may be necessary to equip some of them with a grate over the top opening as a safety measure. The biofiltration basins proposed for the site would be lined; therefore, no infiltration is assumed in the biofiltration basins.

The storm drain system and layout would be designed to address peak flows and to integrate water quality features needed to comply with the City's BMP Design Manual requirements for water quality and hydromodification. As designed, the proposed project would allow biofiltration, evapotranspiration, and filtering of stormwater to remove microscopic organisms, suspended solids, organic material, nitrogen, and phosphorous. The results show that development of

the proposed project would not increase peak flows for any point of discharge. Therefore, the proposed project would not compromise the capacity of downstream drainage facilities, and effects due to erosion, sedimentation, and flooding are anticipated to be minimal.

The proposed project has been designed in compliance with the San Diego RWQCB and the City's requirements. Post-development flow rates would be reduced to below pre-development flow rates with implementation of bioretention and hydromodification basins. Construction runoff would be contained in compliance with the State of California Construction Permit. Post-construction runoff would be cleaned through bioretention basins and modular wetlands in compliance with the San Diego RWQCB Order R9-2013-0001. Portions of Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street, Magnolia Avenue, and Summit Avenue have been designed as a Green Street per the requirements of the San Diego RWQCB.

All site runoff would receive water quality treatment prior to discharging off site. To prevent erosive velocities at pipe outlet locations, energy dissipating measures would be included as part of project design. These measures would be designed during final engineering and would include but not be limited to riprap and concrete energy dissipating headwalls. Landform grading has been incorporated into the proposed project to mimic existing conditions where the proposed grading ties into or daylights with the existing terrain. It is intended that the stormwater running off manufactured slopes would sheet flow and follow existing drainage patterns. Implementation of hydromodification measures would reduce post-project flows to below pre-project conditions. As shown, the basins proposed for the proposed project would help to reduce flows by approximately 583 cubic feet per second compared to existing conditions. Thus, post-project flows would be released into Sycamore Canyon Creek at a lower rate than existing natural flows. Runoff from the adjacent hillsides and natural off-site areas would be collected in a series of brow ditches and conveyed to culverts located within the proposed street improvements. Runoff generated by the hardscape improvements would be intercepted via curb and gutter, draining to an internal storm drain system that would convey these flows to Modular Wetland Biofiltration BMP's prior to draining to HMP detention facilities. Once treated and detained, these flows are then discharged to their respective discharge location. Proposed structural BMPs would be maintained by the homeowners association in perpetuity.

Additionally, Green Streets principles and infrastructure are proposed for meeting water quality requirements for portions of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, Magnolia Avenue and Summit

Avenue in the areas outside of the villages where the roadways are proposed to be improved. The Green Streets approach integrates strategies into roadway design that help protect, restore, and mimic the natural water cycle such that runoff is encouraged to be percolated or stored in a more natural manner, with the use of features such as rock garden swales and tree wells, which are designed to capture runoff from hardened surfaces, slow water down, spread it out, and allow it to sink into the soil during storms. Methods like this would help to trap silt and pollutants to reduce siltation and erosion. The use of Green Street principles would reduce the proposed project's potential to increase peak flows. Therefore, compared to existing conditions, the potential for erosion to occur downstream of the project site would be reduced with implementation of the proposed project. Existing flow velocities would be lessened with implementation of the proposed project since post-development flows would be reduced. As such, the proposed project would not compromise the capacity of downstream drainage facilities, and effects due to erosion and sedimentation are anticipated to be minimal. Therefore, erosion and siltation is not expected downstream of the project site.

Further, the project design includes improvements to allow connection to the City's existing stormwater infrastructure system. Proposed improvements would ensure that stormwater flows are properly maintained and treated on site so that runoff volumes or velocities do not exceed that which currently occur under existing conditions. The proposed project would be subject to National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements and other local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to maintaining water quality and minimizing potential adverse effects on downstream water bodies. Because stormwater runoff from the site would be less with the proposed project, it would not create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, and the proposed project would not generate additional sources of polluted runoff.

Lastly, the project site is in Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Zone X, which is outside of the 100- and 500-year flood hazard areas. The proposed project would be designed to reduce peak-flow rates such that downstream locations would be below existing flow rates. The proposed project would not impede or redirect flood flows because redirected areas would be reduced by attenuation facilities such that post-development flows would not exceed pre-project flows. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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 substantially increase

the rate or amount of surface runoff in a way that would impede or redirect flood flows or result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site or flooding on or off site. The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, and the proposed project would not generate additional sources of polluted runoff. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

4. Flood Hazard

Threshold: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the Project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Finding: No impact. (EIR, § 4.9.5.4.)

Explanation: The project site is not subject to inundation by tsunami or seiche. The project site is located approximately 16 miles from the Pacific Ocean negating the potential for the site to be subject to a tsunami event. A seiche is a wave on the surface of a lake or landlocked bay that is caused by atmospheric or seismic disturbances. The nearest lake to the project site is San Vincente Reservoir located approximately 2 miles from the northeastern portion of the project site. This portion of the project site is located at approximately 1,000 feet above mean sea level and the area between the reservoir and the project site is a valley. This topographical variation would make it difficult for the project site to be inundated by the reservoir. Further, the project site is located in Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Zone X, which is outside of the 100- and 500-year flood hazard areas. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not release pollutants due to inundation caused by a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche.

5. Water Quality Control Plan

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.9.5.5.)

Explanation: The project site is located within the San Diego River Hydraulic Unit (HU) of the San Diego region as defined by the San Diego RWQCB and is further located within the Santee Hydrologic Subarea. The project site currently drains west to Sycamore Canyon Creek and east to unnamed tributaries and storm drain conveyance systems that eventually discharge to San Diego River, both of which are on the CWA Section 303(d) list for dissolved oxygen. Once developed, on-site hydromodification would divert acreages from areas that drained easterly to now drain west toward Sycamore Canyon Creek.

As identified in the Basin Plan, the designated beneficial uses for Sycamore Canyon Creek include: agricultural supply (AGR), industrial services supply (IND), contact water recreation (REC1), non-contact water recreation (REC2), warm freshwater habitat (WARM), and wildlife habitat (WILD), and rare, threatened, or endangered species (RARE). Sycamore Canyon Creek is a tributary to the San Diego River, which is on the CWA Section 303(d) list for benthic community effects, cadmium, indicator bacteria, nitrogen, dissolved oxygen, phosphorus, total dissolved solids, and toxicity. Construction and operation activities associated with the proposed project could result in an increase in potential discharge of pollutants to receiving waters, including waters designated as impaired. Additionally, hydromodification could increase stormwater runoff and intensify erosion and the transport of sediment and other pollutants. Land use changes may also introduce new types of pollutants in stormwater runoff. There is no sustainable groundwater management plan prepared for the project site.

Construction. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would involve various types of equipment such as bulldozers, scrapers, backhoes, and other earthmoving equipment; dump trucks; cranes; trucks; concrete mixers; and generators. Pollutants associated with these construction activities that could result in water quality impacts include soils, debris, other materials generated during demolition and clearing, fuels and other fluids associated with the equipment used for construction, paints, other hazardous materials, concrete slurries, and asphalt materials. The proposed project would be required to comply with General Construction Stormwater Permit requirements, including the development and implementation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP must identify BMPs that the discharger would use to protect stormwater runoff from pollutants and the placement of those BMPs. Therefore, with the implementation of policies and regulatory requirements, which include the implementation of construction-period BMPs to address potential discharges of pollutants to stormwater, any short-term water quality impacts during construction of the proposed project would be minimized and would not cause a conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Basin Plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Operation. Implementation of the proposed project would result in land use changes that would have the potential to generate pollutants that could degrade the surface water quality of downstream receiving waters. Pollution sources for the proposed project would include landscaping, rooftops, parking, and trash storage areas. In addition, implementation of the proposed project would also result in routine operation and maintenance activities,

increasing opportunities for accidental spills and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and non-stormwater connections (e.g., sewer connections) that could result in the potential discharge of pollutants to receiving waters.

However, the proposed project requires the implementation of construction and operation BMPs, which include low-impact development site design and source control BMPs, to reduce runoff or pollutants at the source. Therefore, with implementation of appropriate BMPs, compliance with Chapter 9.06 of the Santee Municipal Code, and applicable state requirements, project impacts would be minimized and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Basin Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

J. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Established Communities

Threshold: Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.10.5.1.)

Explanation: The proposed project does not contain any components that could result in dividing an established community. The project site is an undeveloped area located in the City's boundary. Areas directly north are currently undeveloped, though they are designated as Rural Lands (RL-40) (one residential unit per 40 acres) and Open Space (Conservation) by the San Diego County General Plan and zoned Agriculture (A70) and Specific Plan (S80). Beyond that, north of the project site and west of SR-67 lies the 2,272-acre Goodan Ranch/Sycamore Canyon County Preserve. Areas northeast include undeveloped hillsides and Slaughterhouse Canyon, where active mining operations take place. East of the project site is an unincorporated rural residential subdivision known as Eucalyptus Hills. Existing detached single-family residences in the Carlton Hills neighborhood are south of the project site. The Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve is southwest of the project site and MCAS northwest of the project site.

Proposed roadways would connect, rather than separate, the project site from established communities in the vicinity. A proposed extension of Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street would connect the project site to the existing residential development to the south. The proposed project also proposes to construct Magnolia Avenue from its current terminus to the extension of Cuyamaca Street just south of the project site.

Additionally, people have historically taken informal access through the proposed project for active and passive recreation. Implementation of the proposed project would formalize permanent public access trails, trailheads, and staging areas. The proposed project proposes more than 35 miles of multimodal public trails allowing access for pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the site and providing connections to the City center and regional trails. Thus, the proposed trail system would provide enhanced connectivity to existing trails in and near the project site. The proposed project would not result in the physical division of an established community. Impacts would be less than significant.

2. Conflicts With Plans

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

Finding: Less than significant. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.10.5.2.)

Explanation: The review of local land use plans, including the ALUCPs for MCAS Miramar and Gillespie Field, SANDAG's Regional Plan, the Santee General Plan, and the City's Zoning Ordinance, has indicated that the proposed project would be generally consistent with the implementation of these plans.

San Diego County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans: The project site is located in the vicinity of two airports: MCAS Miramar and Gillespie Field. The project site abuts the easterly property line of the MCAS Miramar. The entire project site is within the Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77, Outer Boundary, which establishes standards and Federal Aviation Administration notification requirements for potential hazards to use of navigable airspace. The easterly portions of the project site are in a High Terrain zone, which is an area of land in the vicinity of an airport where the ground is above a surface regulated by Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77. However, only a small northerly portion of the site falls in Review Area 2 of the AIA. The portion of the site in Review Area 2 would be dedicated as Habitat Preserve and would not be developed, and the remainder of the project site is outside of any AIA. Therefore, the proposed project addition, the areas proposed for development fall outside of any Overflight Zones and are not subject to overflight-related disclosure or notification requirements (SDCRAA 2011).

The project site is north of Gillespie Field. Southerly portions of the site are within the Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification

Boundary. The proposed Habitat Preserve and Special Use area are within this notification boundary. Within this boundary, the Federal Aviation Administration is required to be notified of any proposed construction or alteration having a height greater than an imaginary surface extending 100 feet outward and 1 foot upward (slope of 100 to 1) from the runway elevation. The Special Use area also falls in the Review Area 2, which requires limitations on the height of structures. Review Area 2 also requires overflight notification documents for residential uses; however, residential uses are not permitted in the Special Use area, except for one caretaker unit. If a caretaker unit is proposed, notification in accordance with the Review Area 2 requirements would be made. The development standards for the Special Use area consider the site's relationship to Gillespie Field and adjacency to off-site neighbors. Height in the Special Use area would be limited to conform to the Gillespie Field ALUCP. Buffers would be required adjacent to existing residences off site to preserve privacy (SDCRAA 2010). Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the ALUCPs for MCAS Miramar and Gillespie Field.

San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan: In accordance with SB 375, the Regional Plan includes five building blocks that are accompanied by strategies to move the San Diego region toward sustainability and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The building blocks and strategies aim to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through a land use pattern that accommodates the region's future employment and housing needs and protects sensitive habitats, cultural resources, and resource areas.

The proposed project proposes Village Center, Medium Density Residential, Low Density Residential, and Active Adult land use designations that would allow for a diversified mix of housing types. Additionally, the proposed development would be clustered into three villages to preserve approximately 63 percent of the site as Habitat Preserve to maintain core habitat identified in the Final MSCP Plan, preserve known wildlife corridors, and maintain a contiguous and connected open space system, which would help implement the first building block. By clustering compact, walkable, sustainable, low-impact development in strategic locations that minimize ecological impacts, development of the proposed project would allow for the restoration of sensitive habitat areas and management of the Habitat Preserve. Implementation of the proposed project would include the establishment of a formal management entity and a management plan to monitor and protect biodiversity. Open space corridors between the villages would preserve connectivity and allow for continued wildlife movement through the site. Wildlife crossings at roadways would be designed

to support the safe and efficient movement of wildlife. In addition, existing drainages between the villages would allow for revegetation and restoration of these important features, which provide habitat and connectivity for wildlife.

The proposed project's mobility plan focuses on reducing the number and length of vehicle trips and providing alternatives to fossil fuel-powered vehicle use, which would help implement the second building block. This would be achieved through organizing land uses to locate services and goods close to residences and optimizing circulation systems to create direct, efficient, safe, and comfortable routes for a variety of transportation modes. The proposed project land uses are designed to meet the daily needs of the project residents to minimize trips outside the project site. Emphasis is placed on encouraging a transportation network that generate fewer emissions, such as walking, biking, electric vehicles, transit, and ridesharing. A Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan has been prepared to support alternative modes, manage shared facilities to optimize transportation modes, implement and support appropriate advanced technologies, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The TDM Plan considers community programs to support and encourage ridesharing, alternative modes, and other strategies to reduce single-occupancy vehicle use, which would help implement the third and fourth building blocks. Implementation of the TDM Plan would be required by Mitigation Measure AIR-6.

The proposed project includes a Complete Streets system that supports various modes of transportation and offers alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel. Streets on the project site are designed as a system of Complete Streets that safely accommodate and support multiple user types, including motorists, pedestrians, bicycles, and transit riders in an effort to manage the transportation system. The Fanita Ranch Development Plan establishes the street designs within the boundaries of the project site. Street improvements associated with development on the project site include the extension of existing streets and the construction of a new internal systems of public and private streets. The proposed project establishes a network of streets of varying design capacities tailored to meet the unique concepts of the three villages. Additionally, the proposed project street designs address safety, aesthetics, and functionality, as well as site constraints.

The proposed project would offer sustainable transportation features that would reduce the number of vehicle trips, reduce emissions, and improve the overall mobility of people in the community, all of which would help implement the fifth building block (innovative pricing policies) of the Regional Plan. One proposed mobility feature is a

bicycle circulation network throughout the community through a combination of on-street bike lanes and off-street multi-purpose trails. Bicycle trails would be designed for both recreation and to provide direct access between the villages. Another project feature is a project layout that promotes walkability and wellness. The proposed project would provide direct connections to multiple destinations that shorten the routes and allow walking to be an efficient and viable method of travel. The project proposes two pedestrian bridges that would provide direct connections across the two drainages in Fanita Commons to shorten the walking distance. The bridge that would traverse the northerly drainage would provide convenient access between the Active Adult neighborhood and the Community Park. The bridge that would traverse the southerly drainage would connect Orchard Village to the school, Community Park, and Fanita Commons. Additionally, every street on the project site would include a sidewalk or multi-purpose trail to accommodate pedestrian travel. Trails along the northerly and southerly drainages would also offer pedestrian connections between the school, the Farm, and the Active Adult neighborhood with minimal interruptions from vehicular traffic. The proposed project would include a pedestrian and bicycle mobility system consisting of sidewalks, trails, and bikeways throughout the proposed project, providing linkages between neighborhoods to other key land uses.

The proposed project supports the Regional Plan by proposing a land use pattern and TDM strategies that would accommodate the region's future employment and housing needs and protect sensitive habitats, cultural resources, and resource areas. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the strategies and objectives of the Regional Plan.

Multiple Species Conservation Program: The proposed land use plan would be consistent with the Fanita Ranch Subunit of the City's Draft MSCP Subarea Plan. The proposed project would adhere to or exceed conditions of coverage and mitigation/conveyance requirements for covered projects as defined in the City's Draft MSCP Subarea Plan (City of Santee 2018). The Santee General Plan, including its Conservation Element and the Natural Communities Conservation Plan Enrollment Agreement executed by

the City, requires that any development in the City comply with the City's Draft MSCP Subarea Plan.

Santee General Plan: The Santee General Plan provides the framework for the City's long range planning vision. The project site is designated for Planned Development (PD).

The proposed project provides for mixed-use development of employment, commercial, recreational, and various residential densities consistent with the framework for development set forth by the Santee General Plan PD designation.

Further, the proposed project would implement development generally consistent with the 16 Guiding Principles for the project site. The proposed project would include business and office uses in the Village Center and include a community focus including public parks, commercial, school, a fire station, and other uses. The proposed project would provide a range of residential densities, including Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Active Adult. The proposed project would be developed sensitive to natural open space and major landforms: 1,650.4 acres of the site would be preserved as Habitat Preserve. The Habitat Preserve would include hillsides with steep slopes to minimize landslide and mudslide hazards and to protect key visual resources.

The proposed project would provide approximately 78 acres of public parklands for active and passive recreation (including sports fields and parks) and private parklands and 4.5 acres of trail lands consisting of perimeter trails and the Stowe Trail connections planned on the project site, totaling 82.5 acres. Mini-Parks, Neighborhood Parks, a Village Green, Linear Parks, and Community Parks would be included.

The proposed Fanita Ranch Development Plan contains a comprehensive pedestrian and bicycle trail system that provides connectivity within and between the villages and with the adjacent regional trails and local trails that connect to surrounding open space areas, residential neighborhoods, parks, and the Santee Town Center to the south. Multi-purpose trails would be within the street rights-of-way along Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street, which would support pedestrian and bicycle travel. The multi-purpose trail along Cuyamaca Street would extend south off site to connect to the Santee Town Center and the San Diego River as part of the north–south regional corridor. Trail access in the Habitat Preserve would

be subject to the requirements and provisions of the Public Access Plan and the City's Draft MSCP Subarea Plan.

The project includes an extension of Fanita Parkway along the western boundary of the property, an extension of Cuyamaca Street into the site, the Magnolia Avenue extension, and additional circulation improvements. The Fanita Ranch Development Plan includes a comprehensive implementation chapter (Chapter 10) identifying public improvements, phasing, financing, and other plans according to projected need. The site will not be subdivided until the Fanita Ranch Development Plan is adopted by the City. Chapters 4 and 6 of the Fanita Ranch Development Plan also include illustrative plans showing prototype circulation systems and residential product types. The proposed project does not include a golf course or lake, meet minimum lot size requirements, provide a dedicated Sports Park accessed by Carlton Hills Boulevard, or include a Development Agreement. Overall, the project is generally consistent with the 16 Guiding Principles. Moreover, as discussed below, the project is consistent with the Santee General Plan pursuant to Urgency Ordinance No. 592.

Urgency Ordinance No. 592, the City's Essential Housing Program, provides an alternative process to boost housing production and improve housing affordability for housing projects that meet specified criteria through 2026 (City of Santee 2021). Under the program, projects that follow the procedures and meet the strict requirements of the program are deemed to be in compliance with the Santee General Plan, including the Land Use Element and Housing Element, and do not require an amendment to the Santee General Plan or other legislative act for approval. Specifically, by complying with the City's Essential Housing Project Credits Assessment Guide and Checklist, Essential Housing Projects will have demonstrated Santee General Plan consistency by furthering the objectives and policies of the plan while not obstructing their attainment. Urgency Ordinance No. 592 controls any other City plan or ordinance in the event of a conflict, with its interpretation being afforded the fullest possible weight to the interest, approval, and provision of housing. Certification as an Essential Housing Project is available for use to expedite (1) any new application for a Housing Development Project, (2) any Housing Development Project currently under City review, or (3) any approved, entitled, and/or permitted Housing Development Project not yet built by the date application for certification is made.

An application under the Essential Housing Program was submitted for the proposed project in November 2021. On December 27, 2021, the City's Director of Development Services certified the proposed

project as an Essential Housing Project based on the criteria adopted by the City Council.

As demonstrated by the December 27, 2022, certification, the proposed project would address the City's housing crisis by providing a mix of residential and nonresidential uses and a mix of housing types and sizes. A total of 2,949 housing units would be developed if the proposed project includes a school, or 3,008 units without a school, including 435 moderate-income units. The proposed project would also contribute up to $2 million for affordable housing.

Stringent environmental and Santee General Plan consistency criteria established by the Essential Housing Program would be met. The proposed project would implement mobility improvements, including bus stops, traffic calming, an up to $300,000 contribution to relieve congestion on SR-52, and rideshare/carshare parking. Open space would be conserved. In addition to preserving 1,650.4 acres in the Habitat Preserve, the proposed project would provide at least $300,000 in funding for the management of City-owned natural open space and would plant at least 10 trees per acre of land to be developed. Water use would be reduced by connections to recycled or advanced treated water when PDMWD's East County Advanced Water Purification project is completed.

With regard to energy, air quality, and GHG emissions, the proposed project's residential units would be all-electric and would exceed Title 24 standards by all-electric residential development, implementing heat pump technology, increasing solar production, and expanding ventilation systems. Appliances would be Energy Star rated, electric vehicle chargers would be provided in the Village Center, and solar panels would be installed on accessory buildings and car ports. Wildfire safety would be ensured through implementation of fuel management zones and the Fire Protection Plan (FPP), among the many other measures set forth in the FPP and Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan.

Many miles of trails and sidewalks would be provided with the proposed project, and up to $300,000 would be provided to the City to fund additional improvements to trail facilities. Finally, the proposed project's extensive park and recreational facilities would exceed the Santee Municipal Code standards by at least 5 percent and would provide for multi-purpose playing fields and public recreational facilities for Citywide use. The certification of the proposed project based on the City's Essential Housing Project Credits Assessment Guide and Checklist demonstrates that the current development proposal for the project site addresses the City's immediate housing needs and furthers Santee General Plan

objectives and policies. Therefore, the proposed project is deemed Santee General Plan consistent and does not require an amendment to the Santee General Plan or other legislative act for approval. The proposed Fanita Ranch Development Plan establishes a program for the comprehensive implementation of the project, including development guidelines and standards, which are imposed through a Development Review Permit process.

Table 4.10-1 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR identifies the goals, objectives, and policies found in the various elements of the Santee General Plan that are relevant to the proposed project and provides an evaluation of the proposed project's consistency with them. Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, only the goals, objectives, and policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect are discussed.

City of Santee Zoning Ordinance: The proposed project promotes the Planned Development (PD) designation because it provides a unique development that includes creative housing types and use configurations not currently addressed in the City's existing Zoning Ordinance. The proposed project would include detailed development standards and design guidelines intended to facilitate the creation of new and innovative housing types and configurations, walkability, and housing attainability by creating greater efficiency and addressing the diverse range of incomes, lifestyles, special needs, and household types in Santee and the greater San Diego County region. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the City's Zoning Ordinance upon project approval.

K. MINERAL RESOURCES

1. Regional and Statewide Mineral Resources

Threshold: Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.11.5.1.)

Explanation: Construction of the proposed project has the potential to impact the mineral resources of both known and unknown significance in MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 on the project site. The proposed project would have the potential to impact MRZ-2 lands in the northeastern and central portions of the proposed project where the Vineyard and Orchard Villages would be developed. The development of Fanita Commons, the Farm, and surrounding roadways would have the potential to

impact MRZ-3 lands. The MRZ-2 lands in the southern portion of the project site and the majority of the MRZ-3 lands throughout the rest of the project site would remain undeveloped in the proposed Habitat Preserve. Although there is the potential of mineral recovery from the MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 areas on the project site, in accordance with the Santee General Plan Conservation Element, economic, land use compatibility, and environmental protection factors must be considered when deciding on the appropriateness of mining in a particular area. Furthermore, the Santee General Plan designates the project site for Planned Development, not mineral resources extraction.

The majority of the project site is underlain with two major rock types, granitic rock and Stadium Conglomerate, with alluvial deposits made up of sand, gravel, and silt overlaying these basement rocks. These rock formations are commonly mined elsewhere in the County and the State of California for use as aggregate and are considered valuable to the region and the state. The proposed project would reuse on-site rock materials, such as large boulders, rock cobble, decomposed granite, and processed rock. There are large quantities of rock cobble existing on site. Rock cobble would be collected and used in the construction of water quality and landscape features. It is also anticipated that a relocatable, temporary aggregate plant would be permitted and set up on site during construction. The temporary aggregate plant would crush rock and produce roadway subbase and other aggregate materials for use on site. In addition to rock materials, there are large deposits of decomposed granite on site, which would be reused for trails and other landscape related purposes.

The processing and use of the on-site aggregate would reduce the need for mining and trucking aggregate materials from off-site sources for the infrastructure needs of the proposed project. The on-site aggregate plant would be capable of producing the materials required for roads, drain rock and backfill materials for wet and dry utilities, cobbles to line drainage channels and road medians, and a variety of landscaping materials for on-site and off-site road improvements. Construction of the proposed project would require on-site processing of approximately 937,500 tons of raw aggregate obtained from the project site. This equates to approximately 300,000 cubic yards of manufactured aggregate to be used for the building materials for the proposed project. Areas of high-grade Stadium Conglomerate or granite would be selected as the cut operation is ongoing and would be moved to the aggregate plant as aggregate is needed. The on-site aggregate plant would be permitted by the City as a part of the overall project entitlement

process. Rock-crushing activities would comply with the City's noise standards and regional air quality standards. The on-site aggregate plant would not be designed to produce materials for asphalt or ready-made concrete. These materials would be brought in from local off-site sources. The use of the on-site aggregate plant would terminate at project buildout.

In consideration of the Santee General Plan Conservation Element's Objective 5.0 and Policy 5.1, the project site's proximity to the Goodan Ranch/Sycamore Canyon County Preserve and the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve would likely preclude the proposed project from eligibility for mineral extraction due to the potential habitat and water quality impacts to those preserve areas. Use of the on-site aggregate plant would allow for the mineral resources existing on the project site to be used as part of the proposed project and would not contribute to other environmental impacts from transporting aggregate from off-site locations. Transitioning the on-site aggregate production areas to the proposed project uses would comply with the Santee General Plan Conservation Element's Objective 6.0 and Policy 6.1, which prioritize the reclamation of mined lands for the use of recreational, wildlife habitat, and residential uses. In addition, consistent with the Santee General Plan Conservation Element's Objective 10.0, over 60 percent of the project site would remain in open space, and the mineral resources like aggregate and sediment in the open space would not be lost to the region. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact associated with the loss of mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the state.

2. Locally-Important Mineral Resource

Threshold: Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.11.5.2.)

Explanation: The Santee General Plan Conservation Element designates the project site as MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 lands containing mineral resources of known and unknown importance. However, the proposed project would satisfy the Santee General Plan Conservation Element's Objectives 5.0, 6.0, and 10.0 and Policies 5.1 and 6.1 regarding consideration of environmental disturbance from mineral resources extraction; reclamation of mined lands for recreational, habitat, and residential uses; and the preservation of mineral resources. In addition, the Santee General Plan designates the project site as Planned Development, not mineral resource extraction, and does not

consider the project site a potential significant local source of mineral resources. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact associated with the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

L. NOISE

1. Airport Noise

Threshold: 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?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.12.5.3.)

Explanation: MCAS Miramar is located adjacent to the west/northwestern boundary of the project site. The runways are located approximately 6 miles west of the project site. Additionally, Gillespie Field is located approximately 1.75 miles south of the project site. The project site is currently subject to periodic, audible overflights, particularly from MCAS Miramar. However, the proposed project site is not located within the 60 dBA CNEL noise contour of either airport (SDCRAA 2010, 2011). Additionally, the proposed project does not include any components that would increase air traffic or require changes to existing air traffic patterns. As such, overflights are anticipated to continue to be audible at the project site; however, the proposed project is not anticipated to increase exposure to excessive noise levels from airport operation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

M. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Population Growth

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

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.13.5.1.)

Explanation: *Direct Impacts*

Preferred Land Use Plan with School: The proposed project would result in the construction of 2,949 residential units under the preferred land use plan with school. Of the 2,949 residential units,

445 are proposed to be designated as Active Adult units. The proposed project residential population is based on a population generation factor of 2.9 persons per household and 1.6 persons per Active Adult unit. Based on this population factor, the proposed project is expected to result in a population increase of approximately 7,974 residents (2.9 x 2,703 residential units) + (1.6 x 445 Active Adult units). It is unknown whether the proposed project would generate residents from in the City or result in resident migration from other areas. Presumably, the additional residents generated by the proposed project would be a combination of current residents in the City and residents who migrate from other areas. The analysis conservatively assumes the proposed project would increase the City's population by 7,974 residents.

SANDAG's population projections for the City are based on the adopted Santee General Plan. The current designation of the project site as Planned Development (PD) in the Santee General Plan Land Use Element and the identification of the site to provide 1,395 units in the Santee General Plan Housing Element demonstrate that the site has been planned for residential growth by the City. Using the 2.9 persons per household multiplier, a development project of 1,395 units could result in a population increase of approximately 4,045 residents. The difference between the planned and proposed land uses, when translated to persons per household, is approximately 3,929 persons. However, the project site has been subject to land use planning for the past 40 years, indicating that this site was planned for development even before it was part of the City. In 1980, the project site was designated in the County General Plan for development of approximately 14,000 residential units. When the City adopted its first General Plan (1984), the project site was designated for a maximum of 8,100 residential units. The number of residential units proposed on the project site has continued to vary over the years, with many proposals greater than the 2,949 residential units currently proposed, indicating that the project site has been intended for population growth by the City and the County for many decades.

Further, the production of housing in California has not returned to the level required to meet the projected housing demand and would need to be approximately 100,000 additional residential units annually to meet this demand (HCD 2018). In the County, SANDAG projected that housing production at the regional level will not be able to keep pace with population growth in the coming years. Because new development in the County are constrained to the north by Camp Pendleton, to the west by the Pacific Ocean, and to the south by Mexico, the proposed project would be beneficial to County residents because it would contribute to the overall County housing

stock. Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to begin in 2021 with a buildout of approximately 10 to 15 years. Thus, based on a conservative estimate and averaged over 10 years, the 7,974-person population increase would equate to approximately 797 new residents per year, which would be consistent with the City's historical population increases. In the context of the housing shortage currently experienced by the state and the San Diego region, the provision of new housing on the project site would be considered growth accommodating and would represent a regional benefit.

In addition, the RHNA has identified housing needs based on income level for the City. The Santee General Plan Housing Element lists the project site as the only source for above moderate income residential units. Other sites are identified to meet RHNA requirements for the other income levels. The proposed project would satisfy the RHNA requirements for above moderate residential units and provide additional residential units to meet the anticipated future deficiencies in the City.

Further, the widening of State Route 52 from Cuyamaca Street to State Route 67 has contributed to the loss of housing in the City. This project resulted in the loss of approximately 199 residential units as of 2006, which the proposed project would replace (Poucel 2006). Therefore, the preferred land use plan with school would not result in direct impacts to unplanned population growth, and impacts would be less than significant.

The Planned Development (PD) land use designation in the Santee General Plan allows for a variety of mixed-use development types, including commercial uses. The non-residential components of the proposed project, including commercial uses (retail, service, and office) in the Village Centers, the Farm, and the proposed school, would result in the creation of approximately 450 jobs (411 full-time and 39 part-time positions), which would not induce substantial population growth given the size of the labor pool anticipated on the project site and in the existing City and nearby communities. Approximately 250 jobs would be associated with the proposed on-site school. The proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant numbers of people to relocate to the area solely to be close to the project site for employment purposes. This proposed non-residential development is allowed by the PD land use designation and would not contribute to unplanned population growth.

Land Use Plan Without School: The underlying land use for the on-site designated school location is Medium Density Residential. If the

school site is not acquired for school use by the Santee School District within 2 years of filing the final map containing the school site, then the Medium Density Residential land use may be implemented on the school site for development of an additional 59 residential units, for a total project development potential of 3,008 residential units. Using the same population generation factors of 2.9 persons per household (U.S. Census Bureau 2020) and 1.6 persons per Active Adult unit, the land use plan without school would provide housing for approximately 8,145 residents, which would be an increase of 171 persons compared to the preferred land use plan with school.

As discussed previously, SANDAG's population projections for the City are based on the adopted Santee General Plan land uses for the project site, which would allow 1,395 residential units that could result in a population increase of approximately 4,045 residents (assuming 2.9 persons per household). The difference between the planned and proposed land uses, when translated to persons per household, is approximately 4,100 persons. As stated previously, the project site has been slated for development for the past 40 years with designated residential development ranging from 1,395 to 14,000 residential units. In addition, the state and the County recognize a prominent housing deficit, and the provision of new housing on the project site would be considered growth accommodating and would represent a regional benefit. The proposed project proposes to increase the units on the site up to 3,008 without a school, which would be consistent with the Santee General Plan Housing Element, as amended.

Additionally, the land use plan without school would be a phased development with a construction start date of 2021 and a buildout of approximately 10 to 15 years. Therefore, based on a conservative estimate and averaged over 10 years, the 8,145-person increase would equate to approximately 815 new residents per year. The land use plan without school would be consistent with the historical numeric population increases that have occurred in the City. Therefore, under the land use plan without school, the proposed project would not induce unplanned population growth, and impacts would be less than significant.

The Planned Development (PD) land use designation on the project site would allow for a variety of mixed-use development, including commercial uses. The non-residential components of the land use plan without school would include commercial uses (retail, service, and office) in the Village Centers and the Farm. These uses are estimated to create approximately 200 jobs (161 full-time and 39 part-time staff positions), which would not induce substantial

population growth given the size of the labor pool anticipated on the project site and in the existing City and nearby communities. Non-residential development is allowed by the Planned Development (PD) land use designation and would not contribute to unplanned population growth.

Indirect Impacts

Preferred Land Use Plan With School and Land Use Plan Without School: Population growth can be induced indirectly with the provision of streets or other infrastructure. Substantial new infrastructure would be built to serve the project site including the extension of and improvements to Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue. These street extensions are included in the Santee General Plan Mobility Element and would facilitate residential development contemplated in the Santee General Plan Land Use Element. The proposed project would also extend water and sewer utilities to the project site. The infrastructure improvements would allow for the development of the proposed project, the resulting growth of which is described previously. However, the extension of infrastructure would not allow for additional development on the project site or beyond, since the undeveloped open space on the project site would be dedicated in perpetuity as Habitat Preserve and much of the undeveloped land surrounding the project site is owned by the federal government, County and Padre Dam Municipal Water District and is not planned for future growth. Instead, the proposed infrastructure would accommodate growth already planned for in the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly induce substantial population growth. The proposed project's indirect impacts would be less than significant.

2. Displacement of Housing

Threshold: Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; and displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Finding: No impact. (EIR, §4.13.5.2.)

Explanation: The project site is currently undeveloped, and there are no existing housing units on the project site. As such, the proposed project would have no impacts related to the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing units or people. Therefore, this significance criterion listed previously would not apply to the proposed project,

and no additional analysis related to this criterion is required. There would be no impacts related to this issue area.

N. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Fire Protection

Threshold: 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 fire protection?

Finding: Less than significant. EIR, § 4.14.5.1.)

Explanation: Under the preferred land use plan with school, the proposed project would develop 2,949 new residential units, which would generate approximately 7,974 residents. Under the land use plan without school, the proposed project would develop 3,008 residential units, which would generate approximately 8,145 residents. Using the City's current per capita call generation factor of 100 calls per 1,000 persons, the project site is projected to add approximately 950 calls per year to the SFD's existing call load. Under the land use plan without school, the additional population would increase the annual calculated call volume to 889 calls per year.

Due to increased demand and larger service area, response times to emergencies may exceed established response time goals. The primary standard used in the City to determine adequate levels of service is response time. The Santee General Plan (City of Santee 2003) states the goal is to provide an average maximum initial response time of no more than 6 minutes for fire, rescue and emergency medical services with an average maximum response time of no more than 10 minutes for supporting paramedic transport units 90 percent of the time. Secondary to response time is the number of personnel necessary to perform critical tasks required to safely mitigate emergencies.

According to the Fire Service Letter prepared for the proposed project, fire stations and personnel within the City are currently operating at capacity. To accommodate the increased demand and larger service area, the proposed project designates a 1.5-acre site for a new fire station and requires firefighting apparatus and trained firefighters in Fanita Commons to serve the project site and ensure adequate response times. The new station specifications regarding

size, staffing, and layout would be determined through the Development Plan between the applicant and the City.

The SFD has indicated it can and would serve the project site with the addition of an adequately staffed and equipped fire station. The station design would comply with City building and design standards, including City Ordinance No. 457, Article 86, Amended – Fire Protection Plan Wildland-Urban Interface Areas, in accordance with the approved Development Plan. Either a permanent or a temporary fire station must be constructed prior to the occupancy of any residential units in the proposed project. The proposed project would provide a fully constructed and staffed permanent fire station. In addition, a temporary fire station site equipped with apparatus and personnel may be provided on site until a permanent fire station is complete. The temporary fire station must be in an area that would meet a response time maximum of no more than 6 minutes to all areas of the proposed project. The temporary fire station would be fully equipped and staffed 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. The final location for the temporary fire station would be specified in the approved Development Plan and must be approved by the Santee Fire Chief. The applicant may choose to provide a permanent fire station in lieu of a temporary station. The Santee Fire Chief confirmed the addition of the new fire station, equipment, and staff on the project site would adequately serve the project site while maintaining current response standards. Travel time from the new permanent station to the most remote (distant) lot on the project site is calculated at 3 minutes and 26 seconds. This would allow just under 2 minutes for dispatch and turnout and would meet the Santee General Plan response time goal of no more than 6 minutes.

Fire flow pressure would be required to be a minimum of 2,500 gallons per minute for 3 hours of fire flow for single-family and multi-family residential and 3,500 gallons per minute for 4 hours of fire flow for commercial areas with fire hydrants spaced on average every 300 feet. New construction in the City requires the installation of fire sprinklers, which would further reduce the potential for fire loss on the project site. To address fire and life safety issues on new development, the City's Fire Marshal reviews proposed residential, commercial, and industrial projects through the City's Development Review process to ensure that adequate fire hydrant locations, water flow pressures, access for emergency vehicles, and other requirements are met, which would also reduce the need for fire protection services (City of Santee 2003).

The on-site fire station would be constructed to serve the increased development and population associated with the proposed project and would be a project component located within the boundaries of

the project site. Because the proposed project would provide an on-site fire station to serve the anticipated increase in development and population, it would not require construction or expansion of additional new fire protection facilities off site. Therefore, impacts associated with the need for new or expanded fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection would not result in a new significant impact.

2. Police Protection

Threshold: 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 police protection?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.14.5.2.)

Explanation: The proposed project would generate additional population under either the preferred land use plan with school or the land use plan without school. The increase in population would increase the demand for law enforcement services, with a consequent increase in the response times to emergency and non-emergency calls. The SDCSD provided a will-serve letter that includes service ratio and response time information for law enforcement services provided to the City by the County. The ratio of officers to population in the City is approximately 2.5 full-time deputies per 1,000 residential unit, which is higher than the SDCSD goal[1] of providing 1 patrol position per 10,000 residents. Based on this ratio, the addition of the proposed project would equate to a need for approximately 7.4 new officers to serve the proposed project at full buildout under the preferred land use plan with school or 7.5 officers under the land use plan without school.

The proposed project would be constructed in four phases, and the addition of approximately 7,974 residents under the preferred land use plan with school, or 8,145 residents under the land use plan without school, would be spread out over approximately 10 to 15 years until full buildout, enabling the City to contract with the SDCSD for appropriate increases in the level of service, including personnel, equipment, shifts, and person-hours committed to the City as a

[1] The SDCSD staffing goals and facility plans are based on population instead of residential units.

whole.

The Village Center land use designation in Fanita Commons allows for the development of a law enforcement satellite office for future expansion of police protection services, if deemed necessary, to accommodate these additional officers. Overall staffing would be a contractual commitment in which both the City and SDCSD would enter into and agree on personnel required for the proposed project. As stated in the SDCSD will-serve letter for the proposed project, the provision of additional officers would not require the need for new or expanded police facilities on the project site to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. The additional officers could be in the SDCSD's existing facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new significant impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities.

3. Schools

Threshold: Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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 schools?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.14.5.3.)

Explanation: According to the Santee School District (SSD), the development of 2,949 residential units under the preferred land use plan with school would generate approximately 635 K–8 students. Though SSD identifies that it has capacity to house some new students in existing schools within the district, in order to accommodate the total influx of new students, a new school facility would need to be constructed. The proposed project reserves a school site for a potential K–8 public school or other educational uses on the project site boundaries. If acquired by the SSD, the site can accommodate up to 700 students, including existing City students and new students on the project site, plus required staff. Under this land use plan, the proposed project would provide an on-site K–8 school to serve the proposed project's anticipated increase in population, and would not require construction or expansion of additional K–8 school facilities off site.

Additionally, according to the Grossmont Union High School District (GUHSD), the project site is within the West Hills High School attendance area, and if necessary, the GUHSD may consider a boundary adjustment to allow students living on the project site to

attend Santana High School. According to the GUHSD, both of these school facilities have adequate capacity to serve students from the project site and the GUHSD does not anticipate the need to modify or expand the schools to accommodate the additional students from the proposed project. Therefore, impacts associated with the need for new or expanded school facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for public schools would be less than significant.

Should the SSD not acquire the on-site school site, the proposed project would allow development of an additional 59 residential units on the school site. Based on the generation rates provided by the SSD, the land use plan without school is anticipated to generate 647 students, which is only 12 more students than the SSD's calculation of 635 students under the preferred land use plan with school.

According to the SSD, the district does not have sufficient classroom space to accommodate the additional students generated by this land use plan. However, given the 10–15 year project buildout, a new or expanded school would not be needed for several years after on-site residential units begin to be occupied. The SSD uses a centralized, open enrollment system, whereby students are assigned to schools based on available space. Therefore, an interim solution for school placement of new students generated by the proposed project would be to assign them to any of the SSD's current nine schools, depending on space availability. SSD makes every attempt to assign students to their school of residence, when requested. However, given available space, it is not always possible to assign students to the facility closest to their residence. An additional option may include the construction of new classrooms on existing school campuses to accommodate the increase in students. If the long-term solution is an expanded or new school, the SSD would be required to comply with CEQA under separate review.

According to the GUHSD, both of the high schools that would serve the project site (West Hills High School and Santana High School) have adequate capacity to serve students from the proposed project, including the additional students generated by the development of 59 residential units in the area sited for the school. The GUHSD does not anticipate the need to modify or expand schools to accommodate additional students from the proposed project.

The applicant would be required to pay development impact fees for the proposed project's residential and commercial development in the amount required at the time of building permit issuance. Both school districts have established school impact mitigation fees to address the facility impacts created by residential and commercial

development. The districts use these fees to pay for facility expansion and upgrades needed to serve new students. These fees would be collected during the plan check process. Payment of mandatory school impact fees in accordance with SB 50 would mitigate potential impacts to school facilities from the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

4. Other Public Facilities - Libraries

Threshold: Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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 libraries?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.14.5.4.)

Explanation: The Santee branch library, which is run by the Serra Cooperative Library System in conjunction with the County of San Diego, is considered to be in a space deficit. The City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Five-Year Budget (Fiscal Years 2020 through 2024) includes a project to develop a new library facility (City of Santee n.d.). The CIP project would build a new, 20,000 square foot library facility to replace the undersized space currently rented by the County of San Diego. Though a specific location is not identified at this time, as part of the CIP approval process, the City would conduct environmental review compliant with CEQA and identify mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts, as applicable. The library CIP project is currently unfunded by the City and is anticipated to occur in Fiscal Year 2023–2024. It is anticipated that the New Library Building Fund created by the Friends of Santee Library would provide some funding for the new library.

The construction of the proposed project would incrementally increase the existing library space deficit. The proposed project includes a Village Center land use designation that would allow for a mix of uses including civic uses. While a library is not precluded, a designated library site has not been identified on the project site. If a library is built on the project site in the Village Center area, the library construction and operation would be no more impactful than the other proposed commercial or public uses proposed within this land use designation.

Though the proposed project would be required to pay development impact fees (Chapter 12.30 of the Santee Municipal Code), which fund the construction of public facilities that are reasonably related

to the impacts of the new development, the fees associated with Chapter 12.30 do not go toward funding the construction of libraries. The location of a new library on site or an expanded library off site has not been identified; however, the provision of new facilities off site would be subject to separate environmental review. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

O. RECREATION

1. Increased Use

Threshold: 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?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.15.5.1.)

Explanation: Parks. The proposed project would develop 2,949 residential units (under the preferred land use plan with school) or 3,008 residential units (under the land use plan without school). Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase of approximately 7,974 persons (under the preferred land use plan with school) or 8,145 persons (under the land use plan without school) on the project site and in the City, which, as of 2019, has a current population of 58,408, bringing the estimated population in the City to 66,382 (under the preferred land use plan with school) or 66,553 (under the land use plan without school).

The City's objective of providing 10 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents would be satisfied through compliance with the Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 12.40, requirement to provide 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents of parkland dedication and the provision of "other recreation and open space areas" equal to 5 acres per 1,000 persons. The increase in population from implementation of the proposed project would require approximately 79 acres of additional parkland under the preferred land use plan with school or approximately 81 acres under the land use plan without school. Including the proposed project's population increase, the City would require approximately 663 acres of developed parkland Citywide under the preferred land use plan with school or approximately 665 acres under the land use plan without school to meet the Santee General Plan policy.

To meet the City's minimum standard while adhering to the Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 12.40, the proposed project would provide

new recreational amenities, including 78 acres of public and private parkland for active and passive recreation and 4.5 acres (approximately 4.8 miles) of trail land consisting of the perimeter trail and Stowe Trail connection for a total of 82.5 acres. This parkland could be accessed by the public at large and project residents. Per the public park credit provisions set forth in the Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 12.40.110, Credit for Public Parks, developed parkland dedicated to and maintained by the City would receive up to 100 percent park credit. Developed parkland maintained by a homeowners association and trail systems would receive up to 50 percent credit per the private park credit provisions in Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 12.40.100, Credit for Private Parks. Applying these credits, approximately 52.4 acres of the total 82.5 acres of public and private parkland and trail land would be available for parkland dedication credit, which would satisfy the Santee Municipal Code parkland dedication requirement of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents based on 740.5 square feet per single-family unit and 675.2 square feet per multi-family unit. The proposed project would be required to provide 47.6 acres of dedicated parks and trails based on the Santee Municipal Code requirement stated above. With the provision of 52.4 acres of dedicated parks and trails, the proposed project would result in a surplus of 4.8 acres. Under the land use plan without school, the developed parkland and recreational facility dedication requirement would increase by 0.9 acre due to the addition of 59 Medium Density Residential units. This would result in a total parkland dedication requirement of 48.5 acres and would result in a surplus of 3.9 acres under the land use plan without school.

Of the 82.5 acres of parkland and trails, the largest proposed park would be the Community Park (31.2 acres) in Fanita Commons. This park would be the primary location for active and organized recreational activities on the project site. Eight Neighborhood Parks totaling 30.4 acres would be provided in key locations to define neighborhoods and provide community-gathering spaces. Thirty-one Mini-Parks totaling 16.4 acres would be designed to enhance open space areas such as vistas and riparian corridors, break up development patterns, and provide visual relief. The 1.6-acre Village Green would be a special Mini-Park that, together with the Village Center and the Farm, would establish a centralized landmark and event space for the entire community. The proposed perimeter trail and Stowe Trail connection would total approximately 4.5 acres (approximately 4.8 miles). Applying the applicable 50 percent or 100 percent park credit to these acreages, these parks and trails would provide 52.4 acres of credited parkland dedicated to the City for public use.

Furthermore, to comply with the specific ratio outlined in Santee Municipal Code, Section 12.40.070 (740.5 square feet per single-family unit and 675.2 square feet per multi-family unit), approximately 47.6 acres of other recreation and open space areas would be needed to meet the Santee General Plan Recreation Element Objective 1.0. To meet that requirement, the proposed project would provide 49 additional acres of parks, trails, and other recreation and open space areas, resulting in a surplus of 1.4 acres. The 49 acres includes the 4.8 acres of surplus public and private parks and trails described previously, the 27.3-acre Farm, 10.9 acres of Open Space areas with an Agriculture Overlay, and 6 acres of multi-purpose trails.

In addition, playgrounds and other recreational facilities would be provided at the reserved school site under the preferred land use plan with school should the Santee School District acquire the site and construct a school. When taken together, the 52.4 acres of dedicated parks and trails, the 49 additional acres of other recreation and open space areas, and the miscellaneous playground and recreational facilities would support a broad range of active and passive recreational opportunities to serve the City's population and proposed residents and would satisfy Objective 1.0 of the Santee General Plan Recreation Element.

The proposed project would be designed so that every residence would be within a short walking distance of a park or trail. Active sports-oriented parks, playgrounds, gardens, and seating areas with views that provide meditative space would be spread throughout the community to allow residents opportunities for outdoor recreation. Play structures in the parks would be of non-combustible or other materials approved by the Santee Fire Department. Park designs would be consistent with the Fire Protection Plan prepared for the proposed project. In addition, an AgMeander would use the proposed trail, path, and sidewalk system and provide numerous interpretive stations and exhibits.

Under existing conditions, the City has approximately 823 acres of public parkland, or approximately 12 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents, which exceeds Objective 1.0 in the Santee General Plan Recreation Element. Implementation of the proposed project would increase the parkland inventory for the City to approximately 13 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents under either the preferred land use plan with school or the land use plan without school. The proposed project would add public parkland acreage to an already surplus City inventory, which would increase access to public recreational facilities for the entire community. In total, the proposed project would provide more than the minimum acreage required by the Santee General Plan Recreation Element for the

proposed project's population increase.

Trails. Trails proposed throughout the project site would provide connectivity between the villages, existing City development, and regional trails. The proposed project would provide over 35 miles of trails (23 acres), including the perimeter trail and Stowe Trail connection (approximately 4.8 miles combined), that were used to calculate compliance with the Santee Municipal Code. While not all trails would meet access requirements (particularly the existing primitive trails in the Habitat Preserve), the proposed project would comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act accessibility requirements to the extent practicable. The proposed project's local trails would connect with the nearby existing regional trails north to Goodan Ranch/Sycamore Canyon County Preserve and south to Mission Trails Regional Park. Trail locations throughout the project site would be coordinated to minimize conflicts with sensitive habitat areas by using existing trails and dirt roads and providing signage, well-defined trail markers, fencing, and community education to protect habitat areas.

The Santee General Plan Recreation Element and Objective 9.0, Policies 9.1 through 9.5, of the Trails Element discuss recreational trails in the City's 2018 Draft Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan. As considered in the Recreation and Trails Elements, certain trails in the proposed Habitat Preserve would offer recreational benefits and may be included in the overall park and open space calculations for the proposed project.

The proposed project would provide sufficient acreage of parks, trails, and recreational facilities to satisfy the parkland dedication requirements and comply with the Santee General Plan Recreational Element Objectives 1.0 and 2.0 to provide adequate recreational facilities including trails.

The proposed project would provide a variety of new, on-site recreational amenities to occupants of the project site, thereby offsetting the need to go off site to use recreational facilities. While project residents may use existing Neighborhood and Regional Parks or other recreational facilities, they would also be expected to use the on-site recreational amenities due to convenience and variety. Therefore, substantial physical deterioration of the existing recreational facilities would not be expected to occur or be accelerated. Impacts would be less than significant.

P. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC

1. Design Hazards

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

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.16.5.3.)

Explanation: Implementation of the proposed project would establish a network of streets of varying design capacities tailored to meet the needs of the three proposed villages. The Fanita Ranch Development Plan has developed its own street design criteria intended to address safety, aesthetics, and functionality, as well as site constraints. The streets would be designed to meet or exceed Santee Fire Department (SFD) requirements. The project would design a system of complete streets that supports multiple user types, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders. On-site streets would generally be two lanes and would include a variety of design elements, including roundabouts, split streets, landscaped medians, and parkways.

A Traffic Calming Plan would be implemented throughout the proposed project in an effort to reduce traffic-related hazards by lowering vehicle speeds on neighboring streets without restricting access. The overall goals of the Traffic Calming Plan would be to improve the quality of life for residents, reduce impacts of motor vehicles on local and collector streets, create safe and attractive streets, and create a friendly environment for pedestrians and bicyclists. Several traffic calming measures would be implemented throughout the project site to assist in meeting these goals.

To relieve potentially dangerous intersections, a series of roundabouts would be incorporated throughout the proposed project to eliminate the need for left-turn and U-turn movements, controlling vehicle speed, and providing a safer environment for pedestrians. Additional features include specialized wildlife crossing on Streets “V” and “W,” which traverse the Habitat Preserve. To create a safe corridor for automobiles, accommodate nocturnal wildlife movement, and enhance the viability of planned wildlife crossings, these streets would be marked with highly reflective pavement markers instead of standard City roadside lights. A wildlife crossing tunnel would be provided under the extension of Cuyamaca Street near the entrance to Orchard Village. It has been demonstrated that, from an animal’s perspective, the pavement markers mimic a small rock in the landscape and would not negatively impact wildlife movement. Retroreflective pavement markers (pursuant to the California Department of Transportation specifications) would be spaced 24 feet of center on these segments. Bollard-type lighting with touch-activated sensors would be located on the pedestrian walkway that runs along these streets to enhance pedestrian safety. In addition,

there would be agricultural uses on the project site primarily within the central Farm. Outside materials storage would be provided for farming equipment and machinery. A tunnel would be constructed under Street "W" to allow for the movement of agriculture equipment to and from the Farm and avoid any potential conflicts with automobile traffic.

The proposed project would improve and construct new segments of three Santee General Plan Mobility Element streets: Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue. Improvements would also occur at the terminus of Carlton Hills Boulevard and at existing dead-end streets that terminate at the project site boundary. Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street would be widened and include sidewalks, multi-purpose trails, emergency lanes and enhanced pedestrian crossings to encourage multimodal transportation and pedestrian safety.

The proposed project would include transportation design features to enhance public safety and would not result in changes to roadway design that would cause increased hazards. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

2. Emergency Access

Threshold: Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.16.5.4.)

Explanation: The project proposes the extension of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue to allow access to and from the project site with planned improvements on the existing segments and intersections to accommodate additional project traffic.

A Fire Protection Plan and Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan were prepared for the proposed project to address emergency access and evacuation in the case of an emergency. The proposed project would provide emergency access that meets current City requirements throughout the proposed development areas. The proposed internal looped roadways would be built to the currently adopted California Fire Code and City Ordinance 545 (Sections 503.2.1, 503.2.3) requirements and would provide travel lane widths consistent with the Fanita Ranch Development Plan standards, adequate parking, 28-foot inside radius, grade maximums, signals at intersections, and extremely wide roadside fuel modification zones. Interior residential streets would be designed to accommodate a minimum of a 77,000-pound fire truck. All dead-end streets would meet SFD requirements. Additionally, the streets would provide residents the option to

evacuate from at least two routes that lead to three main arteries.

The project site would have two points of primary access for emergency response and evacuation. Depending on the nature of the emergency, future residents would exit to the south on Fanita Parkway or Cuyamaca Street. It is anticipated that the majority of the community traffic would exit the project site via Cuyamaca Street, which would also connect to the extension of Magnolia Avenue. These are the most direct routes to the project site. Both streets would include bike lanes that could be used as an additional emergency lane for first responders. These streets would provide access to major traffic corridors including directly or indirectly to SR-52 to the south, SR-67 to the east, I-8 to the south, I-125 to the south, and I-15 to the west. Fanita Parkway would be used for emergency access by the western portion of the proposed project development. The planned extension and improvements to Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue south of the Project site would be sized to provide adequate access for fire equipment and personnel. The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Q. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Water Supplies

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

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.17.5.2.)

Explanation: Proposed project water demand was calculated based on land use type, number of residential units, the Santee Municipal Code, and the PDMWD-defined unit demand factors. The calculation also took into account the effects of climate change on water supply, including the rising sea levels and changes in weather events. For water demand per residential land use area, the residential units are multiplied by a per capita water-use factor of 100 gallons per capita per day obtained from PDMWD's 2015 Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan and multiplied by the estimated number of persons per residential unit as defined in the Santee Municipal Code. Commercial and irrigation water demands are calculated per WAS design criteria based on land area type. The total projected water demand for the entire project site is 1.44 mgd, or 1,618 acre-feet per year (AFY). PDMWD's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) accounts for 840 AFY of demand associated with the proposed project. Thus,

the WSA prepared for the project evaluated the additional demand of 778 AFY associated with the proposed project that was not previously accounted for.

Supply shortfalls are projected in the single and multiple dry year scenarios. PDMWD can address the shortfalls identified here and in its 2015 UWMP through the implementation of conservation measures identified in Section 8 of its 2015 UWMP, Water Shortage Contingency Planning (Appendix O3). The San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) 2015 UWMP has identified no shortages in a single dry year until 2035 and no shortages in multiple dry years until 2028, provided carryover storage supplies are utilized in both instances. Carryover storage currently totals 170,000 AFY. SDCWA maintains that single and multiple dry year shortages can be mitigated through extraordinary water conservation actions and dry year transfers, which the SDCWA successfully acquired and used during the 2007–2011 shortage period (SDCWA 2015 UWMP Section 9.3.) Further, the shortfalls identified in the SDCWA's 2015 UWMP would be mitigated by the interim demand forecast reduction of approximately 60,000 AFY for the 2020 to 2040 planning horizon identified in the 2018 SDCWA Annual Report based on water-use efficiency increase projections throughout the region and with the increased output at the Carlsbad Desalination Plant in comparison with the SDCWA's 2015 UWMP. Similarly, PDMWD can address the shortfalls identified in its 2015 UWMP through the implementation of conservation measures identified in Section 8 of its 2015 UWMP, Water Shortage Contingency Planning.

The proposed project's projected demand is 1,618 AFY. PDMWD's projected total water demand for 2040 is 16,816 AFY (14,800 AFY potable and 2,016 AFY recycled) or 15 mgd. According to PDMWD's 2015 Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan and Program Environmental Impact Report, which were approved by the PDMWD Board in May 2017, only 0.75 mgd or 840 AFY of proposed project demand is accounted for in the 2040 projections for PDMWD because it was based on the previously proposed project from 2007. Therefore, the 2015 UWMP only accounts for 56 percent of the proposed project's calculated demand. The proposed project's accounted for demand of 840 AFY is 5 percent of PDMWD's total potable demand for the year 2040. The proposed project's total demand of 1,618 AFY would be about 9.6 percent of PDMWD's 2040 adjusted potable water demand of 15,578 AFY (14,800 AFY + 778 AFY [unaccounted for demand by the proposed project]).

Since PDMWD's 2015 UWMP only accounts for 840 AFY of the proposed project's total projected demand of 1,618 AFY over the 20-year planning horizon, the WSA evaluates and concludes that the

additional required 778 AFY can be accommodated by additional imported water from the SDCWA. The SDCWA has confirmed in a response letter that it can meet the additional 778 AFY demand associated with the proposed project through the use of its accelerated forecast growth (AFG) component of its 2015 UWMP. The AFG is incorporated into the SDCWA's demand forecast at a regional level and is available to all member agencies to meet additional demand increments not previously identified. The demand associated with the AFG component is included in the SDCWA's regional total demand forecast and is intended to account for a portion of SANDAG's estimated residential land use development that is currently projected to occur beyond the SDCWA's 2040 planning horizon but that has the potential to move forward on an accelerated schedule. This AFG demand was incorporated by the SDCWA at a regional level for planning purposes and is not portioned out by member agencies. This allows for an additional 4,807 AFY beginning in 2025, a portion of which (778 AFY) has been allocated by SDCWA to PDMWD for the proposed project.

In addition, the proposed project would implement water-efficient irrigation, landscaping, appliances, and fixtures to further reduce water demand. Landscape plans would be required to ensure compliance with applicable requirements, and the applicant would be required to plan and install water-efficient devices and landscaping in accordance with applicable PDMWD development guidelines and standards, ordinances, and requirements.

PDMWD is also planning and developing a regional drought-proof water supply known as the East County Advanced Water Purification (ECAWP) Project, which would decrease PDMWD's reliance on imported water supplies and improve water supply reliability. The ECAWP Project, which is currently in the project procurement and permitting phase, is anticipated to treat the combined 2025 wastewater flow of approximately 15 million gallons per day (MGD) and produce up to 12,880 acre-feet per year (AFY), or 11.5 MGD, of new, reliable, and locally controlled potable water supply which represents approximately 30% of East County San Diego's water demand. If the ECAWP Project is implemented, based on this projected time frame, the proposed project would utilize purified water from the ECAWP Project within the 20-year water supply planning horizon and beyond. The ECAWP Project is not necessary for PDMWD to meet the demand associated with the proposed project, however. But it could provide an additional supply source for further water supply security to the proposed project and other PDMWD customers if it is implemented. Further, PDMWD plans to reduce its dependence on imported supplies from the SDCWA by continuing permanent water conservation efforts.

The effects of climate change drastically alter the overall planning required for the conservation and distribution of Metropolitan's water supply. Accounting for the effects of climate change is a challenging task because the events that can occur are unpredictable. However, previous hydraulic studies produced by Metropolitan have provided a strong basis for the prediction of future events. According to Metropolitan's UWMP, the predicted impacts of global climate change that could affect Metropolitan's water supply include, but are not limited to: (1) reduction in the average annual snowpack; (2) changes in the timing, intensity, and location of weather events; (3) rising sea levels; (4) decrease in local sources such as groundwater; (5) increase in urban and agricultural water demand; (6) degrading water source; (7) declines in ecosystem viability; and (8) changes to pumping and power operations.

To prevent further greenhouse gases emissions, Metropolitan has implemented steps to reduce the carbon footprint of its facilities, including the addition of hydroelectric power plants that create energy from the water flowing through pipelines, and implementation of solar power technologies to its facilities. Metropolitan not only audits its own energy usage but also voluntarily reports its greenhouse gas emissions to California's Climate Registry.

Metropolitan has taken steps to offset the effects of climate change on water supply. To reduce the water impacts due to climate change, Metropolitan has developed and implemented drought response action items. According to "Current Conditions" section of the Metropolitan 2015 UWMP, Metropolitan's drought response actions include providing incentives for on-site recycled water hook ups; augmenting water supplies with water transfers and exchange; improving storage programs; upgrading its distribution system to enhance CRA water delivery; and implementing the Water Supply Allocation Plan to distribute the limited imported supplies and preserve storage reserves.

The conservation method allows for a reduction in energy that normally would have been used by exporting water instead of storing it. With the use of gravitational distribution for recycled water, less electricity is required to generate energy needed to distribute pressurized water. Efforts to implement water conservation include recycling and reusing sea water and wastewater as a reliable source of potable water. Applying such measures reduces the amount of water imported from the SWP and the Colorado River.

Likewise, SDCWA has developed strategies to manage the supply uncertainties associated with a changing climate. This includes the foundational strategy to diversify the region's resource mix through

development of local projects, such as recycled water and seawater desalination and reduce reliance on imported and local surface supplies whose yields could potentially decrease as a result of climate change (see Tables 10-3 and 10-4 of the SDCWA 2015 UWMP). SDCWA uses tracking metrics to monitor the progress on implementation of its water resource mix, which are then used in updates to its UWMP every 5 years.

Therefore, based on PDMWD's projected supplies, combined with additional confirmed supplies from the SDCWA AFG, water supplies are sufficiently available to meet the proposed project's demand in normal, single dry, and multiple dry years, provided that the water shortage contingency planning measures identified in PDMWD's 2015 UWMP and the SDCWA's 2015 UWMP are implemented in dry years. In addition, efforts underway by Metropolitan, SDCWA, and PDMWD to diversify and augment their supplies provide further assurance of the sufficiency of the water supply for the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on water supply availability.

2. Wastewater Capacity

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

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.17.5.3.)

Explanation: The proposed project would construct new public sewer infrastructure that would be owned, operated, and maintained by PDMWD. Sewage generated on the project site would be treated at the existing Ray Stoyer WRF or at the new WRF to be constructed as part of the ECAWP Project. In instances where the WRF is offline for maintenance, capital improvement, etc., sewage generated on the project site would be diverted to the City of San Diego's Metropolitan Sewerage System. PDMWD's existing Ray Stoyer WRF does not have adequate capacity alone to serve the sewer demand generated by the proposed project. A combination of the WRF and the available capacity in the San Diego Metropolitan Sewerage System (Metro) would provide sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project.

The Sewer Service Study prepared for the proposed project used flow generation rates developed in PDMWD's 2015 Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan. The study analyzed average dry weather flow (ADWF), peak dry weather flow (PDWF), and peak wet weather flow

(PWWF) scenarios. The average daily flow was analyzed for the proposed project under both the preferred land use plan with school and the land use plan without school. Based on the analysis performed, the school site would produce an ADWF of 15,000 GPD while the alternative residential use would generate an ADWF of just under 11,000 GPD. Therefore, the preferred land use plan with school is used because it would generate a higher ADWF and thus represents a worst-case scenario based on PDMWD's 2015 Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan consumption criteria. The proposed project would generate approximately 591,158 GPD of wastewater. This equates to approximately 662 AFY.

According to the 2015 UWMP, PDMWD's wastewater collection system consists of sewer mains, lift stations, and flow diversion structures. Almost all of the collected wastewater flows to the PDMWD's influent pump station. Up to 2,240 AFY of wastewater is pumped to the PDMWD WRF and 2,175 AFY is pumped to the Metro system where it receives advanced primary treatment at the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant. In total, PDMWD can collect approximately 4,426 AFY, or 3,951,277 GPD. However, the PDMWD's Ray Stoyer WRF was analyzed for adequate treatment capacity for the proposed project, which can treat up to 2,240 AFY. According to PDMWD's 2015 UWMP, the Ray Stoyer WRF treated approximately 2,175 AFY in 2015.

The proposed project would generate approximately 662 AFY, or 591,158 GPD ADWF. In addition, PDMWD's 2015 Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan has already included 1,380 residential units on the project site consistent with the Santee General Plan as part of the ADWF future projections. Therefore, a portion of the proposed project's sewer demand totaling approximately 392 AFY has already been planned for by PDMWD. Further, there are plans to expand the existing PDMWD influent pump station and Ray Stoyer WRF through the ECAWP Program. This program would increase the capacity of the wastewater system to approximately 6,725 AFY by 2040, consistent with buildout of the proposed project. However, the remaining sewer demand of approximately 270 AFY from the proposed project would be capable of being treated by PDMWD facilities with or without this expansion. Thus, PDMWD has sufficient existing or planned capacity to receive and treat wastewater from the project site. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on wastewater treatment capacity.

3. Solid Waste

Threshold: Would the Project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Finding: Less than significant. EIR, § 4.17.5.4.)

Explanation: Construction activities including clearing, grubbing, grading, and building would occur and produce green waste, scraps, and other debris typical of construction. Operation of the proposed project would require services to pick up solid waste generated by the proposed land uses on the project site.

Residential and commercial trash hauling and industrial solid waste, green waste, and recycling collection and disposal services for the proposed project would be provided by Waste Management, Inc., under a contractual franchise agreement with the City. Waste Management, Inc., would provide trash, recycling, and yard waste pickup services on a weekly basis for residential customers and up to seven times per week for business customers. Waste Management Inc., identified in the solid waste service letter that they are capable of adequately serving the proposed project and would not need to provide additional services or expand existing facilities to do so.

Solid waste from the proposed project that is not recycled or diverted would be hauled to Sycamore Landfill, a 349-acre site at 8514 Mast Boulevard approximately 1.7 miles southwest of the project site. Sycamore Landfill is fully permitted as a Class III landfill and accepts only routine household and commercial waste; thus, hazardous wastes are not collected. According to the Solid Waste Information System database maintained by CalRecycle, the landfill's maximum permitted capacity is approximately 147,908,000 cubic yards with a current remaining capacity of approximately 113,972,637 cubic yards as of 2016. Based on the remaining capacity and disposal rates, the Sycamore Landfill is expected to close December 31, 2042 (CalRecycle 2019).

Based on CalRecycle's 2017 waste disposal rate of approximately 6.2 pounds per day per resident and recycling rate of 42 percent, the residential portion of the proposed project would dispose of approximately 28,675 pounds per day of waste (7,974 residents x 6.2 pounds per day – 42 percent) under the preferred land use plan with school and 28,289 pounds per day (8,145 residents x 6.2 pounds per day – 42 percent) under the land use plan without school. Based on CalRecycle's employee disposal rate of 11.9 pounds per employee per day and an employee recycling rate of 62 percent, the commercial portion of the proposed project would generate

approximately 2,035 pounds per day (450 employees x 11.9 pounds per day – 62 percent) under the preferred land use plan with school and approximately 904 pounds per day (200 employees x 11.9 pounds per day – 62 percent) under the land use plan without school. The total waste generated for the proposed project would be approximately 30,710 pounds of municipal solid waste per day under the preferred land use plan with school and approximately 29,193 pounds of municipal solid waste per day under the land use plan without school. Converting Sycamore Landfill's remaining capacity to pounds, it has approximately 192 billion pound capacity as of 2016. Thus, the landfill has adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. In addition, waste diversion rates are expected to continuously increase as more waste is diverted from the landfills as mandated by AB 1826 and SB 939. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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 and impacts would be less than significant.

4. Solid Waste Laws

Threshold: Will the Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Finding: Less than significant. (EIR, § 4.17.5.5.)

Explanation: Development of the proposed project would result in an increase in domestic municipal solid waste generation. Solid waste generated by the proposed project would be hauled away by Waste Management, Inc., to Sycamore Landfill in the City of San Diego. As California laws get more stringent, the amount of waste sent and managed at Sycamore Landfill would be expected to decrease. Waste Management, Inc., is required to implement measures to divert 65 percent of waste generated during construction/demolition activities. Santee Municipal Code, Section 9.04.080, also requires that any covered project submit a completed C&D debris management plan that identifies waste materials expected to be generated by the proposed project at the time of demolition or building permit application.

Standard solid waste practices identified in AB 939 and AB 1826 would be implemented throughout operation of the proposed project. Example measures include waste characterization, source reduction, recycling, composting, education and public information, special waste, household hazardous waste, and programs for organic waste. Waste and recycling for project construction and operation would comply with CALGreen and current regulations,

such as SB 1374, designed to divert waste from landfills. Effective January 1, 2017, all jurisdictions are required to divert 65 percent of construction waste. The proposed project would also comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance (Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 9.04) requiring the diversion of 65 percent of construction waste as required under AB 939.

Non-residential development and attached residential development in the proposed project would comply with the trash enclosure requirements. Detached residential development and attached residential development where private garages are attached to individual units would participate in the residential curbside pickup program managed by Waste Management, Inc. Solid waste containers for these units, which would be stored in private side or rear yards or in garages, would be picked up from the street curbside or alley edge on collection days. In addition, the proposed project would be required to institute recycling services to divert at least 90 percent of the waste generated and 70 percent of non-hazardous construction waste, and provide recycling and composting services (Mitigation Measure GHG-2), which includes providing recycling containers within multi-family residential communities and non-residential buildings and providing composting containers and compost collection services within commercial and office facilities.

Proposed development on the project site would involve the reuse of on-site rock materials, such as large boulders, rock cobble, decomposed granite, and processed rock. There are large quantities of rock cobble existing on site. Rock cobble would be collected and used in the construction of water quality and landscape features. It is also anticipated that a temporary aggregate processing operation would be set up on site during construction. The aggregate processing plant would produce roadway sub-base and other aggregate materials for use on site. In addition to rock materials, there are large deposits of decomposed granite on site, which would be reused for trails and other landscape-related purposes. Use of on-site materials would eliminate the need for importing and exporting rough or finished materials, reducing the number of solid waste disposal truck trips and associated construction-related vehicle emissions in support of the Sustainable Santee Plan (2020).

The design of residences on the project site would be constructed of durable materials and simple design to minimize materials waste. The Architectural Design Guidelines for the proposed project include recommendations for efficient residence designs that can potentially reduce the amount of lumber and other building materials needed. Strategies include simple massing forms and efficient framing techniques, use of rapidly renewable resources, and installation of

durable material that require less frequent replacement. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant.

R. WILDFIRE

1. Emergency Response Plan or Evacuation Plan

Threshold: Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: Less than significant. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.5.1.)

Explanation: The proposed project's Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix P2 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) was prepared based on the 2018 Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization and County of San Diego Operational Area (OA) Emergency Operations Plan (County EOP), its Evacuation Annex Q (Evacuation Annex Q), and the 2020 City of Santee Emergency Operations Plan (City EOP), which references the County EOP for purposes of evacuation planning. These plans provide a framework for implementing well-coordinated emergency response and evacuations between many agencies, organizations, and jurisdictions. In the event of a wildfire or other emergency, the agencies follow these pre-plans and utilize experience, situational awareness, and available resources to move people from areas of higher, to areas of lower, potential risk.

The proposed project would provide supplemental project-specific information to these plans and inform area residents of what they can anticipate during an evacuation event. In the event of an actual wildfire emergency, law enforcement and fire agencies charged with managing evacuations likely would not refer to a project-specific evacuation plan but would rely on the protocols established by these pre-plans (EOPs and Evacuation Annex Q) as a "playbook" to use for guiding anticipated evacuation timeframes under the most probable scenarios. In an actual wildfire emergency, unified command would take into account numerous factors including wind speeds and direction, humidity, topography, fuel loading, emergency access routes, evacuation routes, shelter-in-place options, time needed to evacuate, fire-hardening of structures (or lack thereof), and other variables, and issue specific evacuation or shelter-in-place directives consistent with the process and protocols outlined in the City and County's EOPs.

However, the proposed project's Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan acts as a site-specific supplement to the EOPs, describing the "playbook" for evacuation of the project site based on and consistent with the County and City EOPs.

During the project's construction phase, appropriate actions would be implemented to maintain evacuation routes so that they are available if needed. Temporary road closures or detours during construction would be coordinated with SFD and others, as necessary, and an alternate route provided so that evacuations and emergency responses would not be significantly impacted.

The project site is located within the SFD's jurisdiction with the closest existing station (Fire Station 5) located at 9130 Carlton Hills Drive in the City of Santee. Fire department response from Fire Station 5 to the furthest lot in the northeast corner of Orchard Village was calculated at 9 minutes and 49 seconds, according to the Insurance Service Office travel time formula. The City of Santee's Quality of Life Standard encourages all new development to be located within the response time of 6 minutes or less 90 percent of the time from the closest fire station responsible for serving the parcel. Accordingly, the Fanita Ranch project proposes to include a new fire station, which is analyzed in the EIR (Fire Station 20). The new fire station would be fully staffed and equipped to operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The new fire station would be able to respond to all of the proposed project's buildable lots within a 4-minute travel time, compliant with the City's goal of 6 minutes or less. Additionally, an off-site fire force (3 engines, 14 firefighters, and battalion chief) would be able to be on site within 8 minutes to assist the initial response. Providing a new fire station would assist in, not impair, emergency response.

The project would meet or exceed the Code requirements for access roads, including the 2019 California Fire Code, Appendix D and Santee's local amendments to the California Fire Code. The proposed project would provide internal roads for emergency access and evacuation access throughout the site. Internal streets would provide residents the option to evacuate from at least two points in two different directions from each neighborhood. The roadways are designed to meet or exceed Fire Code requirements, including unobstructed travel lane widths consistent with the Fanita Ranch Development Plan standards, unobstructed travel lanes, adequate parking, 28-foot inside radius, grade maximums, and signals at intersections. Two external points of ingress/egress are provided to/from the project – Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street – which

can be used for a combination of evacuation and emergency access. These two routes would lead to three main arteries traveling south off site (Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue) and numerous east/west connections off site during an emergency evacuation event. The project would not cut off or impair existing evacuation routes. It would also provide roadway improvements to improve existing evacuation conditions.

The internal roadways from the residences to existing and planned off-site travel routes would be fuel-modified passageways. Project access roads that traverse areas of natural vegetation (consistent with current fuels) would provide a minimum of 50 feet of modified fuel areas along both sides of the road. These 50-foot buffers would reduce ignitions from vehicle-related causes (catalytic converter, brake-related, tossed cigarette, etc.) and provide a set back from wildland fuels.

The project's Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix P1 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) is consistent with the County EOP and City EOP, which serve as the roadmap for emergency response, including wildfire emergencies in Santee. In response to the trial court's ruling, the Fanita Ranch Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan provides important population, education and preparedness information and a sophisticated evacuation modeling approach. The modeling and analysis portion of the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan focus on ensuring the project and surrounding community can be evacuated within a reasonable time frame and that contingency plans are available to emergency managers. Wildfire evacuations from the site would be focused on early relocation from the project site long before a fire would threaten the project or its access routes.

Evacuations would follow the "Ready, Set, Go!" model, which is the model adopted by most emergency agencies in California. Fanita Ranch would provide emergency decision makers with the contingency option of temporarily refuging people on site, in their homes, at the designated Village core areas, or other protected spaces that would be available in the project's developed areas. These areas may be determined to be safer than evacuating in some fire scenarios.

A condensed version of the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan would be provided to homeowner's, renters, business owners and employees, and other persons regularly at the project site. In addition, the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan would be posted on the community's website with regular reminders so that all residents are aware of the

evacuation routes, of the fluidity of wildfire events, and of the options (including evacuation routes, temporarily sheltering on site) that may be presented to them by responding law enforcement and/or fire personnel, Reverse 911, or other officials. An annual evacuation awareness program would be conducted as well as on-line access to fire awareness educational material on the communities' website.

In addition to these emergency response and evacuation-specific actions, the project would incorporate redundant measures to improve fire prevention and defensibility at the project site and adjacent properties, which would improve the Fire Department's ability to respond to and extinguish fires promptly in order to keep them from spreading. While these measures do not directly address emergency response and evacuation, they show the numerous features that would reduce the need for emergency response and evacuation in the first place.

Based on the reasons described above, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

.

2. Pollutant Concentrations

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

Finding: Less than significant. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.5.2.)

Explanation: The wildland fire risk in the vicinity of the proposed project site has been analyzed according to a standard used throughout the County (San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance – Wildland Fire and Fire Protection [2010]). It has been determined that wildfires may occur in wildland areas on and surrounding the project site as they have historically. Additionally, increased vehicle traffic and human presence on the project site could increase the potential for wildfire ignitions during operation.

Construction. The proposed project is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) and heat or sparks from construction equipment, vehicles, and the use of flammable hazardous materials have the potential to ignite adjacent vegetation and start a fire, especially during weather events that include low humidity and high wind speeds. The proposed project would implement the FPP (Appendix P1 of the Recirculated Sections of

Final Revised EIR), prepared in compliance with the requirements of the Santee Municipal Code and Ordinances, the 2019 California Fire and Building Codes, and the County's 2010 FPP Guidelines for Determining Significance. The potential risk of wildfire ignition and spread associated with construction of the proposed project can be managed so that the potential for vegetation ignition is substantially reduced. In addition, pre-planning and construction personnel training for fire awareness, reporting, and suppression not only results in lower probability of ignition but also in higher probability of fire control and extinguishment in its early stages. Data indicate that 95 percent of all wildfire ignitions are controlled during initial attack (Smalley 2008). Further, the project's Construction Fire Prevention Plan (CFPP) provides guidance for such management and pre-planning for Fanita Ranch to increase the probability that any construction-cause fires are prevented or extinguished promptly.

Additionally, the proposed project would use construction measures as identified in the FPP to avoid construction-related wildfire impacts. These measures include having adequate water available to service construction activities, implementing the CFPP and the FPP provisions, providing proper wildfire awareness, reporting, and suppression training to construction personnel, and requiring that all construction-phase components of the fuel modification are complete prior to delivery of combustible materials/lumber to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire during construction, and impacts would be less than significant.

Operation. The proposed project would implement the FPP that has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of the Santee Municipal Code and Ordinances, the 2019 California Fire and Building Codes, and the County's 2010 FPP Guidelines for Determining Significance. Slopes at the project site and in the region are variable, but do include steep topography that can facilitate fire spread. Conversely, prevailing winds, which are from the west and southwest and typically include higher humidity and lower wind speeds, would not tend to facilitate aggressive fire spread. However, the occurrence of the Santa Ana winds, which are dry and much higher velocity, could facilitate fire spread. The project's FPP contemplated these conditions and designed fire protection features that are site specific and focused on protecting the project's buildings and residents while simultaneously minimizing the likelihood for on-site fire to burn off site into open space.

The proposed project would include a variety of fire protection features that form a redundant system of protection to minimize the

likelihood of wildfire exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The proposed project would provide a fire hardened landscape, ignition-resistant residences and other buildings, and conversion of fuels to maintained developed areas with designated review of all landscaping and fuel modification areas and highly ignition-resistant structures. The project site would implement the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan compliant with City and County requirements, and if evacuation is not considered the preferred approach, such as during a short-notice evacuation, the proposed project offers a contingency option of temporarily sheltering on site.

Ignition-Resistant Structures. The Santee City Council adopted a wildland-urban interface (WUI) development standard in November 2004 and then amended the Fire Code with adoption in June 2006. Measures were also adopted into the 2007 California Building Code and have been retained and enhanced in code updates since then, including the 2019 California Building and Fire Codes. The following project features are required for new development in WUI areas and form the basis of the system of protection necessary to minimize structural ignitions and facilitate access by emergency responders as identified in the FPP (Appendix P1 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR): Application of the latest adopted ignition-resistant building codes; Non-combustible or ignition-resistant exterior wall coverings; Multi-pane glazing with a minimum of one tempered pane; Ember resistant vents; Interior, automatic fire sprinklers for all structures; Modern infrastructure, access roads, and water delivery system; Maintained fuel modification areas; and Fire apparatus access roads throughout the proposed project.

Effective Fuel Modification Zones. The proposed fuel modification zones (FMZs) are designed to minimize wildfire encroaching upon the community and minimize the likelihood that an on-site ignition would spread into the Habitat Preserve areas. The proposed FMZs would provide separation from the unmaintained vegetation occurring outside the FMZs. The FMZs would include low-fuel, maintained vegetation, including 65 feet of irrigated zone, resulting in high vegetation moisture, which is ignition resistant. The FMZs would provide a buffer of reduced fuel densities, lack of fuel continuity, and a reduction in the receptiveness of the landscape to ignition and fire spread.

Ignition Sources. The types of potential ignition sources that currently exist in the project area include overhead power lines, vehicles, roadways (SR-67), and off-site residential neighborhoods. The proposed project would introduce potential ignition sources, particularly more people in the area. While it is true that humans are

the cause of most fires in California, equipment and powerlines are the predominant human fire causes in San Diego County, followed by roadway ignitions (Romero-Calcerrada et al. 2008). There is no data available that links increases in wildfires with the development of ignition-resistant communities such as the proposed project. The proposed project would include a robust fire protection system, as described previously and detailed further in the FPP (Appendix P1). This same robust fire protection system would provide protections from onsite fire spreading to off-site vegetation. The landscape throughout the project and on its perimeter would be highly maintained and much of it irrigated (all zone 1 setback areas, common areas throughout the community and private yards), which would further reduce its ignition potential (Appendix P1). Structures would be highly ignition resistant on the exterior and the interiors would be protected with automatic sprinkler systems, which have a very high success rate for confining fires or extinguishing them. Therefore, accidental fires within the proposed project's landscape areas or on-site structures would have limited ability to spread.

The proposed project would be fire adapted with a strong resident outreach program that raises fire awareness among its residents, as defined further in the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). The project population would provide a heightened early wildfire detection network for the City and surrounding areas.

The proposed project would convert nearly 986 acres of ignitable fuels to lower flammability landscape and hardscape, include better access throughout the site, provide managed and maintained landscapes, and place more fire aware individuals on the ground that would reduce the likelihood of arson, off-road vehicles, shooting, or other non-authorized recreational-based activities that cause fires, some of which is currently occurring on the undeveloped project site. In addition, the project would include a fire station equipped with trained firefighters that would be able to respond quickly to reported fires.

Fires originating off site would not have continuous fuels across the development footprint. Once fires reach the FMZs, they would be expected to progressively reduce in intensity until starved of fuels, which would occur well away from the site's structures. Burning vegetation embers may land on project structures, but are not likely to result in ignition based on ember decay rates and the types of non-combustible and ignition-resistant construction materials that would comprise project buildings. Ember-resistant venting would be used on all structures within the proposed project, addressing one of the biggest causes of wildfire structure losses. Ongoing inspections and

maintenance that would occur in the proposed project's landscape and fuel modification areas would assure that the FMZs continually meet the requirements of the SFD and the proposed project's FPP (Appendix P1 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

Fire Protection Features that Lower Wildfire Ignition Risk. The ignition-resistant landscapes and structures and the numerous specific requirements would minimize the ability for an on-site fire to spread to off-site fuels, as follows:

Ignition-resistant, planned, and maintained landscape. Site landscaping of common areas and FMZs would be subject to strict plant types that are lower-ignition plants, with those closest to structures requiring irrigation to maintain high plant moistures that equate to difficult ignition. These areas would be closest to structures, where ignitions would be expected to be highest, but would be prevented through these ongoing maintenance efforts.

Wide FMZ around perimeter of proposed project. The wide FMZ, between 115 and 165 feet wide, includes specifically selected plant species, very low fuel densities (only 30 percent retention of native plants in outer zones and irrigated inner zones), and ongoing HOA-funded and applied maintenance, resulting in a wide buffer between the developed areas and the off-site native fuels.

Twice-annual FMZ inspections. The HOA would have a contracted, third-party, SFD-approved FMZ inspector perform two inspections per year to ensure that FMZs are maintained in a condition that is consistent with the City's and FPP's requirements and would provide a benefit of a wide barrier separating wildland fuels from on-site ignitions.

Ignition-resistant structures. Structures would be built to the California Building Code, Chapter 7A, ignition-resistant requirements that have been developed and codified as a direct result of after-fire save and loss assessments. These measures would result in homes that are designed, built, and maintained to withstand fire and embers associated with wildfires. The wide FMZs would not result in wildfire directly next to these structures. Homes and buildings can be built in the VHFHSZs and WUI areas when they are part of an overall approach that considers wildfire and provides design features that address the related risks. A structure in a VHFHSZ that is built to these specifications can be at lower risk than an older structure in a non-FHSZ. The ignition resistance of on-site structures would result in a low incidence of structural fires, further minimizing the potential for project-related wildfires.

Interior fire sprinklers. Sprinklers in residences would be designed to provide additional time for occupants to escape the residence. Sprinklers in multi-family and commercial structures would be designed to provide structural protection. The common benefit of fire sprinklers is that they are successful at assisting responding firefighters by either extinguishing a structural fire or containing the fire to the room of origin and delaying flash over. This benefit also reduces the potential for an open space vegetation ignition by minimizing the possibility for structure fires to grow large and uncontrollable, resulting in embers that are blown into wildland areas.

Fire access roads. Streets provide access for firefighting apparatus. Proposed project streets would provide code-consistent access throughout the community, including access from existing dead-end streets south of the proposed project. Better access to wildland areas may result in faster wildfire response and continuation of the fire agencies' successful control of wildfires at small sizes.

On-site fire station. The on-site fire station would result in fast response and additional resources for the SFD. Fires, whether on site or in the open space, would receive fast response, which is important for successful containment and, in the case of fires occurring during extreme fire weather, for fast size up and additional resource requests.

Water. Providing firefighting water throughout the proposed project with hundreds of fire hydrants accessible by fire engines is a critical component of both structural and vegetation fires. The proposed project would provide firefighting water volume, availability, and sustained pressures to the satisfaction of the SFD. Water accessibility helps firefighters control structural fires and helps protect structures from and extinguish wildfires.

The proposed project would comply with and, in some cases, exceed the applicable fire and building codes (2019 California Fire and Building Codes and Santee Municipal Code and Ordinances) and would include a layered fire protection system inclusive of site-specific measures that would result in a community that is less susceptible to wildfire than surrounding landscapes and that would facilitate firefighter and medical aid response. Tables within the FPP (Appendix P1 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) summarize the Code-required safety measures as well as proposed measures that exceed Code requirements. These project features, combined with the proposed ignition-resistant construction materials, would be consistent with the adopted the SFD Fire and Building Codes and would not exacerbate or expose project occupants to

unacceptable wildfire risk.

Occupant Exposure. The proposed project has identified a population of approximately 7,974 residents under the preferred land use plan with school and 8,145 residents under the land use plan without school. Given the proposed project site's location in a VHFHSZ, several fire protection systems have been included in the proposed project design, or are otherwise required by relevant codes and standards. Fire protection systems for the proposed project that serve to minimize occupant exposure to wildfire impacts are described below and detailed further in Section 6 of the FPP (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

A public water system would be installed with a redundant or looped water supply for fire protection and system reliability in the event of a large-water-demand fire. The public water system would provide a minimum fire flow of 2,500 gallons per minute for 3 hours of fire flow for single-family and multi-family residential and 3,500 gallons per minute for 4 hours of fire flow for commercial areas with 300-foot spacing between hydrants, a dedicated fire water pipeline system, and appropriate hose connections.

Construction of proposed project structures would comply with the latest ignition-resistant building codes found in Chapter 7A of the California Building Code, as adopted by City, and any additional restrictions or requirements adopted locally by the SFD.

Sprinklers designed by a licensed fire protection engineer or fire sprinkler contractor would be installed in all structures for each occupancy type. A private booster pump and secondary power source would be installed for approximately 21 single-family residences in Vineyard Village where the area experiences residual pressures of less than 40 pounds per square inch during peakhour demand conditions.

Defensible space areas (FMZs) would be installed and maintained along the southern edge of the project site and interior open space areas of 115 feet wide. The proposed project's FMZs on the northern and eastern edges of the project site would be extended to 165 feet in width because these areas are adjacent to native landscapes in the Habitat Preserve that produce higher flame lengths. Both FMZs would reduce the potential for extreme fire behavior adjacent to developed areas and provide a working area for firefighters to conduct suppression activities.

Unobstructed travel lanes to the SFD's satisfaction would be installed for on-site access roads and vehicle turnarounds, meeting

appropriate loading standards per the Fanita Ranch Development Plan. Roadways adjacent to natural areas would provide 50 feet of fuel modification area on each side of the street. The proposed project would further provide at least two routes that lead to at least three main arteries for evacuation. If evacuation is not considered the preferred approach, such as during a short-notice evacuation, the proposed project would offer a contingency option of temporarily sheltering on site.

As described throughout this section, the proposed project has been designed to adhere to the most recent ignition-resistant building codes applicable to developments in VHFHSZs, including defensibility features, and would not result in the exposure of project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire due to slope, prevailing winds, or other factors. Therefore, impacts from operation of the proposed project would be less than significant

Risk from Adding New Residents. In addition, the FPP for the proposed project (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) analyzed the wildfire risk associated with adding new residents to a previously undeveloped area. Human-related activities are responsible for the majority of California wildfires (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). Certain human activities can result in sparks, flames, or heat that may ignite vegetative fuels without proper prevention measures in place. These ignitions predominantly occur as accidents but may also be purposeful, such as arson. Roadways are a particularly high source for wildfire ignitions due to high usage and vehicle-caused fires (catalytic converter failure, overheated brakes, dragging chains, tossed cigarette, and others). In Southern California and the County, the population living at, working in, or traveling through the WUI is vast and provides a significant opportunity for ignitions every day. However, it is a relatively rare event when a wildfire occurs and an even rarer event when a wildfire escapes initial containment efforts. Approximately 90 to 95 percent of wildfires are controlled below 10 acres.

Research indicates that the type of dense, master planned developments, like the proposed project, are not associated with increased vegetation ignitions. During preparation of the FPP (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR), a summary of the wildfire ignitions included in the CAL FIRE FRAP database was reviewed, dating back over 100 years. It found that, in the County, equipment-caused fires were the most numerous, and these also accounted for most of the area burned, followed closely by the area burned by power line fires. Ignitions classified as

equipment-caused frequently resulted from exhaust or sparks from power saws or other equipment with gas or electrical motors, such as lawn mowers, trimmers, or tractors and associated with lower density housing. In the County, ignitions were more likely to occur close to streets and structures and at intermediate structure densities.

Housing density directly influences susceptibility to fire because, in higher density developments, there is one interface (the community perimeter) with the wildlands. Lower density development creates more structural exposure to wildlands, less or no ongoing landscape maintenance (an intermix rather than interface), and consequently, more difficulty for limited fire resources to protect well-spaced homes. The intermix includes housing amidst the unmaintained fuels, whereas the proposed project would convert fuels within the footprint and provide a wide, managed fuel modification zone separating homes from unmaintained fuel areas and creating a condition that makes defense easier.

The research reviewed during preparation of the FPP concludes that lower density housing poses a higher ignition risk than higher density communities. A vast WUI already exists in the area adjacent to the project site, dominated by older, more fire-vulnerable structures, constructed before stringent Fire Code requirements were imposed on residential development, with varying levels of maintained fuel modification buffers. As discussed in detail throughout the FPP, the proposed project is an ignition-resistant community designed to include professionally managed and maintained fire protection components, modern Fire Code-compliant safety features, and specific measures provided where ignitions are most likely to occur (such as roadways). Therefore, the development of the proposed project would not be expected to materially increase the risk of vegetation ignitions.

Moreover, frequent fires and lower density housing growth may lead to the expansion of highly flammable exotic grasses that can further increase the probability of ignitions. This is not the case with the proposed project because the landscapes would be managed and maintained to remove exotic fuels that may establish over time. As discussed previously, research indicates that it is less likely for higher density developments to be impacted by wildfires than lower density developments. The same protections that starve wildfires of fuels and minimize or prevent wildfires from transitioning into a higher density community such as the proposed project also serve to minimize or prevent on-site fires from transitioning into wildlands. Further, the proposed project’s requirement that structures include interior fire sprinklers would significantly reduce the likelihood that a

building fire would spread to the point of flashover, where a structure burns beyond control and produces embers. Interior sprinklers are very efficient, keeping fires to the room of origin or extinguishing the fire before the responding firefighters arrive. Similarly, the irrigated FMZs are positioned throughout the development areas and the first zones on the perimeter of the proposed project. Irrigated zones include plants with high internal moisture and spacing between plants and plant groups that make it difficult to ignite and spread from plant to plant. Lastly, the proposed on-site fire station and additional humans on the site would result in fast detection of fires and firefighter response, a key in limiting the growth of fires beyond the incipient stage. Currently, trails exist in and around the proposed project's development footprint and are frequented by a myriad of locals for hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, and motorcycle and all-terrain vehicle use. If a wildfire were to ignite from human activity on these trails today, fire detection and response could be delayed due to the remoteness of the area, which is not directly visible from populated areas. Delayed detection would contribute to delayed response to the scene due to the lack of site access. Fire size up (determining the needed firefighting resources) and requests for additional resources, including aerial support, would also be delayed in comparison to post-construction of the proposed project. With the proposed project, motorized activities on the trails would be prohibited and enforced. If a hiker or mountain biker were to start a fire, detection and response would be anticipated on a fast timeline due to the residents living in the proposed community who would have the ability to detect fires throughout the property. The quick detection and call to 911 would result in a fast response from the on-site fire station, which would be located, staffed, and equipped to reach anywhere on the project site in 6 minutes or less travel time. If a fire is detected and cannot be accessed by a responding fire engine, it would be sized up, and additional aerial and other support would be requested quickly.

Therefore, based on the factors discussed previously, the addition of new residents on the previously undeveloped project site would not exacerbate the spread of wildfire. Impacts would be less than significant.

3. Infrastructure Risks

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

Finding: Less than significant. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.5.3.)

Explanation: Potable Water Supply. The proposed project would be provided water by Padre Dam Municipal Water District (PDMWD) and sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the proposed project. The potable water system for the proposed project would include transmission and distribution pipelines, two storage reservoirs, and two pump stations. The proposed water system would be designed to provide a minimum of 2,500 gallons per minute for 3 hours of fire flow for single-family and multi-family residential and 3,500 gallons per minute for 4 hours of fire flow for commercial areas with fire hydrants spaced on average every 300 feet, consistent with the SFD hydrant spacing requirements (City of Santee 1991). The proposed water system would be a public water system throughout the project site, designed and installed per PDMWD and SFD requirements. PDMWD provided a water availability/will serve form to the proposed project (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

The proposed project would implement construction measures outlined in the CFPP to avoid construction-related wildfire impacts from installation of potable water supply infrastructure. These measures would include but not be limited to having adequate water available to serve construction activities and providing proper wildfire awareness, reporting, and suppression training to construction personnel. Maintenance of potable water supply infrastructure would adhere to policies proposed in the FPP, including implementation of fuel treatment areas along project streets and fire-safe maintenance practices. In addition, water storage reservoirs and access roads would have minimum 3-foot-wide FMZs on either side. The potable water storage reservoirs would also serve as emergency water storage facilities. Fire hydrants would be spaced along Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue per the SFD design standards. Fire hydrant spacing on neighborhood street would be 300 feet apart. Therefore, installation and maintenance of the proposed potable water supply system would not exacerbate wildfire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

Sanitary Sewer System Management. PDMWD would provide sanitary sewer service for the proposed project. A new gravity sewer system, consisting of 8-inch, 10-inch, and 12-inch pipes, would be constructed on the site to collect and convey wastewater to a 15-inch trunk sewer. Ultimately, the wastewater would be conveyed by a gravity system west of Orchard Village on PDMWD property through a 15-inch diameter pipe to a headworks facility that would provide screening and grit removal for the proposed project's sanitary flows

or would be conveyed by gravity to the existing 18-inch and 24-inch City of San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Interceptor. The new gravity sewer system would be installed to existing code standards and PDMWD requirements. The proposed project would implement construction measures outlined in the CFPP to avoid construction-related wildfire impacts from installation of sanitary sewer system infrastructure. These measures would include having adequate water available to serve construction activities and providing proper wildfire awareness, reporting, and suppression training to construction personnel. Maintenance of sanitary sewer system infrastructure would adhere to policies proposed in the FPP, including implementation of fuel treatment areas along project streets and fire-safe maintenance practices. Therefore, with implementation of the measures described previously, the installation and maintenance of the proposed sanitary sewer system would not exacerbate wildfire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

Stormwater Management. The proposed project would install a series of swales, catch basins and culverts that direct stormwater to hydromodification/water quality basins. Operation of these stormwater features are static, do not generate heat/sparks, and would not impede site access or otherwise hinder evacuation or emergency response efforts. The proposed project would implement construction measures outlined in the CFPP to avoid construction-related wildfire impacts from installation of stormwater management infrastructure. These measures would include but not be limited to having adequate water available to serve construction activities and providing proper wildfire awareness, reporting, and suppression training to construction personnel. Maintenance of stormwater management infrastructure would adhere to policies proposed in the FPP, including implementation of fuel treatment areas along project streets and fire-safe maintenance practices. Therefore, with implementation of the measures listed above, installation and maintenance of the proposed stormwater management features would not exacerbate wildfire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

Electrical Power and Natural Gas Infrastructure. The proposed project powerlines and natural gas lines would be installed below ground. During construction activities associated with electrical power and natural gas line undergrounding, the proposed project would implement construction measures outlined in the CFPP to avoid construction-related wildfire impacts from installation of underground power and natural gas line infrastructure. These measures would include having adequate water available to serve construction activities and providing proper wildfire awareness,

reporting, and suppression training to construction personnel. Maintenance of underground power and natural gas line infrastructure would adhere to policies proposed in the FPP, including implementation of fuel treatment areas along project streets and fire-safe maintenance practices. Because the proposed project power and natural gas lines would be below ground, operation of the power lines would not exacerbate wildfire risk. Therefore, with implementation of the mitigation measures listed previously, the installation and maintenance of the proposed electrical and natural gas infrastructure would not exacerbate wildfire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

Fire Protection Infrastructure. The proposed project would designate a 1.5-acre site for a new fire station, apparatus, and trained firefighters in Fanita Commons to serve the project site and ensure adequate emergency response times. A temporary or permanent on-site fire station would be operational prior to the first residential occupancy, and a permanent station would be operational in accordance with City conditions. Additional fire protection infrastructure would include installation of a fire hydrant network, a dedicated fire water pipeline system to provide adequate fire flow to the project site, and Fire Department hose connections throughout the project site. Water reservoirs would also serve as emergency water storage. These features are static, do not generate heat or sparks, and would not impede site access or otherwise hinder evacuation or emergency response efforts. The availability of the on-site fire suppression network and water supply would reduce potential wildfire impacts.

The proposed project would implement construction measures outlined in the CFPP to avoid construction-related wildfire impacts from installation of fire protection infrastructure. These measures would include having adequate water available to service construction activities and providing proper wildfire awareness, reporting, and suppression training to construction personnel. Maintenance of fire protection infrastructure would adhere to policies proposed in the FPP, including implementation of fuel treatment areas along project streets and fire-safe maintenance practices. Therefore, installation and maintenance of the proposed fire protection infrastructure would not exacerbate wildfire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

Fuel Modification Zones. Fuel modification for the proposed project would be implemented along the entire exterior perimeter, roadways, and interior landscaped areas adjacent to natural open space. FMZs are passive measures and would not impede site access or otherwise hinder evacuation or emergency response efforts.

Presence of FMZs would reduce fuel volumes, moderate fire behavior near structures, and reduce potential wildfire impacts. Fuel modification in the proposed project would be governed by the FPP. FMZs would be designated depending on location. Vegetation management would be completed twice per year. Property owners and private lot owners would be responsible for vegetation management on their lots. Open Space would be owned, maintained and managed by the HOA in compliance with the FPP.

Installation of FMZs would not result in additional temporary or permanent impacts beyond those identified in this EIR. Vegetation management requirements during construction would be implemented at commencement and throughout each construction phase. Vegetation management would be performed pursuant to the FPP and the SFD requirements on building locations prior to the start of work and prior to any import of combustible construction materials. Adequate fuel breaks, as approved by the SFD, would be created around grading, site work, and other construction activities in areas where there is flammable vegetation. Fuel breaks would range between 50 and 150 feet around grading activities, depending on available space.

Maintenance of FMZs may require heat- or spark-generating equipment; however, the proposed project would implement fire-safe maintenance practices and fuel treatment areas detailed in the CFPP and FPP to avoid wildfire impacts. These measures would include but not be limited to having adequate water available to service construction activities and providing proper wildfire awareness, reporting, and suppression training to construction personnel. Additionally, the proposed project would exceed fire prevention regulations by providing a CFPP, code-exceeding FMZs, FMZ inspections, fire-resistant landscaping plan, and HOA wildfire education and outreach. Refer to tables within the FPP for a full list of project fire safety features (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). Therefore, installation and maintenance of the proposed FMZs would not exacerbate wildfire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

On- and Off-Site Roadway Improvements. The proposed project would improve and construct new segments of three of the Santee General Plan Mobility Element streets: Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue.

Improvements would also occur at the terminus of Carlton Hills Boulevard and at existing dead-end streets that terminate at the project site boundary. Roadway improvements would also include construction of new internal systems of public and private streets.

Residential collector streets of various types would connect the three villages. East of Cuyamaca Street, two residential collectors (Street "V" and Street "W") would provide access to Vineyard Village. Residential streets would include conventional two-way streets with parallel parking and 5-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides. In certain areas of the proposed development, split residential streets would occur. Split residential streets would be one-way streets separated by a median or park with parallel parking and 5-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides. Private streets would be composed of local two-way streets with parallel parking and a 5-foot-wide sidewalk on one side and a 5-foot-wide street tree easement on the other side. Private driveways are anticipated in Orchard Village.

All on- and off-site roadway improvements would adhere to the construction measures outlined in the CFPP and FPP to reduce risk of ignition from construction activities. These measures would include having adequate water available to service construction activities and providing proper wildfire awareness, reporting, and suppression training to construction personnel. Maintenance of on- and off-site roadways would adhere to policies proposed in the FPP, including implementation of fuel treatment areas along project streets and fire-safe maintenance practices. Therefore, installation and maintenance of proposed on- and off-site roadway improvements would not exacerbate wildfire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

4. Runoff Risks

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

Finding: Less than significant. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.5.4.)

Explanation: The proposed project's hillsides are moderately steep in many areas and may be susceptible to erosion, landslides, and debris flow, particularly following wildfire. However, CAL FIRE mapping data indicates low to moderate erosion potential on the proposed project's hillside areas. Areas of low erosion potential on the proposed project site are associated with lower elevations where proposed development is concentrated. Erosion potential increases on the slopes surrounding the proposed development area.

However, the irrigated and maintained landscaping in the proposed project would be ignition resistant and not expected to be burned or removed entirely should a fire occur on the project site, unlike post-

fire conditions in native vegetation where complete removal is common. Considering these project site features and characteristics, post-fire conditions are not expected to increase risks associated with runoff and erosion. The proposed project would conform to design requirements associated with proper site preparation and grading practices and would implement surface drainage improvements and erosion-control measures and construction best management practices (BMPs). During construction, BMPs would be implemented throughout work areas in quantities and design as necessitated by grade and conditions. Areas of non-native vegetation and unvegetated areas within the construction footprint would receive erosion-control BMPs. Construction BMPs (e.g., fiber rolls, gravel bags) would be used on and around the grading operations as specified in the stormwater pollution prevention plan to stabilize graded slopes. In addition, the proposed project does not propose development in areas adjacent to existing structures or people. The proposed development would not occur below slopes that are not stabilized or manufactured; therefore, the risk of a landslide would be low.

The proposed project's slopes would manage runoff through various required measures and BMPs designed specifically to shed water from slopes in a controlled manner. The proposed project would install interceptor drainage ditches on hillsides throughout the developed areas to deliver upland surface runoff around buildings, retaining walls, roadways, and other built structures. To manage potential debris flows and landslide impacts, water quality and detention basins are also proposed at locations adjacent to proposed development sites. The water quality and detention basins would be constructed adjacent to proposed roadways, parking lots, or maintenance paths to facilitate inspection and maintenance. Implementation of these project features would minimize potential flooding, runoff, or slope instability impacts that may occur post-fire. Therefore, potential impacts associated with post-fire flooding, runoff, or slope instability would be less than significant.

5. Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

Threshold: Would implementation of the proposed project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: Less than significant. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.5.5.)

Explanation: The proposed project would have a significant impact if it were to interfere with the City's adopted EOP (2020). The City's EOP

addresses the planned response to extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural and human-caused disasters. The plan describes the overall responsibilities of government entities, as well as the Santee Emergency Management Organization for protecting life and property in the City. In addition, the Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization and County Operational Area EOP – Evacuation Annex was formed in the 1960s to assist the cities and the County in developing emergency plans by providing strategies, procedures, recommendations, and organizational structures that can be used to implement a coordinated evacuation effort in the County Operational Area (County of San Diego 2018).

The project's Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) is based on the City's EOP. According to the SFD, the project would not interfere with current evacuation and emergency plans. Additionally, the project has developed new project-specific evacuation and emergency responses plans, including the FPP and Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan.

The project's interior street network and the existing regional street system that it connects with would provide multi-directional primary and secondary emergency evacuation routes consistent with, or exceeding, most communities in this area (Appendix P2, Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan, of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). Further, the only proposed through routes on the project site would loop between Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street on site and would not affect emergency response and evacuation plans elsewhere in Santee. Consistent with County Operational Area EOP – Evacuation Annex (County of San Diego 2018), major ground transportation corridors in the area would be used as primary evacuation routes during an evacuation effort. The street systems were evaluated to determine the best routes for fire response equipment and "probable" evacuation routes for relocating people to designated safety areas.

The primary roadways that would be used for evacuation from the project site are Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street, the latter of which would connect to the proposed extension of Magnolia Avenue. Note that the Magnolia Avenue extension would be constructed by the certificate of occupancy for the 1,500th equivalent dwelling unit. The available evacuation routes prior to the Magnolia Avenue extension (Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street) would meet the 2019 California Fire Code, Appendix D, and the Santee Municipal Code and Ordinances for multiple access points; and, therefore, are considered adequate for emergency purposes for the interim period

until the certificate of occupancy of the 1,500th equivalent dwelling unit. These streets provide access to major traffic corridors, including directly or indirectly to State Route (SR-) 52 to the south, SR-67 to the east, Interstate (I-) 8 to the south, I-125 to the south, and I-15 to the west (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

During an emergency evacuation from the project site, the primary and secondary roadways may serve as egress for those leaving the project site and as ingress for responding emergency vehicles. Because the roadways are designed to meet or exceed the County's Consolidated Fire Code requirements, including unobstructed travel lane widths consistent with the Fanita Ranch Development Plan standards, unobstructed travel lanes, adequate parking, 28-foot inside radius, grade maximums, signals at intersections, and extremely wide roadside FMZs, potential conflicts that could reduce the roadway efficiency are minimized, allowing for smooth evacuations. Additionally, the streets would provide residents the option to evacuate from at least two points in two different directions from each neighborhood.

The project site's primary evacuation routes would be accessed through a series of internal neighborhood roadways, which connect with the primary ingress/egress streets that intersect off-site primary and major evacuation routes. Based on the existing street network, the community would evacuate to the north (once off site), south, east, and west depending on the nature of the emergency.

There are at least two ingress/egress routes for the proposed project (see Figure 3-7, Vehicular Circulation Plan, in Chapter 3 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR):

- **Southwest corner of the community**: Fanita Parkway provides access to Mast Boulevard and Carlton Oaks Road, both of which would offer travel options west and east in the City or onto the SR-52 or SR-67 on-ramps.

- **South central portion of the community**: Cuyamaca Street, the proposed project's primary access, provides access to Mast Boulevard, Mission Gorge Road, and the SR-52 on-ramp.

    - **East/southeastern portion of the community**: Magnolia Avenue provides access to Mast Boulevard, Mission Gorge Road, SR-52 on-ramp, and SR-67 on-ramp. Both Mast Boulevard and Mission Gorge Road connect to SR-52 to the west.

Depending on the nature of the emergency requiring evacuation, the majority of the community traffic would exit the proposed project via Cuyamaca Street or Magnolia Avenue via Cuyamaca Street. These are the most direct routes for the project site. Fanita Parkway may be used by the western portion of the project site, depending on the time available for evacuation and the need for additional movement via the southerly route. In a typical evacuation that allows several hours or more time (as experienced for most areas during the 2003, 2007, 2014, 2016, and 2017 wildfires), all traffic may be directed to the south and out Cuyamaca Street and/or Magnolia Avenue. If less time is available, fire and law enforcement officials may direct some neighborhoods to temporarily shelter in their residences. For further information, please refer to the project's Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

An evacuation of any area requires significant coordination among numerous public, private, and community/nonprofit organizations. Among the most important factors for successful evacuations in urban settings is control of intersections downstream of the evacuation area. If intersections are controlled by law enforcement, barricades, signal control, or other means, potential backups and slowed evacuations can be minimized. Another important aspect of successful evacuation is a managed and phased evacuation declaration. Evacuating in phases, based on vulnerability, location, or other factors, enables subsequent traffic surges on major roadways to be smoothed over a longer time frame and result in traffic levels that flow better than when mass evacuations include large evacuation areas at the same time (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

The following emergency response operations could occur under an evacuation order:

Evacuation Points and Shelters. When the SDCSD implements an evacuation order, they coordinate with the responding fire agency, the Emergency Operation Center, and others to decide on a location to use as a temporary evacuation point. The SDCSD Office Dispatch Center would use the AlertSanDiego system to direct evacuees to the established temporary evacuation point or shelter. These evacuation points would serve as temporary safe zones for evacuees and would provide basic needs such as food, water, and restrooms. If residents are unable to evacuate and need transportation assistance to get to a temporary evacuation point or shelter, the SDCSD may establish transportation points to collect and transport people without transportation resources to evacuation points. These points would be large, well known sites such as shopping centers, libraries, and schools. Transportation would be

accessible to all populations, including people with disabilities and other access and functional needs.

Shelter-in-Place. Sheltering-in-place is the practice of going or remaining indoors during or following an emergency event. This procedure is recommended if there is little time for the public to react to an incident and it is safer for the public to stay indoors for a short time rather than travel outdoors. Sheltering-in-place also has many advantages because it can be implemented immediately, allowing people to remain in their familiar surroundings and providing individuals with everyday necessities such as telephones, radios, televisions, food, and clothing. However, the amount of time people can stay sheltered-in-place is dependent upon availability of food, water, medical care, utilities, and access to accurate and reliable information.

The decision on whether to evacuate or shelter-in-place is carefully considered with the timing and nature of the incident. Sheltering-in-place is the preferred method of protection for people who are not directly impacted or in the direct path of a hazard. This would reduce congestion and transportation demand on the major transportation routes for those who have been directed to evacuate by law enforcement or fire personnel. The proposed project would incorporate ignition-resistant construction and wide FMZs and provide defensibility throughout the site. Therefore, responding fire and law enforcement personnel would be able to direct project residents to temporarily refuge in their homes in the rare situation where that alternative is determined to be safer than evacuating.

As discussed, the proposed project would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

6. Wildland Fires

Threshold: Would implementation of the proposed project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fire?

Finding: Less than significant. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.5.6.)

Explanation: The wildland fire risk and features prescribed in the FPP (Appendix P1 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) have been analyzed and developed to reduce risk to acceptable levels at Fanita Ranch by applying comprehensive guidelines developed by a

technical panel of 17 professional fire prevention officers and fire protection specialists and planners. These guidelines are referred to as the San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance – Wildland Fire and Fire Protection (County of San Diego 2010). These guidelines have become a standard for FPPs in numerous fire agency jurisdictions because they use a holistic approach to understanding a site's fire hazards, understanding how a project complies with safety requirements, and understanding where additional fire protection is needed, allowing the FPP to require more robust or equivalent alternative protections to Code requirements.

Wildfires may occur in undeveloped landscapes that surround the proposed project, but the number of fires would not be significantly increased in frequency, duration, or size with construction of the project due to implementation of many fire protection and prevention features. Construction activities can lead to increased potential for vegetation ignitions; however, the project addresses this potential risk through its focused CFPP (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). The CFPP's fire prevention and safety measures, along with its limitations on work activities during fire weather, address the potential for ignitions and would not expose people to increased fire risk during the construction period. The project would include conversion of fuels from existing flammable fuels to highly ignition-resistant structures and maintained urbanized landscapes with designated SFD review. It would also include substantial FMZs, a funded entity to manage and maintain the FMZ, and third-party FMZ inspections twice per year to confirm the FMZ areas are maintained as designed and, therefore, would function as intended. As such, the development footprint would be largely converted from ignitable fuels to ignition-resistant landscape and structures that are provided with defensible space consistent with and exceeding the strictest Code standards. A 100-foot FMZ at the site perimeter adjacent to the existing neighborhood to the south would also be provided, monitored, and maintained as part of the proposed project to further reduce fire risk to those older homes. In addition, the project would provide for fast firefighter response on and off site (4-minute travel time to anywhere on site), would include an on-site fire station, and access for firefighters, early evacuations, water and fire flow to code, and other fire protection features described throughout this FPP.

In addition, as shown in the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR), the project would provide two major routes for ingress and egress during an emergency (Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street), would not cut off or modify existing evacuation routes, and provide numerous roadway improvements in the City that would improve evacuation

over existing conditions (including the Magnolia Avenue extension). Evacuation modeling shows that, under the most likely wildfire evacuation scenario, it would take approximately 19 minutes to perform a surgical evacuation of the project and targeted, existing communities. Under a much less likely and conservative scenario, assuming all the project's residences would be occupied and evacuated, it would take approximately 53 minutes to 1.5 hours. First responders would account for evacuation timing to adjust the lead time given in issuing evacuation orders, to better phase evacuation orders, and to adjust evacuation traffic control methods (such as controlling downstream traffic lights or officers directing traffic) to ensure project occupants and the surrounding community are able to safely evacuate.

In the event evacuation is not recommended as a result of the increased risk of evacuating, the project's fire prevention features and shelter-in-place contingency would further mitigate risks to public safety. The project's fire protection features would result in a redundant and layered fire protection system consistent with fire agency-designated shelter-in-place communities (e.g., Rancho Santa Fe shelter-in-place communities of (1) The Bridges, (2) The Crosby, (3) Cielo, (4) 4S Ranch, and (5) The Lakes; and the Santa Clarita Valley's Stevenson Ranch community). Because of these fire protection features, maintenance, and enforcement requirements, it would be an option, and in some scenarios, the preferred option, for emergency managers to direct residents and visitors to temporarily shelter in their homes or designated shelter sites. This is based on the project's ability to buffer wildfire and related heat away from the community's structures and infrastructure, and protect against burning ember intrusion, while providing firefighters with safe areas and defensible space on site. The project's redundant fire protection features, quick emergency response, evacuation routes and plans, and the contingency option of sheltering on site in protected spaces would ensure that people and structures would not be exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Ignition-Resistant Structures The best mitigation to reduce a project's potential to start on-site and off-site fires is to reduce the likelihood that the project's structural elements would ignite (Gorte 2011; Maranghides & Mell 2012; Zhou 2013; Calkin et al. 2014; Mockrin et al. 2020). Incorporation of the latest structural ignition-resistant features and construction methods minimize the possibility that structures would ignite. Each facet of a building's exterior construction and appendages are addressed within Chapter 7A of the California Building Code, with a primary focus on requiring homes that can withstand heat, flame, and embers.

For example, the 2007 Witch Creek Fire was one of the most destructive fires in California's history and destroyed thousands of homes in San Diego County. Years before the fire, Rancho Santa Fe was a community vulnerable to wildfire damage, as it was set into steep rolling hills covered in chaparral and at one point considered unsafe. However, in 1996, the community made strides to adapt to a very high fire hazard environment. The community implemented modern fire codes, developed defensible space rules, required home hardening measures, and imposed vegetation restrictions. Through this system-based approach, Rancho Santa Fe was able to transform into a fire-adapted community. As a result, when the Witch Creek fire spread to Rancho Santa Fe, no fire-hardened home was lost (Sommer 2019). San Diego County's "after-action" investigation of the Witch Creek Fire concluded that "the fires demonstrated unequivocally that defensible space around homes works" and that "newer homes, built in accordance with new fire-safe building codes, withstood the fire better than older homes built to less stringent codes" (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). These findings support the success of fire-hardening buildings and use of FMZs.

They also support the available option of hardened communities to offer temporary sheltering as a contingency plan when evacuation is considered undesirable, as discussed further below.

Newer master-planned communities constructed in accordance with modern fire-safe development standards also survived the 2003 Simi Fire, the 2008 Freeway Complex Fire, and the 2020 Silverado Fire, with no homes lost (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

These recent examples demonstrate the protective value of ignition-resistant structures and modern fuel management techniques, both of which are discussed in greater detail below. Once a fire-hardened community is planned and built with fire- and ignition-resistant materials and infrastructure, long-term protection of the community and surrounding areas is dependent on ongoing maintenance (Sommer 2019). In addition to its numerous wildfire prevention measures, the project would include a homeowners association (HOA) responsible for long-term funding and maintenance of private roads and fire protection systems. This includes responsibility for fuel modification and vegetation management for all common areas of the project site, including roadside clearance areas and FMZs. HOAs are an effective fire protection feature as they can enforce defensible space compliance and increase wildfire risk awareness through education. In comparison, many non-HOA communities have lower wildfire risk awareness and are less likely to implement defensible

space and fire hazard reduction techniques on private properties or through the community (Steffey et al. 2020). The project's HOA would also enforce homeowner compliance with the project's fuel management plan on an ongoing basis. In addition, the HOA would provide project residents and occupants with ongoing education regarding wildfires so they may maintain an increased awareness of wildfire risk and the possibility that they may be directed to remain in their homes or moved to another on-site location during a wildfire. These educational materials would include information on the need to timely maintain the landscape and structural components according to the applicable fire-safe standards. Moreover, the SFD would review and approve all HOA wildfire educational material and programs before printing and distribution. HOA oversight and community engagement were credited as one of the reasons why Rancho Santa Fe was able to survive the Witch Creek fire in 2007 (Sommer 2019).

Code-Required Fire Safety Features that Facilitate Sheltering in Place Most of the primary components of the proposed project's layered fire protection system are required by Santee Fire and Building Codes, because they have been tested in the lab and in realtime wildfires and found to result in saved structures. They have been proven effective for minimizing structural vulnerability to wildfire. They also make shelter-in-place possible as an evacuation contingency option when evacuation is not possible.

Even though current Building and Fire Codes require these measures, at one time, many of them were used as mitigation measures for buildings in fire hazard areas, because they were known to reduce structure vulnerability to wildfire. These measures were adopted into the 2007 California Building Code and have been retained and enhanced in code updates since then. The following project features are required for new development in fire hazard areas and form the basis of the system to provide adequate access by emergency responders and provide the protection necessary to minimize structural ignitions:

- Application of the latest adopted ignition-resistant building codes.
- Nonflammable roofs, which would be Class "A" listed and fire-rated roof assembly, installed per manufacturer's instructions, to approval of the City. Roofs would be made tight with no gaps or openings on ends or in valleys, or elsewhere between roof covering and decking, in order to prevent intrusion of flame and embers. Any openings on ends of roof tiles would be enclosed to prevent intrusion of burning debris. When provided, roof valley flashings would not be less than 0.019

inch (No. 26 gage galvanized sheet) corrosion-resistant metal installed over a minimum 36-inch-wide underlayment consisting of one layer of 72 pound ASTM 3909 cap sheet running the full length of the valley.

- Exterior wall coverings are to be non-combustible or ignition resistant.
- Multi-pane glazing with a minimum of one tempered pane.
- Ember-resistant vents (recommend BrandGuard, O'Hagin, or similar vents).
    - No vents in soffits, cornices, rakes, eaves, eave overhangs or between rafters at eaves or in other overhang areas. Gable end and dormer vents to be at least 10 feet from property line or provided alternative design resistant to ember penetration. Vents in allowed locations to be protected with wire mesh having no openings greater than 0.125 inch. Vent openings would not exceed 144 square inches. Vents would be designed to resist the intrusion of any burning embers or debris.
    - Vents would not be placed on roofs unless they are approved for Class "A" roof assemblies (and contain an approved baffle system (such as Brandguard or O'Hagin vents) to stop intrusion of burning material) or are otherwise approved.
    - Turbine vents would be prohibited.
- Interior, automatic fire sprinklers to code for occupancy type.
- Eaves and soffits would meet the requirements of SFM 12-7A-3 or be protected by ignition-resistant materials or non-combustible construction on the exposed underside, per City Building Code.
- There would be no use of paper-faced insulation or combustible installation in attics or other ventilated areas.
- There would be no use of plastic, vinyl (with the exception of vinyl windows with metal reinforcement and welded corners), or light wood on the exterior.
- Any vinyl frames to have welded corners and metal reinforcement in the interlock area to maintain integrity of the frame certified to ANSI/AAMA/NWWDA 101/I.S 2 97 requirements.
- Skylights to be tempered glass.
- Rain gutters and downspouts to be non-combustible. They would be designed to prevent the accumulation of leaf litter or debris, which can ignite roof edges.
- Doors to conform to SFM standard 12-7A-1, or would be of approved non-combustible construction or would be solid core wood having stiles and rails not less than 1 3/8 inches thick or

have a 20-minute fire rating. Doors to comply with City Building Code, Chapter 7-A. Garage doors to be solid core 1.75-inch-thick wood or metal, to comply with code.

- Decks and their surfaces, stair treads, landings, risers, porches, balconies to comply with language in City Building Code, Chapter 7-A and be ignition-resistant construction, heavy timber, exterior approved fire retardant wood, or approved noncombustible materials.
- Decks or overhangs projecting over vegetated slopes are not permitted. Decks to be designed to resist failing due to the weight of a firefighter during fire conditions. There would be no plastic or vinyl decking or railings. The ends of decks to be enclosed with the same type of material as the remainder of the deck.
- There would be no combustible awnings, canopies, or similar combustible overhangs.
- No combustible fences to be allowed within 5 feet of structures on any lots. The first 5 feet from a structure would be non-combustible or meet the same fire-resistive standards as walls.
- All chimneys and other vents on heating appliances using solid or liquid fuel, including outdoor fireplaces and permanent barbeques and grills, to have spark arrestors that comply with the City Fire Code. The code requires that openings would not exceed 1/4- inch. Arrestors would be visible from the ground.
- Any liquid propane gas (LPG) tanks (except small barbecue and outdoor heater tanks), firewood, hay storage, storage sheds, barns, and other combustibles would be located at least 30 feet from structures, and, within the FMZ, 30 feet from flammable vegetation. There would be no flammable vegetation under or within 30 feet of LPG tanks, or tanks would be enclosed in an approved ignition-resistant enclosure with 10 feet clearance of flammable vegetation around it. In no case would a tank be closer than 10 feet from the structure. City Fire Code requires 10 feet of clearance of native vegetation, weeds, and brush from under and around LPG tanks.
- Storage sheds, barns, and outbuildings to be constructed of approved non-combustible materials, including non-combustible Class A roofs and would be subject to the same restrictions as the main structure on lot.
- Modern infrastructure, access roads, and water delivery system.
- Maintained FMZs.
- Fire apparatus access roads throughout the project's developed areas.

Notably, interior fire sprinklers, which would be provided in all structures (required by code since 2010), have an extremely high reliability track record (Appendix P1) of controlling fire in 96 percent of reported fires, and statistics indicate that fires in homes with sprinklers resulted in 82 percent lower property damage and 68 percent lower loss of life (Hall 2013). Although not designed for wildland fire defense, should embers succeed in entering a structure, sprinklers provide an additional layer of life safety and structure protection.

Effective Fuel Modification Zones Provisions for modified fuel areas of at least 100 feet separating wildland fuels from structures have reduced the number of fuel-related structure losses by providing separation between structures and radiant heat generated by wildland fuels. FMZs of 100 feet in width that are correctly designed, installed, and maintained over time have been shown to provide effective defensible space. The project's FMZs have been customized dependent on the anticipated adjacent fire behavior to exceed this 100-foot standard. The project provides FMZs of a minimum of 115 feet and, in areas where the potential wildfire hazard was determined to be higher, the FMZs around the project have been extended to 165 feet wide. A 100-foot FMZ at the site perimeter adjacent to the existing neighborhood to the south would also be provided, monitored, and maintained as part of the project to further reduce fire risk to those older homes.

The FMZs are designed to minimize wildfire encroaching upon the community and minimize the likelihood that an ignition from the developed area spreads into the open space by separating the natural vegetation occurring outside the FMZs from the development. FMZs include reduced fuel densities, lack of fuel continuity, and a reduction in the receptiveness of the landscape to ignition and fire spread. Vegetation within the FMZs would be maintained as required by SFD and Development Plan. Irrigated zones provide a high plant/fuel moisture, making it more difficult to ignite (USFS 2015). Positioning the low plant density, irrigated zone directly adjacent to structures provides a significant buffer between a house or other landscape fire and native vegetation. This type of green barrier can have the same benefit of buffering preserved open space areas (and adjacent communities) from accidental on-site ignitions, while also providing positive ecological impacts by preventing/blocking surface fire and crown fires, serving as green ember catchers, and reducing overall erosion impacts (Wang et al. 2021).

The entire project site would represent a large fire break. Fires from off site would not have continuous fuels across the development

footprint and, therefore, would be expected to burn around and/or over the developed landscape via spotting. Burning vegetation embers may land on project structures but are not likely to result in ignition based on ember decay rates and the types of non-combustible and ignition-resistant materials and venting that would be used within the project, and the ongoing inspections and maintenance that would occur in the project's landscaped areas and FMZs. Fuel treatments and landscape design protect homes and also serve as a buffer for natural areas and surrounding communities. FMZs were originally implemented by CAL FIRE to protect natural resources from urban area ignition sources. Over the years, FMZs have become essential to setting urban areas back from wildland areas serving the dual purpose of protecting structures and people while buffering natural areas from urban ignitions, thus reducing the potential for urban fires to spread into wildland areas. Research shows reducing structural exposure to wildland vegetation through the implementation of defensible space practices can address a wide range of highly valued resources, including critical habitat, vegetation conditions, and watershed health (Scott et al. 2016.) As a result, master-planned communities can be hardened against fire and reduce off-site impacts to wildfire, including existing communities.

Research has indicated that the closer a fire is to a structure, the higher the level of heat exposure (Cohen 2000). However, studies indicate that given certain assumptions (e.g., 10 meters of lowfuel landscape, no open windows), wildfire does not spread to homes unless the fuel and heat requirements (of the home) are sufficient for ignition and continued combustion (Cohen 1995; Alexander 1998). Construction materials and methods can prevent or minimize ignitions. Similar case studies indicate that with nonflammable roofs and vegetation modification from 10–18 meters (roughly 32–60 feet) in Southern California fires, 85–95 percent of the homes survived (Appendix P1; Foote and Gilless 1996).

These results support Cohen's (2000) findings that if a community's homes have a sufficiently low home ignitability (i.e., Santee Municipal Code, City Ordinance No. 570), the community can survive exposure to wildfire with minor fire impacts. This provides the option of addressing the wildland fire threat to structures at the residential location without excessive wildland fuel reduction, including within adjacent open space areas. Rather, focusing the effort in the landscapes nearest the project footprint would provide the best fire protection. Cohen's (1995) studies suggest, as a rule-of-thumb, larger flame lengths and widths require wider FMZs to reduce structure ignition. For example, valid structure ignition assessment modeling (SIAM) results indicate that a 20-foot-high flame has

minimal radiant heat to ignite a structure (bare wood) beyond 33 feet (horizontal distance). By contrast, a 70-foot-high flame may require about 130 feet of clearance to prevent structure ignitions from radiant heat (Cohen and Butler 1996). This study utilized bare wood, which is far more combustible than the ignition-resistant exterior walls that would be used for the project.

Based on scientifically modeled fire behavior calculations for the site, flame lengths under the most extreme fire weather conditions within the natural open space areas to the north and east of the project could approach 66 feet in height. Under normal summer weather conditions, flame lengths could approach 19 to 28 feet in height along the southern and western edges of the project site, respectively. As such, FMZs along the southern edge and interior open space areas are typically 115 feet wide, whereas the project's FMZs on the northern and eastern edges in areas adjacent to the higher flame length producing native landscapes were extended to 165 feet in width. This results in fire buffers that are between 3 and 5 times the predicted longest flame lengths directly adjacent the fuel modification area under typical weather conditions and approximately 2 to 3 times as wide as predicted adjacent flame lengths under extreme weather conditions.

Based on the studies referenced above, the proposed FMZ distances would be sufficient to prevent structure ignitions at the project even under the most extreme fire weather conditions (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

In addition, internal roadways and off-site travel routes (Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and the Magnolia Avenue extension) would be fuel-modified passageways. This means that proposed project access roads that traverse areas of natural vegetation would, in addition to consisting of inflammable asphalt/hardscape with ignition-resistant landscaping, provide a minimum of 50-foot buffer of modified fuel areas along both sides of the road. These 50-foot FMZ adjacent to roadways would further reduce ignitions from vehicle-related causes (catalytic converter, brake-related, tossed cigarette, etc.), provide a setback from wildland fuels, improve evacuation safety, and act as a further fire break in a wildfire event.

Ember Protection Embers are frequently formed from burning vegetation and become lofted in the air through convective columns and wind. As wildfire fronts advance through landscapes or communities on the ground, the embers also are thrown ahead of the flaming front, launching thousands of glowing embers into the air. Also known as firebrands, these specks of burning debris can glide for up to 40 kilometers (approximately 24 miles) before landing and

can cause up to 90 percent of home and business fires during wildfires (Bouvet et al. 2021).

Embers have been the focus of some local building codes since the 1990s; but, became a statewide focus when Chapter 7A of the building code was adopted, which focuses on building ignition resistance, including protecting against embers. Embers can ignite new fires when they land in favorable fuel beds. Urbanized landscapes that are hardened against fire through careful plant selection, irrigation and maintenance along with roads, ignition-resistant buildings, and other hardscape do not provide embers with readily ignitable fuel.

The project's fire hazard assessment includes the potential exposure to airborne embers. Proposed fire protection features would include requirements to address embers and minimize the potential for ember-caused structure damage or loss. Specifically, (1) ember-resistant vents would be included in all structures; (2) all structures would include interior fire sprinklers, which are highly successful and provide an additional layer of protection should embers succeed in entering a structure; and (3) landscaping would be planted and maintained as ember-resistant. With implementation of these fire protection features, the proposed project would not be vulnerable to embers, and structures would resist ember penetration and ignition.

Evacuation Mass evacuation during wildfires is no longer used in Santee or San Diego County. Instead, populated areas are evacuated in phases based on proximity to the event and risk levels. For example, the project's wildfire evacuations would likely include the relocation of perimeter residents, either to on-site shelter sites or off site rather than mass evacuating the entire community (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

The wildfire evacuation scenarios selected for analysis were based on a comprehensive approach that included consultation with the SFD, review of fire history, analysis of Cedar Fire evacuations in Santee, fire behavior science, area topography, fuel types and the evolved approach to evacuations, which is targeted/surgical instead of areawide. Accordingly, given the highest probability wildfire scenarios that would result in evacuation, the perimeter populations in certain locations may be targeted for evacuation. The entire project would provide significant protection against exposure to wildfire. However, some perimeter units, based solely on their closer proximity to native fuels, may be selected for occupant relocation as a precautionary measure. This may be combined with targeted evacuations of perimeter populations within existing communities to the south of the project, as indicated in the evacuation modeling

analysis (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

Targeted evacuation is consistent with County/City Annex Q (Evacuation) and with management of recent San Diego County wildfires (for example, the 2017 Lilac Fire) where the phased/surgical evacuation practice was implemented with success. The result of this type of evacuation is that residents in locations closest to a wildfire burning in open space areas are temporarily moved from the vicinity and vehicle congestion on evacuation routes is minimized, enabling a more efficient evacuation. Under the most probable evacuation scenario, the project evacuees, along with neighboring community residents could be evacuated to designated safety areas within 19 minutes (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). If they were relocated to other internal project areas, the evacuation time would be even lower and have no impact on existing off-site communities, except for up to approximately 25 percent of evacuees who decided to leave the area despite not being asked to evacuate off site, known as shadow evacuees (Sorenson and Vogt 2006).

The evacuation modeling conducted for the project site and Santee vicinity utilizes larger, mass evacuation scenarios as well as more realistic, targeted or phased evacuation scenarios. San Diego County experienced large wildfires in 2003, 2007, and 2010. The experience gained from these large wildfire evacuations resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars in investment into better technology, communication, predictive modeling, coordination, and response resources. The County and jurisdictions within the County now benefit from all of these investments, and the most relevant to the project modeling is the investment in evacuation technologies. The 2007 Witch Fire resulted in a mass evacuation of nearly 500,000 people due to the approach used at that time (San Diego County Grand Jury 2007–2008). It was realized afterward that a more accurate system was needed that relied on real-time fire behavior information along with area pre-plans. San Diego County's EOP Evacuation Annex (Annex Q) specifically addresses new capabilities for phased evacuations.

Phased Evacuation The purpose of a phased evacuation is to reduce congestion and transportation demand on designated evacuation routes by controlling access to evacuation routes in stages and sections. This strategy can also be used to prioritize the evacuation of certain communities in proximity to the immediate danger. A phased evacuation effort would need to be enforced by law enforcement agencies and coordinated with the Operational Area Emergency Operations Center and affected jurisdictions.

Evacuations in Santee and throughout San Diego County are now managed by a system that enables emergency managers to designate small areas in a surgical approach that can target neighborhoods, blocks, or streets for alert messaging. This system was utilized with success in the 2017 Lilac Fire in northern San Diego County. In this evacuation, a larger area of approximately 44,000 households, was given a message via the wireless emergency alert system that evacuations may be declared and residents should be prepared to leave when notified. Following this mass notification, numerous targeted evacuation notices were sent via the AlertSanDiego system, in a staggered approach and based on real-time fire behavior and spread rates, road congestion, and other factors. This phased approach to evacuation notices resulted in a successful evacuation and use of available resources (CAL FIRE/San Diego County Fire 2017).

The Department of Homeland Security (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) provides supporting data for why jurisdictions have moved to the targeted/surgical evacuation approach that leverages the power of situational awareness to support decision-making. According to its “Planning Considerations: Evacuation and Shelter in Place” document, the Department indicated that delineated zones provide benefits to the agencies and community members. Evacuation and shelter-in-place zones promote phased, zone-based evacuation targeted to the most vulnerable areas, which allows jurisdictions to prioritize evacuation orders to the most vulnerable zones first and limit the need to evacuate large areas not under the threat. The zones help:

- Jurisdictions to understand transportation network throughput and capacity, critical transportation and resource needs, estimated evacuation clearance times, and shelter demand. • Planners to develop planning factors and assumptions to inform goals and objectives. • Community members to understand protective actions to take during an emergency. • Shelters to limit traffic congestion and select locations suitable for the evacuated population.

As shown in the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR), the project would provide two major routes for ingress and egress during an emergency (Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street), would not cut off or modify existing evacuation routes, and provide numerous roadway improvements in the City that would improve evacuation over existing conditions (including the Magnolia Avenue extension). Further, internal roadways and off-site travel routes (Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and the Magnolia Avenue extension) would be

fuel-modified passageways, consisting of inflammable asphalt/hardscape with ignition-resistant irrigated landscaping with an additional minimum 50-foot buffer of modified fuel areas along both sides of the road. These fuel-modified passageways would improve evacuation safety and act as a further fire break in a wildfire event.

In addition, evacuation modeling conducted by Chen Ryan Associates (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) shows that, conservatively assuming all the project's residences would be occupied and evacuated, it would take approximately 53 minutes to 1.5 hours for all vehicles to exit the site. In a more realistic evacuation event where a portion of the project site and a portion of the existing area residents are evacuated, which would focus on those within approximately ¼ mile of unmaintained open space areas, the evacuation time would be up to approximately 1.3 hours, which is considered a reasonable time frame (Rohde & Associates 2019–2021; SFD 2022; Appendix P1).

Further, the most probable wildfire evacuation scenario, which would follow the latest evacuation strategies of targeted/surgical evacuations, would move certain perimeter residents from the project and the existing community and is modeled to be accomplished within 19 minutes (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). First responders would account for evacuation timing to adjust the lead time given when issuing evacuation orders, to better phase evacuation orders, and to adjust evacuation traffic control methods (such as controlling downstream traffic lights or officers directing traffic) to ensure proposed project occupants and the surrounding community are able to safely evacuate in the primary evacuation scenario.

In the event evacuation off site is not recommended because of the increased risk of evacuating, the project's fire prevention features and shelter-in-place contingency would further mitigate risks to public safety.

Temporary Refuge and Shelter-in-Place The fire protection features detailed in the preceding sections that would be incorporated into the project make it a shelter-in-place-capable community. Wildfire would not be able to burn into the community due to perimeter FMZs and interior fire-resistant landscapes and hardscape, which would not readily facilitate fire ignitions or spread. Structures would be setback from unmaintained native fuels such that there would not be exposure to heat or flames. The structures would also include special vents that are ember resistant. Embers are the primary reason structures are lost in wildfires. Ember

penetration into home attics or crawl spaces, for example, can ignite materials inside the home and go unnoticed for considerable periods of time until the structure is fully involved. Project structures would meet the most stringent ember-resistant requirements established in the California Building Code. Further, all structures would include interior fire sprinklers to provide an additional layer of protection should embers succeed in entering a structure.

Structures that are built to withstand the impact of wildfire are buildings that can be used for temporary shelter-in-place. Sheltering in place or taking temporary refuge when evacuation is considered undesirable is not a new idea. Sheltering in place has been a useful tool in the emergency management toolbox since the 1950s. In some wildfire scenarios, temporarily sheltering in a protected structure is safer than evacuating. Huntzinger (2010) states that: “If sheltering in place can provide the community with the same level of protection from an emergency incident as mass evacuation, this will be the recommended practice to use.” By contrast, many civilian deaths have occurred when residents evacuated late and were exposed to wildfire on unprotected roadways (Braun 2002; CFA 2004).

For example, the SDCSD indicated in multiple public hearings (Harmony Grove Village South Planning Commission Hearing, May 24 2018) that the reason people lost their lives on Highland Valley Road during the 2003 Cedar Fire, was that they initially ignored evacuation declarations and then decided to leave when the fire was too close (late evacuation). There are two primary ways to avoid this outcome: 1) the Ready, Set, Go! Evacuation model that results in prepared residents who are ready to go when given the message to leave; and 2) a shelter-in-place contingency which provides another option to a late evacuation where the evacuees risk being exposed to wildfires on roadways, project residents will be provided ongoing education and public outreach on Ready, Set, Go! and could temporarily shelter on site, if directed.

One example of a fire-hardened community performing extremely well and not requiring evacuation includes the 3,500 home Stevenson Ranch in Santa Clarita Valley, California. A 2003 wildfire threatened the community under extreme weather conditions. However, due to community fire-hardening efforts, including FMZs, the fire burned around the community and did not require evacuation. There was no loss of life or property damage, and little fire service intervention (Foote 2004). The project has been designed with the same types of fire hardening to provide a shelter in-place contingency and would perform similarly under wildfire conditions.

If all communities focused on shelter-in-place capability, similar to

Stevenson Ranch and the project, most or all fire resources could focus on fire control instead of structure defense (Foote 2004). Thus, not only could project residents shelter-in-place safely while fire burns around the community, fire resources could be directed toward better controlling and fighting the fire as the community acts as a "fire break." Further, first responders could utilize resources to focus efforts on defense of less fire-resistant communities. Nasiatke (2003) points out that another advantage to sheltering in place is a substantial reduction in the number of evacuees that would need to be managed, which is a serious problem experienced in large or mass evacuations.

Shelter-in-place may be implemented in a manner where residents are instructed to remain in their homes while firefighters perform their structure protection function; or it would allow for partial relocation, whereby residents in perimeter homes on the north/west/east edges or within certain individual neighborhoods on site are temporarily relocated to internal areas or to the Fanita Commons Village Center. These areas represent the most fire-protected areas of the site in the event future residents are instructed not to evacuate.

The evidence shows that if emergency managers determine shelter-in-place is preferred for the proposed project, project residents would not be exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from a wildland fire. The fire-safe site would act as a fire break within more ignition-prone fuels. The project's property/structures would likely survive, providing an opportunity for residents to shelter-in-place. Safety would also be improved by the project providing a contingency shelter-inplace option to late, unsafe evacuation practices. And the contingency for project residents to shelter in-place may improve safety to off-site residences by freeing up fire resources elsewhere.

Summary and Expert Review The project has been designed and planned by fire protection experts with over 100 years of fire protection and evacuation experience to meet or exceed the most stringent applicable fire protection requirements and provide for a highly defensible community. The planned approach incorporates redundant measures that would improve fire prevention and defensibility at the project site and adjacent properties including ignition-resistant structures, proven fire safety features, project-specific FMZs, and ember protection. The project would provide two major routes out of the site for ingress and egress during an emergency (Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street), would not cut off or modify existing evacuation routes, and would provide numerous roadway improvements in the City that would improve evacuation over existing conditions (including the Magnolia Avenue extension). In addition, evacuation modeling by Chen Ryan

Associates (Appendix P2 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) shows that under the most probable wildfire evacuation scenario, it would require approximately 19 minutes to evacuate the targeted areas of the project and the existing community. Under a more conservative scenario assuming all the project's residences would be occupied and evacuated, it would take approximately 53 minutes to 1.5 hours to safely evacuate all vehicles. In the event evacuation is not recommended for residents of the project during a wildfire event (i.e., because of inadequate lead time), the fire protection features detailed above describe why the project would be considered a shelter-in-place-capable community, which would safely provide homes and public spaces in which people may take temporary refuge.

The input of fire protection experts was integrated into the FPP (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). The SFD has accepted the FPP and recognizes that the features incorporated into the project would result in a defensible community that does not substantially increase fire safety risks to life or property. For all these reasons, the proposed project would not increase exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from a wildland fire.

7. Fire Protection Facilities

Threshold: Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection?

Finding: Less than significant. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.5.7.)

Explanation: Under the preferred land use plan with school, the proposed project would develop 2,949 new residential units, which would generate approximately 7,974 residents. Under the land use plan without school, the proposed project would develop 3,008 residential units, and generate approximately 8,145 residents. Using the City's current per capita call generation factor of 100 calls per 1,000 persons, the project site is projected to add approximately 950 calls per year to the SFD's existing call load. Under the land use plan without school, the additional population would increase the annual calculated call volume to 889 calls per year.

Due to increased demand and larger service area, response times to emergencies may exceed established response time goals. The primary standard used in the City to determine adequate levels of service is response time. The Santee General Plan (City of Santee 2003) states the goal is to provide an average maximum initial response time of no more than 6 minutes for fire, rescue and emergency medical services with an average maximum response time of no more than 10 minutes for supporting paramedic transport units 90 percent of the time. Secondary to response time is the number of personnel necessary to perform critical tasks required to safely mitigate emergencies.

According to the Fire Service Letter prepared for the proposed project (Appendix M of Final Revised EIR), fire stations and personnel within the City are currently operating at capacity. To accommodate the increased demand and larger service area, the proposed project designates a 1.5-acre site for a new fire station and requires firefighting apparatus and trained firefighters in Fanita Commons to serve the project site and ensure adequate response times. The new station specifications regarding size, staffing, and layout would be determined through coordination between the applicant and the City (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

The SFD has indicated it can and would serve the project site with the addition of an adequately staffed and equipped fire station (Appendix M of Final Revised EIR). The station design would comply with City building and design standards, including City Ordinance No. 457, Article 86, Amended – Fire Protection Plan Wildland-Urban Interface Areas. Either a permanent or a temporary fire station must be constructed prior to the occupancy of any residential units in the proposed project.

The project would provide a fully constructed and staffed permanent fire station. In addition, a temporary fire station site equipped with apparatus and personnel may be provided on site until a permanent fire station is complete. The temporary fire station must be in an area that would meet a response time maximum of no more than 6 minutes to all areas of the proposed project. The temporary fire station would be fully equipped and staffed 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. The final location must be approved by the Santee Fire Chief. The applicant may choose to provide a permanent fire station in lieu of a temporary station. The Santee Fire Chief confirmed the addition of the new fire station, equipment, and staff on the project site would adequately serve the project site while maintaining current response standards (Appendix M of Final Revised EIR). Travel time from the new permanent station to the most remote (distant) lot on

the project site is calculated at 3 minutes and 26 seconds. This would allow just under 2 minutes for dispatch and turnout and would meet the Santee General Plan response time goal of no more than 6 minutes (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR).

Fire flow pressure would be required to be a minimum of 2,500 gallons per minute for 3 hours of fire flow for single-family and multifamily residential and 3,500 gallons per minute for 4 hours of fire flow for commercial areas. New construction in the City requires the installation of fire sprinklers, which would further reduce the potential for fire loss on the project site. Other fire protection mechanisms are discussed in Section 4.18, Wildfire, of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR. To address fire and life safety issues on new development, the City's Fire Marshal reviews proposed residential, commercial, and industrial projects through the City's Development Review process to ensure that adequate fire hydrant locations, water flow pressures, access for emergency vehicles, and other requirements are met, which would also reduce the need for fire protection services (City of Santee 2003).

The on-site fire station would be constructed to serve the increased development and population associated with the proposed project and would be a project component located within the boundaries of the project site. The physical environmental impacts associated with the proposed project's construction and operational activities are analyzed in Sections 4.1 through 4.18 of this EIR. Because the proposed project would provide an on-site fire station to serve the anticipated increase in development and population, it would not require construction or expansion of additional new fire protection facilities off site. Therefore, impacts associated with the need for new or expanded fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection would not result in a new significant impact.

8. Inadequate Emergency Access

Threshold: Would the proposed project result in inadequate emergency access?

Finding: Less than significant. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.5.8.)

Explanation: The project site is currently undeveloped and there is no existing roadway Infrastructure on site. The project proposes the extension of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue to allow access to and from the project site with planned improvements on the existing segments and intersections to accommodate additional

project traffic.

The project's FPP (Appendix P1 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) and Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix P2 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) were prepared for the proposed project to address emergency access and evacuation in the case of a wildfire. The project would provide emergency access that would meet current City requirements throughout the proposed development areas. The proposed internal looped roadways would be built to the currently adopted California Fire Code and City Ordinance 545 (Sections 503.2.1, 503.2.3) requirements and provide travel lane widths consistent with the Fanita Ranch Development Plan standards, adequate parking, 28-foot inside radius, grade maximums, signals at intersections, and extremely wide roadside FMZs. Interior residential streets would be designed to accommodate a minimum of a 77,000-pound fire truck. All dead-end streets would meet SFD requirements. Additionally, the streets would provide residents the option to evacuate from at least two routes that lead to three main arteries.

The project site would have two points of primary access for emergency response and evacuation. Depending on the nature of the emergency, future residents would exit to the south on Fanita Parkway or Cuyamaca Street.

It is anticipated that the majority of the community traffic would exit the project site via Cuyamaca Street, which would also connect to the extension of Magnolia Avenue. These are the most direct routes to the project site. Both streets would include bike lanes that could be used as an additional emergency lane for first responders. These streets would provide access to major traffic corridors including directly or indirectly to SR-52 to the south, SR-67 to the east, I-8 to the south, I-125 to the south, and I-15 to the west.

Fanita Parkway would be used for emergency access by the western portion of the proposed project development. The planned extension and improvements to Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue south of the project site would be sized to provide adequate access for fire equipment and personnel. The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

SECTION III: IMPACTS THAT ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

The City Council hereby finds that Mitigation Measures have been identified in the EIR and these Findings that will avoid or substantially lessen the following potentially

significant environmental impacts to a less than significant level. The potentially significant impacts, and the Mitigation Measures that will reduce them to a less than significant level, are as follows:

A. AIR QUALITY

1. Sensitive Receptors

Threshold: Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.2.5.3.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: The project site is approximately 3 miles from the State Route (SR-) 52 and SR-67 freeways. According to the Transportation Impact Analysis, none of the major roadways within 500 feet of the project site would exceed the CARB screening level of 50,000 vehicles per day. No other toxic air contaminant (TAC)-emitting facilities exist in close vicinity to the project site. Therefore, future on-site residents would not be exposed to substantial emissions from existing off-site TAC-emitting sources.

Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots. The estimated worst-case 1-hour CO concentration at any intersection would be 2.7 ppm at the intersection of Mast Boulevard and the SR-52 westbound (WB) ramps. The concentration at that location, however, would not exceed the California 1-hour standard of 20 ppm or the federal 1-hour standard of 35 ppm. The maximum cumulative 8-hour CO concentration at the same intersection would be 1.9 ppm and would not exceed the California and federal 8-hour standard of 9 ppm. Therefore, the increase in vehicle trips that would result from the proposed project would not result in a CO hot spot at any modeled intersection. Impacts would be less than significant.

Toxic Air Contaminants. The greatest potential for TAC emissions during project construction activities would be related to emissions of DPM associated with heavy equipment operations during site preparation, grading, and utilities construction activities. Construction-related activities would result in short-term emissions of DPM from off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment exhaust. Construction of Phase 1 and Phase 2 would be primarily in the southwestern area of the project site, closest to existing sensitive receptors and, as such, was analyzed as the worst-case scenario.

Later construction phases in the eastern portion of the project site would be outside the 1,000-foot screening distance for potential impacts and emit lower levels of DPM because less earthwork would be required during these phases, resulting in less intensive construction activity. Cancer risk levels at off-site sensitive receptors and the first occupied on-site sensitive receptors would exceed the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) threshold during Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction of the proposed project. Non-cancer risk levels at on-site and off-site sensitive receptors would not exceed the SDAPCD threshold, and impact would be less than significant.

The specific future uses or tenants of the commercial components of the proposed project are unknown at this time, but allowable uses include gasoline-dispensing stations that could emit TACs. However, location and operation details of these facilities are currently unknown.

Mitigation Measures **AIR-3**, **AIR-4**, and **AIR-11** would be required to reduce residential cancer risk during Phase 1 and Phase 2 of construction. Mitigation Measure **AIR-12** avoids siting new on-site toxic air contaminant sources in close vicinity of residences and schools and would ensure that operational impacts would be less than significant.

Project Operational Health Impacts. Although the proposed project is expected to exceed the County of San Diego's numeric regional mass daily emission thresholds for VOC and PM_{10}, this does not in itself constitute a significant health impact to the population adjacent to the project site and within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The regional thresholds are based in part on Section 180 (e) of the CAA and are intended to provide a means of consistency in significance determination within the environmental review process. Notwithstanding, simply exceeding the regional mass daily thresholds does not constitute a particular health impact to an individual nearby. The reason for this is that the mass daily thresholds are in pounds per day emitted into the air whereas health effects are determined based on the concentration of emissions in the air at a particular location (e.g., parts per million by volume of air or micrograms per cubic meter of air). State and federal Ambient Air Quality Standards were developed to protect the most susceptible population groups from adverse health effects and were established in terms of parts per million or micrograms per cubic meter for the applicable emissions.

The SDAPCD does not require localized air quality impact analysis and has not established localized significance thresholds for operational emissions from land development. Compared to project construction, operation of the proposed project would emit fewer criteria air pollutants, and the pollutants would be less toxic than the DPM emitted from off-road construction equipment. Moreover, the pollutants would be dispersed over the entire project site, which is much larger than the Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction area analyzed in the HRA. Further, the proposed project would not accommodate land uses that would generate a large number of heavy truck trips during operation. Residential and commercial land uses are not typical generators of substantial DPM. Therefore, the on-site and off-site sensitive receptors would be subject to lower health risks during project operation than during project construction. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not be expected to result in any basin-wide increase in health effects.

As noted in the Brief of Amicus Curiae filed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District in Sierra Club v. County of Fresno (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502 (SCAQMD 2015), the SCAQMD has acknowledged that, for criteria pollutants, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to quantify operational health impacts from land development for various reasons, including modeling limitations, as well as where in the atmosphere air pollutants interact and form. Furthermore, as noted in the Brief of Amicus Curiae by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) in the Sierra Club litigation, currently available modeling tools are not equipped to provide a meaningful analysis of the correlation between an individual development project's air pollutant emissions and specific human health impacts (SJVAPCD 2015). The SJVAPCD explained that "running the photochemical grid model used for predicting ozone attainment with emissions solely from one project would thus not be likely to yield valid information given the relative scale involved" (SJVAPCD 2015). O_3 is not directly emitted into the air but is instead formed as ozone precursors undergo complex chemical reactions through sunlight exposure (SJVAPCD 2015).

In fact, the SJVAPCD indicated that even a project with criteria pollutant emissions that exceed a CEQA threshold does not necessarily cause localized human health impacts because, even when faced with relatively high emissions, the SJVAPCD cannot determine "whether and to what extent emissions from an individual project directly impact human health in a particular area" (SJVAPCD 2015). On that point, the SCAQMD reiterated that "an agency should not be required to perform analyses that do not produce reliable or meaningful results" (SCAQMD 2015).

Additionally, the SCAQMD acknowledges that health effects quantification from O_3, as an example, is correlated with the increases in ambient level of O_3 in the air (concentration) that an individual person breathes. The SCAQMD goes on to state that it would take a large amount of additional emissions to cause a modeled increase in ambient O_3 levels over the entire region. The SCAQMD states that based on its own modeling in the 2012 AQMP, a reduction of 432 tons/864,000 pounds per day of NO_x and a reduction of 187 tons/374,000 pounds per day of VOCs would reduce O_3 levels at the highest monitored site by only 9 parts per billion. As such, the SCAQMD concludes that it is not currently possible to accurately quantify O_3-related health impacts caused by NO_x or VOC emissions from relatively small projects (defined as projects with regional scope) due to photochemistry and regional model limitations (SCAQMD 2015).

The SCAQMD has only been able to correlate potential health outcomes for very large emissions sources as part of its rulemaking activity. Specifically, 6,620 pounds per day of NO_x and 89,180 pounds per day of VOC were expected to result in approximately 20 premature deaths per year and 89,947 school absences due to O_3. The proposed project would generate far less than 6,620 pounds per day of NO_x or 89,190 pounds per day of VOC emissions. With implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-6 through AIR-10 and GHG-4, the proposed project would generate a maximum of 70.65 pounds per day of NO_x during construction and 65.02 or 66.70 pounds per day of NO_x during operation (approximately 1 percent of 6,620 pounds per day). The proposed project would also generate a maximum of 10.98 pounds per day of VOC emissions during construction and 136.32 or 137.37 pounds per day of VOC emissions during operation (0.15 percent of 89,190 pounds per day). Therefore, the proposed project's emissions are not sufficiently high to use a regional modeling program to correlate health effects on a basin-wide level.

AIR-3: ***Tier 4 Construction Equipment. The City of Santee shall require heavy-duty, diesel-powered construction equipment used on the project site during construction to be powered by California Air Resources Board-certified Tier 4 (Final) or newer engines and diesel-powered haul trucks to be 2010 model year or newer that conform to 2010 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency truck standards. This requirement shall be included in the construction contractor's contract specifications and the project construction documents, including the grading plan, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Santee***

prior to issuance of a grading permit. This mitigation measure applies to all construction phases.

AIR-4: ***Construction Equipment Maintenance. The City of Santee shall require the project construction contractor to maintain construction equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per the manufacturer's specification for the duration of construction. Contract specifications shall be included in project construction documents, including the grading plan, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Santee prior to issuance of a grading permit.***

AIR-11: ***Construction Buffer Area. The City of Santee shall require the applicant to complete Phase 1 earthmoving and paving activities within 300 feet from the southwestern corner of the Village Center in Fanita Commons before any residents occupy the Village Center. The applicant shall also integrate the Phase 2 grading and utilities activities within 500 feet from the southwestern corner of the Village Center into Phase 1 so that activities are complete prior to occupation of the Fanita Commons Village Center.***

AIR-12: ***New Source Review. The City of Santee shall require the applicant to avoid siting new on-site toxic air contaminant sources in the vicinity of residences and schools. Gasoline-dispensing facilities with a throughput of less than 3.6 million gallons per year must have the gasoline dispensers at least 50 feet from the nearest residential land use, daycare center, or school. In addition, gasoline-dispensing facilities with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or more, distribution centers, and dry cleaning operations are prohibited within the project.***

The City Council finds Mitigation Measures **AIR-3**, **AIR-4**, **AIR-11** and **AIR-12** are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts to sensitive receptors. Mitigation Measures **AIR-3**, **AIR-4** and **AIR-11** will ensure impacts from DPM concentrations during Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction and roadway construction are mitigated to a less than significant level by reducing on-site and off-site maximum cancer risk to below SDAPCD's threshold of 10 in one million. Mitigation Measure **AIR-12** will ensure operational impacts are less than significant by avoiding siting toxic air contaminant sources in close vicinity of residences or schools. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the

proposed Project to sensitive receptors, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts to sensitive receptors. (EIR, § 4.2.5.3.)

B. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Sensitive Species

Threshold: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.3.5.1.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation:

Sensitive Plant Species

Direct Impacts. Impacts to the following species would not be significant due to the lack of sensitivity of the species (not state or federally listed, CRPR List 3 or 4, or not listed by CNPS): San Diego sagewort, small-flowered morning-glory, Palmer's grapplinghook, graceful tarplant, California adder's-tongue, ashy spike-moss, chaparral rein orchid, and San Diego County viguiera. None of these species are proposed for coverage by the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan. Each of these species is a CRPR 4 species, which are relatively common in this portion of the County and are not considered significantly rare. Therefore, impacts to these non-Covered Species would not be significant under CEQA, and direct impacts would be less than significant.

Other sensitive plant species that occur in the region (e.g., Encinitas baccharis [*Baccharis vanessae*], gabbro-endemic species, clay-endemic species) were not detected in focused surveys; therefore, there would be no significant direct impacts to these species.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in direct impacts to covered special-status plant species, including San Diego goldenstar, variegated dudleya, San Diego barrel cactus, and willowy monardella. All permanent and temporary impacts, in both on- and off-site areas, to these species would be significant.

A total of 117.56 acres of USFWS-designated Critical Habitat for willowy monardella occur along the northwestern boundary of the project site. The majority of the Critical Habitat (110.54 acres) would be in the Habitat Preserve, and only 7.02 acres would be impacted from project implementation. Although 7.02 acres of Critical Habitat for willowy monardella would be both permanently (4.39 acres) and temporarily (2.63 acres) impacted, only 1.39 acres of it is suitable habitat for this species despite being designated. Impacts would occur to one willowy monardella individual in the Critical Habitat area, adjacent to the detention basin (temporary impact). Impacts to the 49 individuals along the existing retained trails and adjacent to proposed trail creation areas would be avoided. Impacts to this species would be significant.

According to the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan, impacts to individual mature oak trees (i.e., oak trees with at least one trunk of 6-inch or more diameter at breast height [DBH] or multi-trunked native oak trees with aggregate diameter of 10-inch DBH) would be significant and require mitigation. Direct impacts to Coulter's saltbush would also occur, resulting in a significant impact to this species.

Permanent and temporary impacts to covered special-status plant species, including San Diego goldenstar, variegated dudleya, San Diego barrel cactus, and willowy monardella, in both on- and off-site areas, are considered significant and would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** and **BIO-2**. The Preserve Management Plan addresses potential indirect impacts to sensitive plant species from soil erosion, litter, fire, and hydrologic changes occurring within the Habitat Preserve (Mitigation Measure **BIO-1**). Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** and **BIO-2** would preserve or restore sensitive vegetation communities that provide suitable habitat for these species and provide translocation for certain species. It is assumed that this is a Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan Covered Project and that impacts to covered narrow endemic species are subject to the narrow endemic species policy identified in the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan, included in the proposed project as Mitigation Measure **BIO-3** that requires 100 percent conservation within open space (i.e., hardline preserve) and 80 percent conservation through translocation within permanent impact (i.e., take-authorized) areas. Direct impacts to the non-covered CRPR 1B species Coulter's saltbush would also be subject to the narrow endemic plant species policy (Mitigation Measure **BIO-3**). Direct impacts to Engelmann oak (five individuals) would be reduced to a less than significant level through Mitigation Measure **BIO-4**, which would replant seedling oak trees at a 3:1 ratio according to the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan.

Indirect Impacts. Indirect impacts to special-status plants would primarily result from adverse edge effects. During construction of the proposed project, edge effects may include dust, which could disrupt plant vitality in the short term, as well as construction-related soil erosion and runoff.

Permanent indirect edge effects could include intrusions by humans and domestic pets and possible trampling of individual plants, unauthorized trail use, invasion by exotic plant and wildlife species, exposure to urban pollutants, soil erosion, litter, fire, and hydrological changes (e.g., changes in surface and groundwater level and quality). Not only can altered hydrology directly affect special-status plants, increased moisture associated with irrigation and runoff can attract invasive Argentine ants (*Linepithema humile*), which could displace native ants (e.g., harvester ants (*Messor* spp., *Pogonomyrmex* spp.) that are potential pollinators and seed dispersers for special-status plants. Argentine ants are ineffective at seed dispersal and can wreak ecological havoc, disrupt ecosystem processes, and threaten future stability.

Application of Mitigation Measures **BIO-5** through **BIO-7** would reduce indirect impacts to special-status plant species to a less than significant level through preparing a SWPPP, conducting preconstruction surveys, and implementing standard best management practices and requirements that address erosion and runoff, including the construction-related minimization measures required by the MSCP, federal Clean Water Act, and NPDES. Mitigation Measure **BIO-9** would reduce permanent indirect impacts to special-status plants by planting cactus species in brush management zones, temporary impact areas, and between roadways and open space to help protect against incursions by domestic pets, children, or recreationists. Additionally, Mitigation Measure **BIO-10** would require that all herbicides used during landscaping activities be contained within the proposed project's impact footprint and weed control treatments include all legally permitted chemical, manual, and mechanical methods applied with the authorization of the County agriculture commissioner. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-11** would establish control measures for, and quarterly monitoring of, Argentine ants along the construction–Habitat Preserve interface to reduce impacts to native ants so that the impact to special-status plant species would be less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** through **BIO-11** would reduce direct and indirect permanent and temporary impacts to sensitive plant species to below a level of significance.

Sensitive Wildlife Species

Direct Impacts. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the direct loss of habitat, including foraging habitat, for the majority of the special-status wildlife species described in Section 4.3.1.4 of the EIR, as well as those species with modeled suitable habitat and a moderate potential to occur on the project site. These species include the following: western spadefoot, southern California legless lizard, California glossy snake, San Diego tiger whiptail, red diamondback rattlesnake, Blainville's horned lizard, Coronado Island skink, Belding's orange-throated whiptail, coast patch-nosed snake, two-striped garter snake, Cooper's hawk, Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, grasshopper sparrow, golden eagle, Bell's sage sparrow, northern harrier, American peregrine falcon, long-eared owl, oak titmouse, coastal cactus wren, merlin, yellow-breasted chat, prairie falcon, loggerhead shrike, coastal California gnatcatcher, rufous hummingbird, Brewer's sparrow, yellow warbler, least Bell's vireo, white-tailed kite, California horned lark, San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, Dulzura pocket mouse, northwestern San Diego pocket mouse, San Diego desert woodrat, pallid bat, western mastiff bat, Townsend's big-eared bat, western red bat, western yellow bat, long-eared myotis, western small-footed myotis, Yuma myotis, big free-tailed bat, pocketed free-tailed bat, San Diego fairy shrimp, Quino checkerspot butterfly, and Hermes copper butterfly.

No direct impacts are expected to osprey because this species was observed perched on site but foraging within nearby Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve, and there is no suitable foraging or nesting habitat for this species on site. Willow flycatcher has a low potential to nest on site since only one willow flycatcher was observed in May 2017 during focused surveys and was not observed during subsequent visits. In accordance with the survey protocol guidelines, this individual was determined to be a migrant subspecies and not southwestern willow flycatcher. Therefore, direct impacts to breeding willow flycatchers would not occur.

A total of 2,407.40 acres of USFWS-designated Critical Habitat for coastal California gnatcatcher occur on the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would result in impacts to 987.58 acres of Critical Habitat for coastal California gnatcatcher, including both permanent and temporary impacts; however, only 399.19 acres would be considered suitable habitat for this species. Impacts would occur to 12 coastal California gnatcatcher use areas within the designated Critical Habitat area.

A total of 2,426.06 acres of proposed USFWS Critical Habitat for Hermes copper butterfly occur on the project site. It should be noted

that the USFWS modeling used to prepare the proposed Critical Habitat designations is based on a combination of internal and external opinion and buffering of assumed habitat and does not take into account the site-specific suitable habitat. In this instance, suitable habitat refers to redberry buckthorn within 15 feet of California buckwheat. Therefore, proposed USFWS Critical Habitat designations can overestimate the actual suitable habitat within an area and include many acres of unsuitable habitat (e.g., areas where redberry buckthorn and/or California buckwheat are not present). Implementation of the proposed project would result in impacts to 974.11 acres of proposed Critical Habitat for Hermes copper butterfly, including both permanent and temporary impacts; however, only 52.97 acres would be considered potentially suitable habitat for this species.

It is assumed that this is a hardline Covered Project under the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan. As such, impacts to covered narrow endemic species are subject to the narrow endemic species policy identified in the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan which requires 100 percent conservation within open space (i.e., hardline preserve) and 80 percent conservation through translocation within permanent impact (i.e., take-authorized) areas.

Indirect Impacts. Temporary construction-related indirect impacts to wildlife generally include noise, vibration, lighting, increased human activity, hydrologic and water quality (e.g., chemical pollution, increased turbidity, excessive sedimentation, flow interruptions, and changes in water temperature), and trash and garbage, which can attract predators, such as American crows, common ravens, and coyotes, and mesopredators, such as raccoons and striped skunks. Permanent development-related indirect impacts to wildlife generally include noise, lighting, increased predation or harassment by pet, stray, and feral cats and dogs as well as other mesopredators, invasion by exotic wildlife species, pesticide use, altered fire regimes, and increased roadkill.

Due to the probable increase in manicured lawns and decrease in overall open space, there may be increased parasitism of native birds by brown-headed cowbirds (*Molothrus ater*). Parasitism to shrub nesting bird species would be a significant indirect permanent impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts to nesting birds.

Permanent indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species could occur from Argentine ants. Argentine ants are known to displace native insects that are the main prey base for many special-status wildlife species and possibly help promote other non-native

invertebrates such as earwigs and sowbugs, which could affect the Quino checkerspot butterfly.

Western spadefoot and San Diego fairy shrimp are generally vulnerable to exotic wildlife (including African clawed frog) and disease (e.g., viruses and chytridiomycosis caused by the chytrid fungus). The lower seasonal basins in the western portion of the project site (typically adjacent to Goodan Ranch/Sycamore Canyon County Preserve) support predatory African clawed frogs. This species could have a negative permanent effect on remaining San Diego fairy shrimp, western spadefoot, and other native amphibians that use the basins as breeding resources and could also have a negative effect on the success of created basins in which they could invade. Implementation of the proposed project would result in potentially significant indirect impacts to western spadefoot and San Diego fairy shrimp.

Project construction could result in temporary construction and permanent development-related indirect impacts to individuals and suitable habitat for reptile species and small mammals. Implementation of the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts to special-status reptiles and small mammal species. In addition to general temporary construction-related and permanent development-related indirect effects to host plants on site (e.g., dust, trampling, non-native species), the Quino checkerspot butterfly and Hermes copper butterfly are vulnerable to pesticides that could kill individuals and wildfire that could eliminate host plants and kill individuals, including adults and larvae. Adult butterflies also would be at risk of habitat fragmentation, isolation and vehicle collisions when dispersing. Wildfires may result in loss of habitat for these species as well.

Permanent development-related indirect impacts may occur to grasshopper sparrow from altered fire regimes. The grasshopper sparrow prefers fairly continuous grassland (preferably native grasslands) for foraging and nesting with occasional taller grasses, forbs, or shrubs for song perches. The reduction or elimination of wildfires on the project site could cause the annual grassland habitat to permanently revert back to scrub habitat and contribute to a potentially significant impact to the grasshopper sparrow.

Mitigation Measures **BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, **BIO-6** through **BIO-8**, and **BIO-10** through **BIO-20** would mitigate all direct and indirect permanent and temporary impacts to sensitive wildlife species to below a level of significance. EIR Table 4.3-8a lists special-status wildlife species that would be subject to direct impacts from project development and

the mitigation measure proposed to reduce the impact to less than significant for each species.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-6** through **BIO-10** and **BIO-20** and **BIO-21** would reduce indirect impacts to sensitive wildlife species on the project site to a less than significant level through non-invasive herbicide use; conformance with the SWPPP; biological monitoring; signs/fencing; planting of cactus patches, poison oak, and stinging nettle along the development–Habitat Preserve interface; non-invasive herbicide use; and implementation of a Fire Protection Plan.

Impacts to special-status amphibian and reptile species would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1**, preserving suitable habitat, and **BIO-2**, restoring temporary impacts to suitable habitat. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-11** would reduce indirect impacts to native ants to less than significant through control measures and quarterly monitoring of Argentine ants that would occur along the construction–Habitat Preserve interface. In addition, implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-12** and **BIO-13** would reduce impacts to western spadefoot to less than significant requiring a Vernal Pool Mitigation Plan and relocating individuals in impact areas to suitable breeding habitat outside of impact areas. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-19**, which would monitor for presence of African clawed frogs within seasonal basins and require eradication if needed, would reduce potential impacts to western spadefoot and San Diego fairy shrimp to a less than significant level.

Impacts to nesting birds would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-14**, nesting bird surveys; **BIO-15**, restoring temporary impacts in wetland areas; **BIO-16**, utilizing a coastal cactus wren management plan; and **BIO-17**, brown-headed cowbird trapping on the project site.

Impacts to special-status mammal species would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-1**, management of the Habitat Preserve.

Impacts to special-status invertebrate species would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1**, **BIO-12**, and **BIO-18**, restoring and enhancing suitable habitat.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, **BIO-6** through **BIO-10**, and Mitigation Measures **BIO-11** through **BIO-21** would

reduce potentially significant direct and indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species to less than significant.

BIO-1: ***Preserve Management Plan. Within the on-site Habitat Preserve, the applicant shall preserve in perpetuity a total of 1,650.38 acres of on-site Multiple Species Conservation Program open space including 1,518.50 acres within the Habitat Preserve (including 1,448.84 acres of sensitive upland habitats), 10.52 acres of proposed trails, 6.88 acres of San Diego Gas & Electric access road, and 114.47 acres of on-site temporary impacts that shall become part of the Habitat Preserve once restored (see Mitigation Measure BIO-2, Upland Restoration Plan). Preservation of on-site open space requires recordation of a Habitat Preserve conservation easement and in-perpetuity management by the Preserve Manager in accordance with the Preserve Management Plan, which would be funded by an endowment or other acceptable permanent funding mechanism. The Preserve Management Plan includes a combination of active and passive restoration programs to gradually increase biological resources within open space areas through periodic treatments, mainly involving seed application on a landscape level combined with weed control activities.***

An example diagram of a Preserve Management Plan is included in the Biological Resources Report for the Fanita Ranch Project (Appendix D), Figure 6-1, Potential Restoration Treatment Areas, and an example diagram of the rotational hexagonal treatment areas is included as Figure 6-2, Habitat Treatment Areas, but the actual distribution of restoration and long-term treatment blocks is in the Preserve Management Plan and the restoration plans. As shown in Appendix D, Figure 6-2, Conceptual Habitat Treatment Areas, the Habitat Preserve was divided into Zones A and B. Zone A includes areas that will receive treatment on a rotational basis, whereas Zone B will receive as-needed treatment since this area of the Habitat Preserve is more intact than in Zone A. Each hexagon is approximately 12 acres and numbered 1 through 8, which represents the year that treatment activities will take place within that hexagon. This would be separate from the treatments occurring from restoration activities associated with the proposed project's temporary impacts. Some of these treatments shall be directed to increase biological resources for specific Covered Species such as Quino checkerspot butterfly, Hermes copper butterfly, coastal California gnatcatcher, and coastal cactus wren. It is anticipated that gradual habitat enhancements shall focus on mapped disturbed habitat and

mapped disturbed native vegetation communities such as coastal sage scrub and valley grasslands. The Preserve Management Plan addresses the salvage of individual plants of sensitive species from the project development impact footprint prior to construction and translocation into open space areas.

The Preserve Management Plan addresses long-term, permanently funded management of the on-site open space that accomplishes the goal of maintaining appropriate, high-value native plant communities throughout the Habitat Preserve. The Preserve Management Plan addresses management and monitoring of vegetation communities through specific minimum survey and management requirements. Multiple Species Conservation Program-level monitoring is the responsibility of the City of Santee or designee. The Preserve Management Plan discusses appropriate signage and fencing to protect certain sensitive resources, trash receptacle placement, and bicycle access and speed limits in the Habitat Preserve. The Preserve Management Plan also designates and describes all permitted land uses and activities (e.g., trails and utilities) in the open space area and how impacts to preserved vegetation communities shall be avoided and minimized. The Preserve Management Plan includes long-term management and monitoring measures for four covered plant species (variegated dudleya, San Diego goldenstar, willowy monardella, and San Diego barrel cactus) and one sensitive plant species (Coulter's saltbush) to maximize the likelihood of their long-term viability.

As identified in Table 4.3-9, temporary impacts to 116.45 acres (including on- and off-site areas) of sensitive upland vegetation communities are expected with project implementation. All on-site temporary impacts, totaling 114.47 acres, shall become part of the Habitat Preserve once restored, including 110.59 acres of on-site sensitive upland vegetation communities.

Table 4.3-9. Restoration Requirement for Temporary Impacts to Sensitive Upland Vegetation Communities

Vegetation Community	*Temporary Impacts (On Site)*	*Temporary Impacts (Off Site)*	*Mitigation Ratio [1]*	*Total Restoration Requirement (Acres)*
Scrub and Chaparral				
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	33.09	1.33	1:1	34.42
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub (Disturbed)	4.20	3.28	1:1	7.48
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub/Valley Needlegrass Grassland	0.50	0.09	1:1	0.60

Table 4.3-9. Restoration Requirement for Temporary Impacts to Sensitive Upland Vegetation Communities

Vegetation Community	*Temporary Impacts (On Site)*	*Temporary Impacts (Off Site)*	*Mitigation Ratio* [1]	*Total Restoration Requirement (Acres)*
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub/Valley Needlegrass Grassland (Disturbed)	1.48	0.94	1:1	2.41
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub–Baccharis-dominated	0.62	—	1:1	0.62
Granitic Southern Mixed Chaparral	45.53	—	1:1	45.53
Scrub and Chaparral Subtotal	*85.43*	*5.64*	—	*91.07*
Grasslands, Vernal Pools, Meadows, and Other Herb Communities				
Valley Needlegrass Grassland	7.92	—	2:1	15.85
Valley Needlegrass Grassland (Disturbed)	5.84	—	2:1	11.68
Non-Native Grassland	11.40	0.21	1:1	11.61
Grasslands Subtotal	25.16	*0.21*	—	*39.14*
Total Acreage[2]	110.59	5.86	—	130.21

[1] Mitigation ratios are based on Table 5-14 in the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan (City of Santee 2018).

[2] Totals may not sum due to rounding.

BIO-2: ***Upland Restoration Plan. Temporary impacts to sensitive upland vegetation communities occurring in both on- and off-site improvement areas are anticipated to require a total of 130.21 acres of restoration. Temporary impacts shall require restoration in place. A 1:1 ratio of in-place restoration for impacts to native grassland areas (i.e., valley and needlegrass grassland [including disturbed]), in addition to a 1:1 ratio of preservation and/or creation of native grassland within the Habitat Preserve, would satisfy the 2:1 mitigation ratio for impacts to native grassland outlined in Table 5-14 in the Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan. Restoration and creation of native grassland will have the added benefit of increasing suitable habitat for grasshopper sparrow.***

Temporary impact areas shall be restored to the appropriate native vegetation community type. In order to determine the appropriate restored habitat, the Upland Restoration Plan includes an evaluation of restoration suitability specific to proposed vegetation types, soil preparation, plant palettes, irrigation, erosion control, maintenance and monitoring program, and success criteria. All areas shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years to maximize the likelihood of establishment of intended plant communities. If temporary impact areas are not considered appropriate for restoration of the sensitive native plant community that originally was mapped in that area, these areas shall be considered

permanently impacted and mitigated in conformance with mitigation ratios for permanent impacts to sensitive upland vegetation communities as outlined in Mitigation Measure BIO-1, Preserve Management Plan. There is currently a surplus of approximately 145.51 acres in the Habitat Preserve that would be available to accommodate these additional impacts if deemed necessary. The Upland Restoration Plan is included as Appendix Q in the Biological Resources Report for the Fanita Ranch Project.

BIO-3: ***Narrow Endemic Plant Species. Mitigation requirements for impacts to special-status plant species proposed under the Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan shall seek to establish adequate preservation of the species to ensure long-term population stability. The narrow endemic species policy identified in the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan requires 100 percent conservation in open space (i.e., hardline preserve) and 80 percent conservation through translocation in permanent impact (i.e., take-authorized) areas. Based on the current project impacts, two special-status plant species (Coulter's saltbush and San Diego goldenstar) shall require translocation of individuals and/or planting to meet the 80 percent conservation in take-authorized areas. Conservation of Coulter's saltbush, although not a Covered Species, shall be treated in a manner consistent with the narrow endemic policy of the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan. Implementation of this policy ensures adequate conservation of each species in the subarea and regionally in the MSCP Plan area. Mitigation requirements are summarized in Table 4.3-10.***

Table 4.3-10. Mitigation Requirements for Impacts to Sensitive Plant Species

Species/Status (Federal/State/CNPS/ Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan)	*Total Individuals*	*Individuals Impacted (Percent Impacted)*	*Habitat Preserve Individuals (Percent Conserved)*	*Individuals Needed to Meet the 80% Conservation Requirement*	*Translocation Requirement[1] (Individuals)*
Coulter's saltbush (*Atriplex coulteri*)[2] None/None/1B.2/None	65	15 (23%)	50* (77%)	52	2
San Diego goldenstar (*Bloomeria clevelandii*)[2] None/None/1B.1/Covered	18,318	7,964 (44%)	10,354 (56%)	14,654	4,300

Table 4.3-10. Mitigation Requirements for Impacts to Sensitive Plant Species

Species/Status (Federal/State/CNPS/ Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan)	*Total Individuals*	*Individuals Impacted (Percent Impacted)*	*Habitat Preserve Individuals (Percent Conserved)*	*Individuals Needed to Meet the 80% Conservation Requirement*	*Translocation Requirement[1] (Individuals)*
Variegated dudleya (*Dudleya variegata*)[3] None/None/1B.2/Covered NE	8,942	786 (9%)	8,156 (91%)	7,154	0
San Diego barrel cactus (*Ferocactus viridescens*)[3] None/None/2B.1/Covered	4,856	585 (12%)	4,270 (88%)	3,885	0
Willowy monardella (*Monardella viminea*) FE/CE/1B.1/Covered	1,622	1** (<1%)	1,621 (99%)	1,298	0

Notes: CNPS = California Native Plant Society; MSCP = Multiple Species Conservation Program.
[1] The number of individuals proposed for translocation is the minimum needed to meet 80 percent preservation. It is likely that more individuals will be translocated to ensure translocation success.
[2] Species that require translocation to meet 80 percent preservation.
[3] This species meets the 80 percent preservation; however, individuals occurring within the impact area will be targeted for collection and translocation.
* It should be noted that these individuals do not occur with the Habitat Preserve. However, since they occur in the impact neutral area and will not be impacted with project implementation, they are considered preserved.
** All impacts to the 49 individuals occurring along existing retained trails and adjacent to proposed trail creation areas would be avoided through the maintenance and management of trails as outlined in the Public Access Plan (Appendix D).
Status Legend
Federal
FE: Federally listed as endangered.
State
CE: State-listed as endangered.
CRPR: California Rare Plant Rank (previously known as the CNPS List)
1B: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
2B: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere
4: Plants of limited distribution – a watch list
Threat Rank
.1 – Seriously threatened in California (over 80 percent of occurrences threatened/high degree and immediacy of threat)
.2 – Fairly threatened in California (20–80 percent occurrences threatened/moderate degree and immediacy of threat)
Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan (City of Santee 2018)
Covered: Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan Covered Species

Coulter's saltbush and San Diego goldenstar require translocation or planting of impacted populations in order to adequately mitigate project impacts. Translocation requires evaluation of the donor site for suitability of translocation method and of the receptor site for suitability of sustaining Coulter's saltbush and San Diego goldenstar. The translocation program is detailed in the Upland Restoration Plan and Preserve Management Plan and will be integrated with the overall uplands and wetlands restoration of the project site.

The rare plant mitigation component of the Upland Restoration Plan discusses appropriate methods for plant salvage and/or

growing and planting; in general, the impacted population of the sensitive plant shall be targeted for salvage and translocation in order to meet the 80 percent minimum translocation survival rate. Where this is not feasible, germination and growing of appropriate genetic stock shall occur and be planted on site in suitable receptor sites. Success of the translocation program in the receptor sites such that the plant and acreage goals as required in Table 4.3-10 are established shall be measured through 5 years of monitoring and annual reporting to the City of Santee.

BIO-4: ***Oak Tree Restoration. Impacts to 5 individual Engelmann oak trees and 17 individual oak trees in the coast live oak woodland vegetation community shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1; that is, three established sleeve-sized seedlings for each mature tree (i.e., oak trees with at least one trunk of 6-inch or more diameter at breast height or multi-trunked native oak trees with aggregate diameter of 10-inch diameter at breast height) to be impacted by the proposed project. Therefore, a total of 66 oak trees shall be planted to meet the 3:1 mitigation ratio requirement. Oak tree restoration is included as a component of the Wetland Mitigation Plan (included in the Biological Resources Report for the Fanita Ranch Project as Appendix S), which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Santee prior to issuance of mass grading permits. The oak tree restoration component of the Wetland Mitigation Plan shall be used to guide the oak restoration effort. Replanting shall occur in the general areas where grasslands occur adjacent to existing oak trees and shall be conducted by a City of Santee-approved contractor. "Established" shall be defined as 5 years of sustained life without the assistance of irrigation and growth rates that are similar to those of naturally occurring reference oak trees. In the event the "established" success criteria cannot be achieved, the applicant and the City of Santee shall jointly agree on the implementation of remedial measures to mitigate for impacts to individual oak trees.***

BIO-5: ***Preconstruction Surveys and Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Special-Status Plant Species. Within the 13.44 acres of off-site impact areas not previously surveyed along Magnolia Avenue and prior to the commencement of construction activities in suitable habitat, a preconstruction survey shall be conducted in suitable habitat, determined by the project biologist, to determine whether special-status plants are present in the construction zone or within 50 feet of the construction zone boundary. Focused surveys for special-status plant species shall be conducted by a qualified biologist***

according to the California Native Plant Society Botanical Survey Guidelines, Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Populations and Natural Communities, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service General Rare Plant Survey Guidelines. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted during a period when the target species would be observable and identifiable (e.g., blooming period for annuals). The target species list will include all species observed on the project site and those that have a high to moderate potential to occur in the construction zone or within 50 feet of the construction zone.

Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures

If any covered narrow endemic plant species are detected during the preconstruction surveys, impacts would be subject to the narrow endemic species policy (Mitigation Measure BIO-3, Narrow Endemic Plant Species), and the location and number of individuals will be mapped and analyzed. If impacts to any covered narrow endemic species exceeds the threshold for the narrow endemic species policy, the following measures shall be implemented:

1. Special-status plants in the vicinity of the disturbance shall be temporarily fenced or prominently flagged and a 50-foot buffer established around the populations to prevent inadvertent encroachment by vehicles and equipment during the activity.

2. Seeds/bulbs shall be collected and stored in appropriate storage conditions (e.g., cool and dry), and dispersed/transplanted following the construction activity and reapplication of salvaged topsoil.

3. The top 6 inches of topsoil shall be salvaged, stockpiled, and replaced as soon as practicable after project completion. The salvaged topsoil shall be redistributed at the same depth and contoured to blend with surrounding grades.

BIO-6: ***Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Mitigation for potential permanent indirect impacts to vegetation communities, wildlife, and jurisdictional resources shall require implementation of Land Use Adjacency Guidelines as specified in the Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan or the Preserve Management Plan. The City of Santee shall ensure that all project development adjacent to the boundary of the Habitat Preserve adhere to the following adjacency guidelines as***

outlined in the Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan:

- ***Drainage — All developed and paved areas must prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, excess water, exotic plant materials, and other elements that might degrade or harm the natural environment or ecosystem processes within the preserves. This shall be accomplished using a variety of methods, including natural detention basins, grass swales, or mechanical trapping devices. The project design shall comply with the Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan such that stormwater flows conveyed from the project site do not adversely affect off-site vegetation communities or jurisdictional resources by significantly altering natural hydrologic patterns.***
- ***Lighting — Lighting of all developed areas adjacent to the Habitat Preserve shall be directed away from the Habitat Preserve wherever feasible and consistent with public safety. Low-pressure sodium lighting shall be used whenever possible.***
- ***Noise — Uses adjacent to the Habitat Preserve shall be designed to minimize noise impacts. Berms or walls shall be constructed adjacent to commercial areas and any other use that may introduce noises that could affect or interfere with wildlife utilization of the Habitat Preserve.***
- ***Invasive species — No invasive non-native plant or wildlife species shall be introduced into areas immediately adjacent to the Habitat Preserve. All open space slopes immediately adjacent to the Habitat Preserve shall be planted with native species that reflect the adjacent native habitat.***
- ***Buffers — There are no requirements for buffers outside the Habitat Preserve, except as may be required for wetlands pursuant to federal and/or state permits or by California Environmental Quality Act mitigation conditions.***
- ***Fuel modification zones — Fuel modification zones shall be fully contained adjacent to the project's development. Prior to implementing the project development adjacent to the Habitat Preserve, the local fire authority shall review and approve proposed fuel modification treatments to ensure that no new fuel modification will be required within the Habitat Preserve.***

Conformance with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines listed above shall be made a condition of project approval and shall be included in Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions.

BIO-7: ***Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The applicant shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan pursuant to***

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System General Construction Permit (Water Quality Order 99-08-DWQ). The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan shall include, at a minimum, the best management practices listed below. The combined implementation of these requirements shall protect adjacent habitats and special-status species during construction to the maximum extent practicable with the goal of providing multiple beneficial uses. At a minimum, the following measures and/or restrictions shall be incorporated into the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and noted on construction plans, where appropriate, to avoid impacts on special-status species, sensitive vegetation communities, and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources during construction. An approved biologist (see Mitigation Measure BIO-8, Approved Biologist) shall verify the implementation of the following design requirements:

1. ***Fully covered trash receptacles that are wildlife-proof and weather-proof shall be installed and used by the operator to contain all food, food scraps, food wrappers, beverage containers, and other miscellaneous trash. Littering shall be prohibited, and trash shall be removed from construction areas daily. All food-related trash and garbage shall be removed from the construction sites on a daily basis.***

2. ***Pets on or adjacent to construction sites shall not be permitted by the contractor.***

3. ***Any equipment or vehicles driven and/or operated shall abide by a speed limit of 15 miles per hour during daylight hours and 10 miles per hour during dark hours.***

4. ***Construction activity shall not be permitted in jurisdictional aquatic resources, except as authorized by applicable law and permit(s), including permits and authorizations approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Regional Water Quality Control Board.***

5. ***Temporary structures and storage of construction materials shall not be located in jurisdictional aquatic resources.***

6. ***Staging/storage areas for construction equipment and materials shall not be located in jurisdictional aquatic resources.***

7. ***Any equipment or vehicles driven and/or operated in jurisdictional aquatic resources, as authorized by applicable law and permit(s), shall be checked and maintained by the operator daily to prevent leaks of oil or other petroleum products that could be deleterious to aquatic life if introduced to the watercourse.***

8. ***No stationary equipment, such as motors, pumps, generators, and welders, or fuel storage tanks, shall be located within jurisdictional aquatic resources.***

9. ***No debris, bark, slash sawdust, rubbish, cement or concrete, or washing thereof; oil; or petroleum products shall occur where it may be washed by rainfall or runoff into jurisdictional aquatic resources.***

10. ***When construction operations are completed, any excess materials or debris shall be removed from the work area according to the conditions outlined in the permit(s).***

11. ***No equipment maintenance shall be performed within or near jurisdictional aquatic resources, where petroleum products or other pollutants from the equipment may enter these areas.***

BIO-8: ***Approved Biologist. To prevent inadvertent disturbance to areas outside the limits of grading, all grading locations shall be monitored by a biologist. Prior to the issuance of any grading permit for areas adjacent to open space, the applicant shall retain a City of Santee-approved biologist for monitoring activities. The biologist shall monitor all grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities in or adjacent to open space areas. The biologist shall monitor these activities to ensure that the applicant complies with the appropriate standard conditions and mitigation measures, including the following:***

1. ***Prior to the commencement of clearing and grading operations or other activities involving significant soil disturbance, all open space areas shall be identified with temporary fencing or other markers clearly visible to construction personnel.***

2. ***A contractor education program shall be implemented for all workers and subcontractors and shall include a description of environmental restrictions relevant to construction and the penalties for violations. A chain of command and***

protocol for communicating problems or potential construction changes that may affect biological resources shall be established with the contractor and the City of Santee. Workers shall be made aware of what resources require protection through the use of photos or on-the-ground demonstration.

3. ***A monitoring biologist acceptable to the City of Santee shall be on site during any clearing of natural vegetation (i.e., annual ground cover, shrubs, or trees). The monitoring biologist shall flush special-status species (i.e., avian or other mobile species) from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush clearing and earthmoving activities.***

4. ***Following the completion of initial clearing/grading/ earthmoving activities, all open space areas to be avoided by construction equipment and personnel shall be marked with temporary fencing and other appropriate markers clearly visible to construction personnel. No construction access, parking, or storage of equipment or materials shall be permitted within such marked areas.***

5. ***In areas bordering the open space area, vehicle transportation routes between cut-and-fill locations shall be restricted to a minimal number consistent with project construction requirements. Waste dirt or rubble shall not be deposited on adjacent protected habitats. Regular preconstruction meetings involving the monitoring biologist, construction supervisors, and equipment operators shall be conducted and documented to ensure maximum practicable adherence to these measures.***

6. ***The monitoring biologist shall verify that the construction site is implementing the following Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan best management practices:***
   a. ***Dust-control fencing***
   b. ***Removal of construction debris and a clean work area***
   c. ***Covered trash receptacles that are wildlife-proof and weather-proof***
   d. ***Prohibition of pets on the construction site***
   e. ***A speed limit of 15 miles per hour during the daylight hours and 10 miles per hour during nighttime hours***

7. ***Open space areas in the likely dust drift radius of construction areas shall be periodically sprayed with water***

to reduce accumulated dust on the leaves, as recommended by the monitoring biologist.

8. ***Oversee the construction site so that cover and/or escape routes for wildlife from excavated areas shall be provided on a daily basis. All steep trenches, holes, and excavations during construction shall be covered at night with backfill, plywood, metal plates, or other means, and the edges covered with soils and plastic sheeting such that small wildlife cannot access them. Soil piles shall be covered at night to prevent wildlife from burrowing in. The edges of the sheeting shall be weighed down by sandbags. These areas may also be fenced to prevent wildlife from gaining access. Exposed trenches, holes, and excavations shall be inspected twice daily (i.e., each morning and prior to sealing the exposed area) by an approved biologist to monitor for wildlife entrapment. Excavations shall provide an earthen ramp to allow for a wildlife escape route.***

BIO-9: ***Habitat Preserve Protection. In order to protect against incursions by domestic pets, children, or recreationists, brush management zones, temporary impact zones between roadways, manufactured slopes in development areas, and open space shall be planted with native cactus species, and redberry buckthorn as appropriate. Native cactus shall be planted so that it does not hinder fire access but shall be clustered so that it discourages or inhibits encroachment. An added benefit is that these areas eventually could support coastal cactus wren. Suitable areas, acreages, and methods are addressed in the Preserve Management Plan.***

BIO-10: ***Weed Control Treatments. Weed control treatments shall include all legally permitted chemical, manual, and mechanical methods applied with the authorization of the County of San Diego agriculture commissioner. The application of herbicides shall be in compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations under the prescription of a pest control advisor and implemented by a licensed applicator. Where manual and/or mechanical methods are used, disposal of the plant debris shall follow the regulations set by the County of San Diego agriculture commissioner. The timing of the weed control treatment shall be determined for each plant species in consultation with the pest control advisor, the County of San Diego agriculture commissioner, and the California Invasive Plant Council with the goal of controlling populations before they start producing seeds. Additionally, the herbicides used***

during landscaping activities shall be contained within the proposed project's impact footprint.

BIO-11: ***Argentine Ant Control and Monitoring. Upon initiating construction, including landscaping in the development area, quarterly monitoring by a qualified biologist shall be initiated for Argentine ants along the development–Habitat Preserve interface at sentinel locations where invasions could occur (e.g., where moist microhabitats that attract Argentine ants may be created). A qualified biologist shall determine the monitoring locations. Ant pitfall traps, bait sampling, or similarly appropriate sampling method shall be placed in these sentinel locations and operated on a quarterly basis to detect invasion by Argentine ants. If Argentine ants are detected during monitoring, direct control measures shall be implemented immediately to help prevent the invasion from worsening. These direct controls may include but are not limited to nest/mound insecticide treatment or available natural control methods being developed. A general reconnaissance of the infested area shall also be conducted to identify and correct the possible source of the invasion, such as uncontrolled urban runoff, leaking pipes, or collected water. Quarterly monitoring reports, as needed, shall be submitted to the City of Santee Development Services Department. Monitoring reports shall include remedial recommendations and issue resolution discussions when necessary. Monitoring and control of Argentine ants shall occur in perpetuity and shall be included in the Preserve Management Plan (included as Appendix P in the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project). See Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project, Appendix P, for additional details on monitoring methods and control of Argentine ants within the Habitat Preserve.***

BIO-12: ***Vernal Pool Mitigation Plan. A Vernal Pool Mitigation Plan (Appendix R of the Biological Resources Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project) has been prepared and would allow disturbance of seasonal basin features (i.e., natural vernal pools and street ruts containing vernal pool indicator plant and wildlife species). The Vernal Pool Mitigation Plan is subject to approval from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and shall comply with Clean Water Act Section 404 and 401 permit/certification by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Regional Water Quality Control Board, respectively, as well as federal Endangered Species Act requirements. The Vernal Pool Mitigation Plan describes and identifies those areas slated for preservation, rehabilitation and enhancement, and requires the***

creation of new seasonal basin resources within the Habitat Preserve as mitigation for anticipated development impacts. The Vernal Pool Mitigation Plan is focused on seasonal basin features and associated upland watershed habitat enhancement opportunities and cover the following: vernal pool design and location, planting plan (planting palettes for both vernal pool and upland watershed habitats), and supplemental water program; maintenance and monitoring guidelines; San Diego fairy shrimp and western spadefoot translocation; and ownership arrangements and long-term management strategy.

Natural vernal pools shall be mitigated at a 4:1 ratio, including preservation and management of existing pools, rehabilitation/enhancement of existing features within the Habitat Preserve, and creation of new features. Constructed pools (i.e., artificial features and street ruts) shall be mitigated through rehabilitation/enhancement and/or creation at a 3:1 or 2:1 ratio, depending on whether the feature supports plant or wildlife indicator species. Rehabilitation/enhancement shall occur in existing features within the Habitat Preserve that are not included as vernal pools (i.e., street ruts lacking vernal pool indicator species). This would entail repairing degraded features through the manipulation of surface topography to improve the overall ecological function of the vernal pool, control of invasive species, and planting of appropriate native species. Creation would consist of establishing new vernal pools in areas where they did not previously occur and/or the returning of areas to a pre-existing condition through manipulation of surface topography to support inundation and ponding for vernal pools. Created features shall exhibit the same or improved characteristics as those within the impact area currently supporting fairy shrimp, indicator vernal pool plant species, and western spadefoot, and shall maintain comparable individual pool sizes and watersheds.

Existing permanently impacted features that support San Diego fairy shrimp and indicator vernal pool plant species shall have the top 1 to 3 inches of soil removed and set aside prior to mass grading. This soil shall be kept in a dry location until it is deposited into the new features. Once the created or enhanced pools are proven to hold water for the appropriate amount of time, they shall be inoculated with the soil from the impacted features. The acreage of surface area that shall be created shall be verified using on-site soil hydrologic properties and modeling of rainfall seasons. The target surface area acreage is 0.50 acre, based on the acreage of impacted features recorded

of which 0.40 acre shall need to include creation of new pools (Table 4.3-11). The Vernal Pool Mitigation Plan is included as Appendix R in the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project. This plan may be modified and augmented pending U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and wildlife agency (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife) review. Table 4.3-11 identifies mitigation requirements for impacts to vernal pools.

Table 4.3-11. Mitigation Requirements for Impacts to Vernal Pools

Vernal Pool Type	*Impacts*	*Mitigation Ratio*[1]	*Mitigation Acreage*	*Mitigation Credits (Habitat Preserve)*	*Total Mitigation Requirement*[2] *(Acres)*
Natural Vernal Pool	0.02	4:1	0.09	0.10	+<0. 01
Street Rut – containing plant indicator species	0.03	3:1	0.08	0.13	+0. 05
Street Rut – containing wildlife indicator species	0.36*	2:1	0.72	0.17	-0.56
Total Acreage	0.41*	—	0.90	0.40**	0.50

Notes: Totals may not sum due to rounding.

[1] Mitigation ratios are based on the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan (City of Santee 2018).

[2] Mitigation shall include both rehabilitation/enhancement of existing features within the Habitat Preserve and creation of new features. The exact breakdown by mitigation type shall be included in the Vernal Pool Mitigation Plan.

* This total includes 0.01 acre of off-site impacts.

** This acreage shall be included within the Habitat Preserve and shall be subject to long-term management and monitoring as directed by the Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan (City of Santee 2018).

BIO-13: ***Western Spadefoot Relocation. During the wet season prior to clearing or grading operations, biologists shall collect western spadefoot adults from areas within 300 meters of known occupied pools. Adults shall be relocated to another area on the project site that has suitable breeding habitat and few or no western spadefoot individuals.***

Details on the western spadefoot relocation effort are included as a component of the Vernal Pool Mitigation Plan (included in the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project as Appendix R), available to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for review, and is subject to approval by the wildlife agencies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife). The Western Spadefoot Relocation Plan includes, at a minimum, the following elements:

- ***The timing and methods for surveying, capturing, and releasing adults. Long-term care methods shall also be discussed if this option is used.***

- ***Collection shall occur during the first three or four large rain events of the season. Ideally, these rain events shall produce a minimum of 0.20 inch during a 24-hour period.***

BIO-14: ***Nesting Bird Survey. To avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds and raptors and other nesting birds, which are a sensitive biological resources pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the California Fish and Game Code, breeding season avoidance shall be implemented and included on all construction plans.***

Except as specified below, there shall be no brushing, clearing and/or grading allowed during the breeding season of migratory birds (between February 15 and) or raptors (January 1 and August 31) or coastal California gnatcatcher (between February 15 and August 15). If vegetation is to be cleared during the nesting season, all suitable habitat within 500 feet of the impact area shall be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by the qualified biologist no earlier than 72 hours prior to clearing. If project activities are delayed or suspended for more than 14 days during the nesting bird season, surveys should be repeated. The survey results shall be submitted by the applicant to the City of Santee Director of Development Services. If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged and mapped on the construction plans along with an initial 100-foot buffer for non-listed passerines, 300-foot buffer for listed passerines (e.g., coastal California gnatcatcher), and up to a 500-foot maximum buffer for raptors. The nests shall be avoided and buffers maintained until the nesting cycle is complete or it is determined that the nest has failed. The final appropriate buffer distance, as well as cycle completion or nest failure, shall be determined by an approved biologist. Factors used to determine and guide the appropriate buffer distance shall include individual pair behavior responses, amount of buffering topography, proximity to existing disturbance, and ambient noise levels. In addition, an approved biologist shall be present on the project site to monitor the vegetation removal to ensure that nests not detected during the initial survey are not disturbed (see Mitigation Measure BIO-8, Approved Biologist). If the monitoring biologist determines that the nesting activities are being substantially disrupted by adjacent construction activity, the City of Santee shall be notified, and measures to avoid or minimize such impacts shall be developed. Such measures might include installation of noise barriers, increased buffering, stopping construction in the area, or other measures, as developed.

BIO-15: ***Wetland Mitigation Plan. A total of 9.81 acres of impacts to jurisdictional resources, including 8.04 acres of permanent impacts and 1.77 acres of temporary impacts, would occur on and off site. Impacts to jurisdictional resources require permits and authorizations by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife prior to impacts. The applicant shall provide the City of Santee with permits and authorizations from each resource agency demonstrating approval of project impacts to aquatic resources prior to the approval of the grading and improvement plans.***

A Wetland Mitigation Plan (included in the Biological Resources Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project as Appendix S) has been prepared and describes the on-site mitigation program to mitigate anticipated temporary and permanent development impacts to waters of the United States and wetland vegetation communities. Both on- and off-site mitigation sites are needed to provide full compensation for project impacts, and therefore, two plans shall be required. The off-site mitigation will provide wetland habitat through a combination of habitat preservation, enhancement, restoration, and creation. With this program, wetland habitat that is comparable in habitat type and quality to the impact area shall be enhanced, restored, or created within the City of Santee's jurisdiction and within the San Diego River and/or its tributaries. The off-site restoration program shall be subject to the same standards and rules as the on-site mitigation program, including management of access control, invasive species, and native vegetation cover and diversity. Off-site restoration shall include these management efforts and a program of revegetation of wetland species with planting and seeding. The off-site habitat creation shall also include potential topographic alteration to expand and create bed and bank areas appropriate for the establishment of new wetland habitat. At least 7.53 acres of off-site mitigation shall be habitat creation and/or re-establishment. This total is based on the current aquatic resource assessment and impacts, and the no-net-loss requirement in the Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan. The off-site preservation/enhancement component may occur at the 11-acre parcel, owned by the project applicant, adjacent to the lower Santee Lakes to satisfy the off-site preservation/enhancement requirement. The City of Santee has agreed to allow the remaining off-site creation/re-establishment mitigation component to be completed within City of Santee-owned lands in the same hydrologic unit, next to the San Diego River. Based on preliminary evaluations, several opportunities have been

identified to provide off-site mitigation for the remaining creation/re-establishment mitigation component, indicating that it is feasible to accomplish the off-site compensatory mitigation.

The Wetland Mitigation Plan (Appendix S) is consistent with the USEPA's 2008 Compensatory Mitigation Rule and subsequent guidance documents. The Wetland Mitigation Plan shall use the latest available tentative tract map to define the mitigation areas. The Wetland Mitigation Plan provides a description of project impacts and required mitigation at approved replacement ratios. An implementation section includes the different types of wetland mitigation areas including treatments such as soil preparation, plant palettes, and temporary interim erosion control. Plant palettes incorporate sensitive species that will be impacted by the proposed project, as appropriate. A maintenance plan to promote the successful establishment of the target vegetation communities includes the specific activities to be performed over the 5-year maintenance period. A monitoring plan is included that describes performance criteria for each vegetation community, monitoring frequency, and methods. The Wetland Mitigation Plan includes reporting requirements and contingency measures.

Since temporary impact areas are not appropriate for restoration of jurisdictional resources, these areas shall be considered permanently impacted and shall be mitigated in conformance with the mitigation ratios for permanent impacts to jurisdictional resources. Mitigation ratios based on the Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan shall be included in the Wetland Mitigation Plan. A draft Wetland Mitigation Plan is included as Appendix S in the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project. This plan may be modified and augmented pending U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife review.

BIO-16: ***Coastal Cactus Wren Habitat Management. Coastal cactus wren is a Covered Species under the Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan. Because suitable and occupied habitat for this species shall be impacted by grading and construction of the proposed project, habitat enhancement and restoration of coastal cactus wren habitat shall occur. Based on project impacts to 0.57 acre of suitable habitat, a 3:1 mitigation ratio resulting in a total of 1.71 acres of habitat enhancement and restoration would be required for mitigation. This habitat restoration and enhancement is outlined within***

Upland Restoration Plan (Appendix Q), and the Preserve Management Plan (Appendix P) of the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project. This habitat shall need to be similar in extent and density to currently occupied patches to be impacted and shall show use by coastal cactus wren prior to clearing of currently occupied habitat. Use is minimally intended to prove that impacted coastal cactus wren have identified where these patches are located so that they can colonize them once their current habitat patches are cleared. It is anticipated that restoration and enhancement activities shall begin prior to construction, where practicable, to provide the most amount of time for maturation.

In order to enhance habitat for coastal cactus wren, appropriate areas in the Habitat Preserve shall be planted with coast prickly pear (Opuntia littoralis) and coastal cholla (Cylindropuntia prolifera) in a matrix that is optimal for coastal cactus wren. Studies performed on the Orange County Central Reserve found that an interstitial mix of cactus and sage scrub or grasslands may be optimal. This ratio has been implemented into the Upland Restoration Plan and Preserve Management Plan where appropriate, but likely, greater than 20 percent 1-meter-high cactus cover associated with Sambucus mexicana shall be best. Minimally, three habitat patches shall be planted along primarily southern exposure slopes to increase the amount of suitable nesting habitat for coastal cactus wren outside of the proposed development footprint.

The habitat enhancement program is focused on improving habitat conditions for coastal cactus wren within portions of the project site that are identified for preservation and along manufactured slopes in development areas. Site selection shall be based on the following criteria:

1. ***Slope aspect (prioritize southern exposures and southwest-facing ridgelines)***
2. ***Habitat quality (prioritize areas where some cacti were present, but with adequate space to support additional cacti to improve habitat quality for coastal cactus wren)***
3. ***Soil conditions (prioritize areas with similar soil conditions compared to occupied cactus scrub habitat)***
4. ***Proximity to occupied cactus patches (prioritize areas that are closer to documented coastal cactus wren occurrences to provide opportunities for dispersal; try to enhance areas within 200 meter to 1,000 meter of occupied habitat)***

5. ***Access (prioritize areas that would be accessible to a planting and maintenance crew)***
6. ***Cactus plantings along manufactured slope areas shall be planted so that they do not hinder fire access but shall be clustered so that they discourage or inhibit encroachment by the public.***

The approach to habitat enhancement shall include planting coast prickly pear and cholla by means of pad and segment cuttings in up to 10 selected enhancement areas. Cacti plants take several years to mature to the size that can support coastal cactus wren nesting. Therefore, the planted cuttings may be augmented with larger container plants in a subsequent year after the most successful planting sites can be determined. In addition, future preconstruction salvage of whole cactus plants and pads may be used to further enhance the structure of the cactus patch areas at the time of construction.

It is not expected that all 10 sites shall be successful or perform at equivalent levels. Therefore, a subset of planted areas shall be selected in the second year to focus maintenance efforts on sites with the greatest potential to develop into habitat suitable for coastal cactus wren occupation. The sites that develop into suitable habitat shall be monitored annually for coastal cactus wren use or occupation over a 5-year period in order to maintain a documented record of coastal cactus wren use of targeted areas for enhancement.

This measure shall also incorporate and implement enhancement methods and implementation procedures; a 2-year maintenance, monitoring, and reporting program; and an adaptive management strategy as outlined in the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project.

BIO-17: ***Brown-Headed Cowbird Trapping. A brown-headed cowbird trapping program shall be initiated on the project site as necessary. The trapping program includes the following: trapping shall begin during the first phase of grading and continue for a period of 15 years or until an alternative control method is developed, which would then replace the trapping program through the 15-year period. The trapping program shall be based on the most current trapping methods. Three traps shall be set at appropriate locations within open space or adjacent to open space on site, though there is flexibility to install one at another location within the City of Santee's sphere of influence (e.g., Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve) that might provide better local and regional benefits (e.g., along a river or***

creek or at a local equestrian center). Trapping shall be performed between April 1 and August 1 unless 21 days without brown-headed cowbirds occurs, then trapping may end for that year.

In order to establish whether a cowbird trapping program is necessary, focused surveys shall be conducted in and around the Habitat Preserve. A qualified biologist shall survey the Habitat Preserve during February, April, and May of each year during the construction phase through final buildout. If final buildout occurs before 10 years, then at least 10 years of surveys shall be required. During the survey, no single biologist may cover more than 300 acres of Habitat Preserve per day. If 10 or more males or 5 or more females or juveniles are observed on any single occasion, then trapping shall commence. No additional monitoring or trapping shall be required after 10 years even if the brown-headed cowbird occurrence thresholds have not been met. Since there is a small segment of trail designated for equestrian use, monitoring for brown-headed cowbirds is addressed in the Preserve Management Plan (included as Appendix P in the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project) and that area shall be monitored and managed in accordance with that plan, even if the 10-year threshold has been met for the remainder of the Habitat Preserve. Yearly reporting of the trapping results shall be provided with the other Preserve Management Plan reporting and will minimally include the rationale for trap placement, number of target species, non-target species, mortalities of each, sex and age of each as able to be determined, comparison to prior trapping, and suggestions for the following year.

BIO-18: ***Restoration of Suitable Habitat for Quino Checkerspot Butterfly and Hermes Copper Butterfly. Mitigation for impacts to suitable habitat for Quino checkerspot butterfly shall include a combination of in-perpetuity management of the Habitat Preserve that shall focus on removal of non-native grasses, weedy material, and duff layers and the supplemental planting of dot-seed plantain (Plantago erecta), woolly plantain (Plantago patagonica), Coulter's snapdragon (Antirrhinum coulterianum), rigid bird's beak (Cordylanthus rigidus), owl's clover (Castilleja exserta), Chinese houses (Collinsia concolor), and purple Chinese houses (Collinsia heterophylla) so that habitat is more suitable for Quino checkerspot butterfly. This shall include an endowment or other acceptable permanent funding mechanism and documented management plan as outlined in the Preserve Management Plan (included as Appendix P in the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita***

Ranch Project). Restoration/enhancement and creation of suitable habitat areas shall entail specific standards or guidelines on vegetation management. Tables 4.3-12 through 4.3-14 summarize the mitigation requirement scenarios based on the three potentially suitable habitat models for Quino checkerspot butterfly. Regardless of the model used, approximately 1,096.57 acres of suitable habitat based on the most conservative 2009 extrapolation model shall be managed for Quino checkerspot butterfly and other compatible species such as coastal California gnatcatcher, San Diego fairy shrimp, and Hermes copper butterfly, providing a minimum 1.9:1 mitigation ratio.

Table 4.3-12. Mitigation Scenario Based on the 2009 Extrapolation Model for Impacts to Suitable Habitat for Quino Checkerspot Butterfly

Suitable Habitat Model	*Impact Acreage*	*Mitigation Acreage Credits (Habitat Preserve Suitable Habitat)[1]*	*Ratio of Mitigation Achieved with On-Site Habitat Preserve*
2009 Extrapolation Model	581.39	1,096.57	1.9:1

Notes:
[1] This is the total acreage included within the Habitat Preserve and shall be subject to long-term management and monitoring as directed by the Preserve Management Plan.

Table 4.3-13. Mitigation Scenario Based on the 1-Kilometer Model (All Known Observations) for Impacts to Suitable Habitat for Quino Checkerspot Butterfly

Suitable Habitat Model	*Impact Acreage*	*Mitigation Acreage Credits*	*Ratio of Mitigation Acheived[1]*
1-Kilometer (all known observations)	396.53	218.22*	0.6:1
		878.35**	2.2:1
Total Suitable Habitat in the Habitat Preserve[2]		1,096.57	

Notes:
[1] Two mitigation ratios are provided based on (1) the amount of suitable habitat within the 1-kilometer buffer that overlaps the Habitat Preserve and (2) the remaining suitable habitat within the Habitat Preserve (based on the 2009 extrapolation model) outside the 1-kilometer buffer.
[2] This is the total suitable habitat acreage included within the entire Habitat Preserve (based on the 2009 extrapolation model) and shall be subject to long-term management and monitoring as directed by the Preserve Management Plan.
* Mitigation acreage available in the 1-kilometer buffer that overlaps the Habitat Preserve.
** This total represents the amount of remaining suitable habitat available in the Habitat Preserve (based on the 2009 extrapolation model) outside the 1-kilometer buffers.

Table 4.3-14. Mitigation Scenario Based on the 1-Kilometer Model (Without the 2005 Observation) for Impacts to Suitable Habitat for Quino Checkerspot Butterfly

Suitable Habitat Model	*Impact Acreage*	*Mitigation Acreage Credits*	*Ratio of Mitigation Acheived[1]*
1-Kilometer (Without the 2005 Observation)	3.82	7.39*	1.9:1
		1,089.18**	285:1
Total Suitable Habitat within the Habitat Preserve[2]		1,096.57	

Notes:
[1] Two mitigation ratios are provided based on (1) the amount of suitable habitat within the 1-kilometer buffer that overlaps the Habitat Preserve and (2) the remaining suitable habitat in the Habitat Preserve (based on the 2009 extrapolation model) outside the 1-kilometer buffer.

[2] This is the total suitable habitat acreage included in the entire Habitat Preserve (based on the 2009 extrapolation model) and shall be subject to long-term management and monitoring as directed by the Preserve Management Plan.

* Mitigation acreage available within the 1-kilometer buffer that overlaps the Habitat Preserve.

** This total represents the amount of remaining suitable habitat available in the Habitat Preserve (based on the 2009 Extrapolation model) outside the 1-kilometer buffer.

As described in the Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan, impacts to potentially suitable habitat for Hermes copper butterfly requires mitigation by preservation of suitable habitat at a ratio of 1:1, or 2:1 if the suitable habitat was previously occupied. Previously occupied habitat includes areas of potentially suitable habitat within 500 feet of a previously known occurrence of Hermes copper butterfly but where the butterfly was not identified during subsequent and more recent focused surveys. Mitigation of suitable habitat is included in the Preserve Management Plan (included as Appendix P in the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project) and includes the following: preservation and management of existing suitable habitat in the Habitat Preserve, restoration/enhancement of existing suitable habitat in the Habitat Preserve, and creation of new suitable habitat areas in the Habitat Preserve and along manufactured slopes in development areas, as appropriate. Restoration/enhancement and creation of new suitable habitat areas would entail repairing degraded habitat through the control of invasive species and/or planting of appropriate native species (i.e., redberry buckthorn within 15 feet of California buckwheat); see the Upland Restoration Plan included as Appendix Q in the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project for details. Table 4.3-15 summarizes the mitigation requirements for impacts to potentially suitable habitat for Hermes copper butterfly.

Table 4.3-15. Mitigation Requirements for Impacts to Suitable Habitat for Hermes Copper Butterfly

Habitat Type	*Impact Acreage*	*Mitigation Ratio*[1]	*Mitigation Acreage*	*Mitigation Acreage Credits (Habitat Preserve)*
Redberry Buckthorn within 15 feet of California Buckwheat				
Potentially Suitable Habitat	44.73	1:1	44.73	79.29
Potentially Suitable Habitat, Previously Occupied	8.25	2:1	16.50	15.48
Total Acreage	52.98	—	61.23	94.77[2]

Notes:

[1] Mitigation ratios are based on the Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan (City of Santee 2018).

[2] This acreage will be included in the Habitat Preserve and will be subject to long-term management and monitoring as directed by the Preserve Management Plan.

BIO-19: ***African Clawed Frog Trapping. African clawed frogs have been detected in the past within Sycamore Canyon Creek and vernal pool features on the project site. A monitoring and control program is included in the Preserve Management Plan (included as Appendix P in the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project) and designed to determine the presence of African clawed frogs within occupied fairy shrimp and western spadefoot features. Monitoring shall consist of surveying flowing and pooled portions of Sycamore Canyon Creek and restored and natural vernal pool features on the project site once per month from January through April while the proposed project is in construction. After construction is complete, these areas shall be surveyed for African clawed frogs once per year in March. If African clawed frogs are observed during the construction or post-construction monitoring, then control measures shall be implemented. Since different areas may require control each year, yearly updates shall be made as necessary.***

BIO-20: ***Wildlife Protection. In order to generally protect wildlife species and habitat, the following measures shall be implemented:***

1. ***Adequate fencing (i.e., wildlife safe that would prevent unnecessary snaring or injury) shall be erected to guide human users away from open space areas where open space abuts streets, parks, and trails.***

2. ***Covenants, conditions, and restrictions shall include a section that forbids collection of native wildlife (e.g., coast horned lizards, toads, snakes) without obtaining the necessary collection permits from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the destroying of wildlife habitat.***

3. ***Covenants, conditions, and restrictions shall include a notice describing the necessary role that coyotes, bobcats, and rattlesnakes have in the environment and shall make recommendations for keeping pets and pet food indoors and safe, and restrictions against controlling these and other native species unless there is a threat to life or property. The Preserve Manager's phone number and email address shall be provided for residents to call when they feel threatened by wildlife or observe injured wildlife.***

4. ***Covenants, conditions, and restrictions shall include a notice describing the trail and preserve restrictions.***

5. ***Street signs, speed bumps, or other traffic-calming devices shall be employed along the residential collector Streets "V" and "W" to allow wildlife to cross more safely (see Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project, Figures 5-7b and 5-7c). The posted speed limit on these streets shall be 25 miles per hour.***

BIO-21: ***Fire Protection Plan. To minimize the potential exposure of the project site to fire hazards, all features of the Fire Protection Plan for the Fanita Ranch Project, prepared by Dudek (2020) and provided as EIR Appendix P1, shall be implemented in conjunction with development of the proposed project.***

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** through **BIO-21** are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to sensitive species. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to sensitive species, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to sensitive species. (EIR, § 4.3.5.1.)

2. Riparian Habitat

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

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.3.5.2.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: Direct Impacts. Implementation of the proposed project would result in permanent impacts to approximately 927.90 acres of sensitive and non-sensitive vegetation communities and land covers on site and temporary impacts to approximately 114.47 acres on site. Of these on site permanent impacts, approximately 10.52 acres would result from new trail creation and retention of some existing trails. The proposed project would also impact a total of 32.60 acres of sensitive and non-sensitive vegetation communities off site, including 25.32 acres of permanent impacts and 7.29 acres of temporary impacts.

All temporary impact areas would be revegetated to pre-existing conditions following construction.

Sensitive vegetation communities that would be impacted on site include scrub and chaparral, grasslands, vernal pools, bog and marsh, riparian and bottomland habitat, and woodland communities. Sensitive vegetation communities that would be impacted off site include scrub, grasslands, vernal pools, and unvegetated channel. Within both on- and off-site areas, the proposed project would permanently or temporarily impact 988.77 acres of sensitive habitats, including 978.54 acres of sensitive uplands, 0.41 acre of vernal pools, and 9.81 acres of wetland habitats. All direct permanent and temporary impacts to sensitive vegetation communities both on and off site are considered significant.

Indirect Impacts. Indirect impacts to sensitive vegetation communities can result from invasion by exotic species, alteration of the natural fire regime, exposure to urban pollutants (e.g., fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, and other hazardous materials), and trampling by humans and domestic pets. Permanent indirect impacts to riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities from development of the proposed project would be potentially significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, **BIO-6** through **BIO-12**, and **BIO-15** set forth above would mitigate all direct and indirect permanent and temporary impacts to riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities to below a level of significance.

Permanent impacts to 862.09 acres (including on- and off-site areas) of sensitive upland vegetation communities are anticipated with project implementation. A total of 1,303.33 acres of mitigation would be required; however, the Habitat Preserve would conserve 1,448.84 acres of sensitive upland vegetation communities, 145.51 acres greater than required by mitigation. Direct permanent and temporary impacts to sensitive upland communities would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** and **BIO-2**, which would preserve sensitive upland communities within the Habitat Preserve and restore temporary impacts to sensitive upland communities.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-6** through **BIO-8**, that include standard best management practices and other requirements that address erosion and runoff, specifically the construction-related minimization measures required by the federal Clean Water Act, NPDES, and preparation of a SWPPP, would reduce indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure **BIO-9** would reduce permanent indirect impacts to sensitive vegetation communities by planting cactus species in brush management zones, temporary impact areas and between roadways and open space to help protect against incursions by domestic pets, children, or recreationists. Additionally, Mitigation Measure **BIO-10** would require that all herbicides used during landscaping activities be contained within the proposed project's impact footprint and weed control treatments include all legally permitted chemical, manual, and mechanical methods applied with the authorization of the County.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-11** would reduce permanent indirect impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species from Argentine ants to a less than significant level. This measure requires control measures and quarterly monitoring of Argentine ants along the construction–Habitat Preserve interface.

Impacts to vernal pools would be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-12**, which would require rehabilitation or enhancement and creation of new seasonal basin resources within the Habitat Preserve.

Direct permanent and temporary impacts to wetland vegetation communities would be reduced to less than significant through implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-15**, which would require mitigation and permits from the agencies that have jurisdiction over them (i.e., ACOE, RWQCB, and/or CDFW).

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-15** would utilize a Wetland Mitigation Plan to restore temporary impacts in wetland areas and reduce impacts to sensitive riparian and wetland vegetation communities to less than significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, **BIO-6** through **BIO-12**, and **BIO-15** would mitigate all direct and indirect permanent and temporary impacts to riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities to below a level of significance.

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measures **BIO-1**, **BIO-2**, **BIO-6** through **BIO-12** and **BIO-15** are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to riparian habitat. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to riparian habitat, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to riparian habitat. (EIR, § 4.3.5.2.)

3. Wetlands

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

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.3.5.3.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: Direct Impacts. Impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources on the project site would be avoided and minimized through project design to the extent feasible. Nevertheless, potentially significant impacts to jurisdictional resources would occur with project implementation. In total, direct impacts to 9.81 acres (67,410 linear feet) of jurisdictional resources under the jurisdiction of the ACOE, RWQCB, and CDFW are expected with project implementation. These impacts consist of 1.83 acres (2,903 linear feet) of on-site wetland waters of the United States or state and riparian habitat; 3.82 acres (60,549 linear feet) of non-wetland waters of the United States, waters of the state, and CDFW streambeds (0.05-acres that are off site); and 0.02 acre (64 linear feet) of on-site non-wetland waters of the United States, waters of the state, and CDFW riparian habitat. In addition to these impacts, another 4.15 acres (3,895 linear feet) of riparian habitat on site under only CDFW jurisdiction would be impacted with project development. EIR Table 4.3-18 identifies impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources, which would require permits and authorizations from the ACOE, CDFW, and RWQCB.

Indirect Impacts. Potential temporary indirect impacts to jurisdictional resources on and off site would primarily result from construction activities and include impacts related to or resulting from the generation of fugitive dust, changes in hydrology resulting from construction (including sedimentation and erosion), and the introduction of chemical pollutants (including herbicides). Long-term indirect impacts could result from the proximity of the proposed project to jurisdictional resources after construction. Permanent indirect impacts that could affect jurisdictional resources include generation of fugitive dust, habitat fragmentation, chemical

pollutants, altered hydrology, non-native invasive species, increased human activity, alteration of the natural fire regime, and shading.

The implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-6**, **BIO-7**, **BIO-10**, and **BIO-15** set forth above would reduce project impacts to wetland resources to below a level of significance.

Mitigation for potential permanent indirect impacts to jurisdictional resources requires conformance with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines as specified in the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan, as required by Mitigation Measure **BIO-6**. The guidelines include control of urban runoff, toxins and pollutants, public activities in open space, and deliberate planting of exotic invasive species, which would be required by implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-7**. As required by Mitigation Measure **BIO-7**, a Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan would be prepared in compliance with the federal Clean Water Act, NPDES, and SWPPP such that storm flows conveyed from the project site do not adversely affect off-site jurisdictional resources by significantly altering natural hydrologic patterns. Additionally, Mitigation Measure **BIO-10** would reduce impacts to jurisdictional resources by requiring that all herbicides used during landscaping activities be contained within the proposed project's impact footprint and weed control treatments include all legally permitted chemical, manual, and mechanical methods applied with the authorization of the County agriculture commissioner. Indirect impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

Permanent and temporary impacts to 9.81 acres (including on- and off-site areas) under ACOE, RWQCB, and CDFW jurisdiction are expected with project implementation. A total of 24.07 acres of mitigation would be required based on mitigation ratios set forth in the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan (City of Santee 2018). The Habitat Preserve would conserve 32.31 acres, the majority of which could only be used for the preservation component of the mitigation requirement. EIR Table 4.3-19 summarizes the proposed project's temporary and permanent impacts and required mitigation ratios.

Mitigation Measure **BIO-15** would require implementation of a Wetland Mitigation Plan to reduce permanent and temporary impacts to wetlands under the jurisdiction of ACOE, RWQCB, and CDFW to below a level of significance. Mitigation ratios based on the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan included in EIR Table 4.3-19 shall be included in the Wetland Mitigation Plan.

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measures **BIO-6**, **BIO-7**, **BIO-10** and **BIO-15** are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce

impacts related to wetlands. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to wetlands, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to wetlands. (EIR, § 4.3.5.3.)

4. Wildlife Movement

Threshold: Would the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.3.5.4.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: Direct Impacts. Currently the entire project site functions as both live-in habitat for a wide variety of large and small wildlife, and functions as partial territory for the largest of mammals (i.e., mountain lion, mule deer, bobcat, and coyote). The entire project site allows for wildlife movement without distinct wildlife corridors and habitat linkages. The project site does not provide habitat for migratory fish species. The project site also acts as a movement corridor (e.g., Sycamore Canyon) between County open space, MCAS Miramar, and Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve.

Wildlife corridors have been designated through MSCP planning in the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan, including the project site as a habitat block that promotes wildlife movement. Whether or not the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan is implemented, these areas would be important connections for wildlife between areas east, west, and north of the project site in a post-project scenario. Two locations pass through the western portion of the project site to MCAS Miramar, one connects the northeastern portion of the project site to lands within the County, and another crosses to the north to lands within the County (City of Santee 2018, Figure 4-3). As a result, there would be direct impacts to habitat linkages and wildlife corridors as a result of proposed project development.

The proposed project design provides for a primary wildlife corridor through the north-central portions of the proposed project, with a

minimum width of 1,150 feet. This criterion meets generally accepted wildlife movement principles and Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan Guidelines. An additional corridor exists along the northern boundary of the project site, which is mostly 1,400 or more feet wide and buffers a canyon. It narrows to 619 feet for approximately 800 feet, but this area is adjacent to protected and managed County of San Diego Park Preserve lands. The entire northern edge buffers existing protected preserve lands to the north, which meets the Draft Santee MSCP Plan Guidelines. To the west, a large corridor buffering Sycamore Canyon Creek is provided. This corridor is between 1,000 and 400 feet wide (at the detention basin which could also be used for movement), but is further widened by the adjacent military base and conserved preserve areas along the entire boundary.

The open space configuration for the proposed project would maintain connectivity to the north into the Goodan Ranch/Sycamore Canyon County Preserve, to the east into open space County lands, and to the west into MCAS Miramar open space (which contains over 3,000 acres of coastal sage scrub and 9,000 acres of chaparral). All three corridors lead to, or buffer, a regional corridor along Sycamore Canyon. Therefore, the landscape-scale habitat connections for regional wildlife movement would not be substantially affected. Depending on future development within the adjacent County lands to the east, the proposed project would provide another secondary wildlife corridor, varying in width from 508 feet to 1,400 feet, along the eastern boundary currently adjacent to extant habitat areas.

After buildout of the proposed project, wildlife movement to the portion of the open space Habitat Preserve in the southern portion of the project site may be constrained by village development to the north and the streets that would border the open space to the west (Fanita Parkway extension and improvements) and to the east (Cuyamaca Street extension and improvements). In addition, wildlife movement to and from the central portion of the Habitat Preserve northeast of the proposed Farm would be constrained by the two, main proposed east–west traversing streets (Streets “V” and “W”) that would connect the village development. To avoid hindering wildlife movement at interior Streets “V” and “W,” as well as the Cuyamaca Street extension, a wildlife undercrossing would be constructed approximately 400 feet south of the project limits along Cuyamaca Street to adequately convey coyotes, mule deer, and smaller-sized wildlife using existing or manufactured topography. The proposed crossing, which would measure 6.9 meters (22.5 feet) wide by 3.7 meters (12.0 feet) tall by 35.0 meters (115 feet) long (0.7 openness ratio), would meet the suggested 0.6 openness ratio suggested for mule deer and other mid-sized mammal species documented during camera studies listed in Biological Resources

Technical Report (Appendix D), Table 4-8, including bobcat and coyote. Mountain lion would also use the undercrossing.

Despite the project design incorporating open space and wildlife movement corridors, development of the proposed project would still have the potential to result in significant direct impacts to wildlife movement corridors in the region, requiring mitigation.

Indirect Impacts. Permanent development-related indirect impacts to wildlife movement would include noise, vibration, lighting, increased human activity, altered fire regimes, and increased roadkill. Development of the proposed project would result in significant indirect impacts to wildlife movement corridors both on and off site.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1**, **BIO-6**, **BIO-9**, **BIO-10**, and **BIO-20** set forth above would preserve on-site habitat areas designed as wildlife movement corridors and provide links to off-site habitat areas. Mitigation Measures **BIO-22** and **BIO-23** would design and implement a wildlife corridor and crossings for wildlife movement in the northeastern part of the project site and under the Cuyamaca Street extension off site, respectively. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to wildlife corridors and habitat linkages to below a level of significance.

Due to the approximate 900-acre block of Habitat Preserve (Mitigation Measure **BIO-1**) in the southern portion of the project site, the loss or constraint of local wildlife movement opportunities would not adversely affect genetic exchange and diversity of populations at the landscape level. None of the wildlife species that would be affected or displaced by the loss or constraint of local movement areas have genetically unique or endemic populations that would be functionally isolated from other populations, and the regional habitat linkages would ensure that genetic exchange and diversity of these species in the region would be maintained.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-6**, **BIO-7**, **BIO-9**, and **BIO-10** would reduce potential indirect impacts to wildlife movement corridors to less than significant levels through conformance with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines as specified in the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan. Typical restrictions (e.g., best management practices) and requirements that address erosion, runoff and weed control treatments would be enforced, including the construction-related minimization measures required by the federal Clean Water Act, NPDES, and SWPPP, planting of cactus patches along the development–Habitat Preserve interface, and weed control treatments. Mitigation Measure **BIO-20**, which employs street signs, speed bumps, or other traffic-calming devices along the north and

south collector streets to allow wildlife to cross more safely, would reduce long-term indirect impacts to wildlife movement to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure **BIO-22**, which would provide a wildlife corridor along the northern, western, and eastern project site boundaries, would reduce impacts to wildlife corridors to less than significant. Mitigation Measure **BIO-23**, which requires the provision of wildlife undercrossings under Cuyamaca Street and Fanita Parkway, would reduce direct and indirect impacts to wildlife, including western spadefoot, to a less than significant level.

BIO-22: ***Wildlife Corridor. The project shall include an interior corridor that is minimally 1,200 feet wide and a northern corridor that is minimally 1,400 feet wide with the exception of one location that narrows to 600 feet for an approximate 800-foot length. This length is adjacent to the protected and managed Goodan Ranch/Sycamore Canyon Preserve to the north so it would still function for wildlife movement of mountain lion, coastal California gnatcatcher, and all other species. The western boundary shall include a corridor that is mostly approximately 1,000 feet wide except at the southern edge where it narrows to 400 feet at the stormwater catch basin. This entire area is bordered and managed by the Marine Corps Air Station Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. In order to retain wildlife movement to the north along the eastern boundary of the project site, a secondary corridor has been included.***

Throughout the Habitat Preserve, the following measures shall be implemented:

1. ***Lighting shall be directed toward development and shielded away from the Habitat Preserve.***

2. ***Trails shall not be in use from dusk to dawn, pets must be on leashes, and trails shall only be used for hiking and biking with the exception of the extreme northeastern trail (approximate 1,200-foot long section) that is already established for equestrian use.***

3. ***Trails shall be managed in accordance with the Public Access Plan (Appendix T to the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project), and disclosed in the Covenants, Codes & Restrictions (CC&Rs):***

a. Only the trail types discussed within the Public Access Plan shall be allowed;

b. Unnecessary trails shall be abandoned and restored in accordance with the Public Access Plan, Preserve Management Plan (Appendix P to the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project), and Upland Restoration Plan (Appendix Q to the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project); and

c. Trails shall be monitored on a regular basis and protected and maintained in accordance with the Public Access Plan and Preserve Management Plan;

4. Trails may be temporarily closed to control unauthorized access.

5. Trails may be closed on a seasonal basis to protect Covered Species in the Habitat Preserve.

6. Streets "V" and "W," which connect the Vineyard Village to Fanita Commons and Orchard Village, shall provide safety lighting that shall be button started with a timer shut-off delay such that lighting shall not permanently be on at night, but only on when needed for emergency purposes or pedestrian safety.

BIO-23: ***Wildlife Undercrossings. A wildlife undercrossing shall be constructed approximately 400 feet south of the project site boundary within the Cuyamaca Street extension to adequately convey coyotes, mule deer, and smaller-sized wildlife. The wildlife undercrossing shall utilize existing or manufactured topography. The crossing shall be designed to provide a greater than 0.6 openness ratio (calculated as width times height divided by length in meters; see the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project, Figures 5-7b and 5-7c, Wildlife Corridors and Crossings). Crossings shall have a raised floor and/or side platform to allow dry passage for wildlife when water is flowing.***

In addition, a 48-inch reinforced concrete pipe culvert and directional curbs shall be constructed to allow western spadefoot and other small wildlife to cross under Fanita Parkway to reduce permanent indirect impacts to these species (see the Biological Technical Report for the Fanita Ranch Project, Figure 5-7a, Local Wildlife Corridors).

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measures **BIO-1**, **BIO-6**, **BIO-9**, **BIO-10**, **BIO-20**, **BIO-22** and **BIO-23** are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to wildlife corridors. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to wildlife corridors, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to wildlife corridors. (EIR, § 4.3.5.4.)

C. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Archaeological Resources

Threshold: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.4.5.2.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: According to the Cultural Resources Phase I Survey Report prepared by Atkins, a CHRIS records search, a review of aerial photographs, and a Phase I pedestrian survey were performed on the approximately 800 acres of the project APE and 17 miles of proposed trails. The CHRIS records search and the Phase I pedestrian survey identified 24 sites and 43 isolates throughout the project site. Based on the quality and integrity of the sites, Atkins recommended 11 of these archaeological sites undergo Phase II testing.

In 2018, Rincon completed a Phase I survey of the Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue extensions and a portion of archaeological site CA-SDI-8243, none of which were surveyed previously. Rincon also evaluated the historic-period Fanita Rancho (CA-SDI-22504) property through an archival research and Phase I survey. Rincon completed Phase II testing of the 11 previously identified archaeological sites considered eligible or potentially eligible for the CRHR and one new site (CA-SDI-22503) identified during the Phase I pedestrian survey completed by Rincon for a total of 12 sites that underwent Phase II testing.

Based on the results of Rincon's Phase II testing, two archaeological sites, CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345, have been recommended eligible for the NRHP and CRHR due to their data potential. The 10 remaining sites are recommended as ineligible for the NRHP and CRHR or any local designations due to their lack of data potential and no further management considerations are recommended.

CA-SDI-8243: A portion of CA-SDI-8243 would be impacted by the proposed project. It is considered a large prehistoric habitation site that yielded 473 artifacts, which is the largest and most diverse assemblage of all the sites tested during the investigation. It contained ceremonial quartz crystals and human remains, among other artifacts, which suggests it likely acted as a regional habitation center. The constituents still present at the site retain the potential to continue yielding data pertinent to the research themes presented in the Phase II testing program. Based on the data potential of the site, the Phase II Cultural Resources Testing and Evaluations Report recommends site CA-SDI-8243 as eligible for the NRHP and CRHR under Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. Because development of the proposed project would partially impact CA-SDI-8243, impacts would be potentially significant.

CA-SDI-8345: A portion of CA-SDI-8345 would be impacted by the proposed project. It is considered a habitation site that consists of several bedrock outcrops with milling features and groundstone tools that suggest this area was used for resource processing. In addition to these resource processing tools and habitation debris, such as faunal, ceramics, and lithics, a ceremonial artifact and the presence of human remains suggest this site functioned as a habitation site during the Late Prehistoric Period. The location of CA-SDI-8345 also provided a vantage point that would have allowed those occupying the Sycamore Canyon valley to look out over the City. The presence of ceremonial object and the diversity of artifacts encountered suggest CA-SDI-8345 has the potential to yield significant information regarding prehistory and is also recommended eligible under Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. Because development of the proposed project would partially impact CA-SDI-8345, impacts would be potentially significant.

Unknown Resources: The proposed project, which would involve substantial grading and excavation in native soils, would be located on currently undeveloped land resulting in considerable cuts into native terrain where cultural resources are known to occur. Therefore, there is a potential for the presence of previously unknown archaeological resources or tribal cultural resources

(TCRs) to be discovered. Depending on the sensitivity of these resources, impacts would be potentially significant.

Areas Located Outside the Area of Potential Effect: Although it is outside the scope of the proposed project's potential effects to archaeological resources or TCRs, in an effort to cooperate with Barona, and in response to Barona's request during consultation, the City shall include the following condition of approval for the proposed project to be completed prior to the issuance of grading permits.

In an effort to cooperate with Barona, the City has agreed that a surface inventory of sensitive areas adjacent to the proposed project's development footprint (but outside of the APE) shall be a condition of approval for the proposed project and shall be completed prior to the issuance of grading permits. This inventory shall be completed by a qualified archaeologist who meets or exceeds the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology and a Native American monitor of Kumeyaay descent. The inventory shall be limited to 300 feet from the development footprint and shall be focused on areas that are known to be sensitive for cultural resources. In the event a cultural resource or TCR is identified adjacent to the proposed project's development footprint, the resource shall be recorded using the California Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 forms, and environmental sensitive area fencing shall be put in place to protect the resource prior to ground-disturbing activities and shall remain in place until project-related ground disturbance is complete. Because these areas are outside of the proposed project's development footprint and would not be impacted by the proposed project development, no further analysis beyond a surface inventory shall be completed.

Because portions of archaeological sites CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345 are located within the development footprint, impacts to these resources would be potentially significant. Preservation in place is the preferred mitigation strategy under CEQA for archaeological sites. Preservation in place can be achieved by project design for avoidance, incorporation into an open space, or capping of the site and construction of features over the cap that will not directly impact the site. The proposed project has been designed to avoid or cap a minimum of 40 percent of CA-SDI-8243 and avoid a minimum of 60 percent of CA-SDI-8345 as shown on the Vesting Tentative Map.

On-site biological resources restoration for the proposed project is required under Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-12, and BIO-15. These mitigation measures require areas outside of the construction footprint on the project site to undergo biological resources restoration. At the time of the EIR public review, the exact

locations of the restoration areas have yet to be established because consultation with regulatory agencies is ongoing. To protect cultural resources from unnecessary impacts, and in keeping with the requests of the consulting Native American tribes, cultural resources surveys shall be completed once consultation with regulatory agencies is completed, and the exact restoration areas are established. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **CUL-9** would avoid and mitigate potential impacts to cultural resources and TCRs from the on-site biological resources restoration required by Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-12, and BIO-15.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **CUL-1** through **CUL-9** would reduce cultural resources and TCRs impacts to below a level of significance.

CUL-1: ***Site Capping Program. Prior to implementation of a site (or locus) capping program, a site capping plan shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist who meets or exceeds the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Project Planner for the City of Santee with input from Native American tribal groups who have consulted on the project. The plan shall include the following or equivalent steps:***

1. ***Retain an archaeological monitor and Native American monitor of Kumeyaay descent with ancestral ties to the San Diego region and at minimum one (1) year of monitoring experience within Kumeyaay ancestral territory to observe the capping process.***

2. ***Remove organic material from the archaeological site surface by hand, including brushing, raking, or use of power blower. Use of motorized vehicles for vegetation removal is prohibited. All vegetation shall be removed at ground surface such that no soil disturbance results.***

3. ***Remaining root balls and masses in the ground after hand removal of vegetation stems and trunks shall be sprayed with topical pesticide per the pesticide manufacturer's specifications to ensure no further growth. The resulting dead vegetation masses shall be left in place. Complete surface vegetation removal and die-off of root massing shall be achieved before geotextile placement.***

4. ***No remedial grading, sub-grade preparation, or scarification shall occur before placement of the geotextile fabric.***

5. ***A biaxial geogrid (Tensar BX1200, TX 160, or equivalent) shall be laid over the ground surface where capping is to take place, and a minimum buffer area to be determined by the City of Santee through consultation with a qualified archaeologist, the Native American groups who have consulted on the project, and the most likely descendant as the final grading plans are prepared. The geogrid type and verification of its technological capability shall be provided by a qualified geotechnical engineer during plan check of final grading plans.***

6. ***Placement of fill soils on top of the geotextile fabric shall be done in no greater than 8-inch lifts with rubber-tired equipment.***

7. ***Geotextile fabric shall be capable of preventing compaction and load impacts on underlying archaeological resources.***

8. ***Fill soils shall have a pH ranging from 5.5 to 7.5 only.***

9. ***Fill soils shall be free of archaeological resources (i.e., culturally sterile).***

10. ***Fill soils shall be spread from the outside with rubber-track, heavy equipment such that the equipment would only be working on top of the fill soils. The fill soils shall be placed ahead of the loading equipment so that the machine does not have contact with the archaeological site surface.***

11. ***The fill soils shall be sufficiently moist so that they are cohesive under the weight of the heavy equipment as the material is spread out over the archaeological site and buffer area.***

12. ***After the first 12–18 inches of fill are laid, larger equipment may be used to increase the fill to desired grade.***

Capping soils shall be visually distinguishable from the native soils below. A minimum of 24 inches of fill material shall be maintained between the surface of the archaeological cap and any ground-disturbing activities. Ground-disturbing activities include but are not limited to grading; excavation; compaction; placement of soil, sand, rock, gravel, or other material; clearing of vegetation; and construction, erection, or placement of any underground utilities, buildings, or structures. Restrictions shall be applied regarding species planted within the cap (deep-rooted species would be avoided in areas where the cap does not exceed 10 feet). Additionally, chemical agents such as

fertilizer shall be avoided in areas where the cap does not exceed 24 inches.

CUL-2: ***Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program. For areas within CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345 that cannot be avoided, capped, or designated as open space by the proposed project, a Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program shall be completed to comprehensively document the resources and exhaust the data potential of the resources prior to the issuance of project grading permits. The Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist who meets or exceeds the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation's 1990 Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format; CEQA; California Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1; and CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.4(b).***

Prior to implementing the field component of the Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program, a Phase III Data Recovery Plan shall be prepared by the qualified archaeologist selected to carry out the program. The plan shall be prepared in consultation with Native American groups who have participated in consultation for the proposed project, and shall be reviewed and approved by the Project Planner at the City of Santee. The plan shall guide the Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program. The plan shall, at minimum, include the following:

- ***Phase III research design including but not limited to the following:***
  - ***Summary of previous research completed for CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345***
  - ***Discussion of relevant research questions that can be addressed by the resources. Relevant research topics include but are not limited to the following:***
    - ***Site chronology***
    - ***Dietary reconstruction***
    - ***Paleo-environment reconstruction***
    - ***Settlement pattern***
    - ***Introduction and use of artifact typologies, such as projectile point typologies and ceramics***
- ***Methods used to gather data***

- ***Number of data recovery units to be excavated***

  - ***The number of recovery units shall be determined based on industry standards for establishing data redundancy. Industry standard typically requires that between 3 to 10 percent of intact site deposits impacted by the proposed project be recovered and analyzed as part of a Phase III Data Recovery Program. The final percentage shall be determined based on the percentage of the site to be impacted by the proposed project, the research questions established for the Phase III, in consideration of the guidelines established by the Office of Historic Preservation for Phase III Data Recovery Programs and in consultation with the qualified archaeologist, City of Santee, and Native American groups who have participated in consultation for the project.***

- ***Artifact screening methods to be used***

- ***Procedures to follow in the event human remains are discovered (Mitigation Measure CUL-10)***
- ***Procedures for backfilling excavated units prior to the completion of the Phase III fieldwork***
- ***Laboratory methods to analyze the artifacts, including but not limited to the following:***
  - ***Methods used to analyze ceramics, lithics, groundstone, and specialty items, such as beads***
  - ***Protein residue analysis***
  - ***Radiocarbon dating***
  - ***Ethnobotanical studies***
- ***Curation procedures (Mitigation Measure CUL-8)***

The Phase III data recovery fieldwork shall be completed in accordance with the established plan by a qualified archaeologist. The fieldwork shall be observed by a minimum of one Native American monitor. The Native American monitors shall be of Kumeyaay descent with ancestral ties to the San Diego region and at minimum 1 year of monitoring experience within Kumeyaay ancestral territory.

Following the completion of the Phase III data recovery fieldwork, the results shall be summarized in a Phase III Data Recovery Report. The report shall be completed by a qualified archaeologist and shall include the results of the fieldwork and laboratory analysis and address the research questions established in the Phase III Data Recovery Plan. The report shall also include the California Department of Parks and Recreation

Series 523 form updates for the sites CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345. The report shall be submitted to the consulting Native American groups and the Project Planner at the City of Santee for review. Upon acceptance of the final report, an electronic version of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Archaeological Center.

CUL-3: ***Worker Environmental Awareness Program. Prior to the commencement of project-related ground-disturbing activities, including but not limited to site clearing, grubbing, trenching, and excavation, a qualified archaeologist who meets or exceeds the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology shall provide a Worker Environmental Awareness Program for the general contractor, subcontractors, and construction workers participating in ground-disturbing activity for project construction. The Worker Environmental Awareness Program training shall describe the potential of exposing archaeological resources, types of cultural materials that may be encountered, and directions on the steps that shall be taken if such a find is encountered. This training may be presented alongside other environmental training programs required prior to construction. A Worker Environmental Awareness Program acknowledgment form shall be signed by workers who receive the training.***

CUL-4: ***Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Program. Following the completion of the Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program, and prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity for project construction, including but not limited to site clearing, grubbing, trenching, and excavation, a qualified archaeologist who meets or exceeds the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology shall be retained to prepare a Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Program for unanticipated discoveries during project construction. The information gathered during the Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program will help to inform the Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Program. The Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Program shall be prepared in consultation with Native American tribes who have participated in consultation for the proposed project. The Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Program shall include provisions for archaeological and Native American monitoring of all ground disturbance related to construction of the proposed project, project construction schedule, procedures to be followed in the event of discovery of archaeological resources, and protocols for***

Native American coordination and input, including review of documents. The Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Program shall outline the role and responsibilities of Native American monitors. It shall include communication protocols and opportunity and timelines for review of cultural resources documents related to discoveries that are Native American in origin. The Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Program shall include provisions for Native American monitoring during testing or data recovery efforts for unknown resources that are Native American in origin (Mitigation Measures CUL-6 and CUL-7). The Native American monitors shall be of Kumeyaay descent with ancestral ties to the San Diego region and at minimum 1 year of monitoring experience within Kumeyaay ancestral territory. Once completed, the Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Program shall be reviewed and approved by the Project Planner at the City of Santee prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities.

CUL-5: ***Cultural Resources Construction Monitoring. A qualified archaeologist who meets or exceeds the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology shall be present during ground-disturbing activity for project construction, including but not limited to site clearing, grubbing, trenching, and excavation, for the duration of the proposed project or until the qualified archaeologist determines monitoring is no longer necessary. The archaeological monitor shall prepare daily logs and submit weekly updates to the Project Planner at the City of Santee regarding the activities observed. In the event that previously unidentified prehistoric or historic archaeological materials or human remains are encountered during project construction, the significance of the discovery shall be assessed based on the steps outlined in the Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Program identified in Mitigation Measures CUL-4, CUL-7, and CUL-10 for the proposed project.***

At the completion of monitoring, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resources Monitoring Report to document the findings during the monitoring effort for the proposed project. The report shall include the monitoring logs completed for the proposed project and shall document any discoveries made during monitoring. The report shall also include the monitoring logs prepared by the Native American monitor for the proposed project. The Native American monitors shall be of Kumeyaay descent with ancestral ties to the San Diego region and at minimum 1 year of monitoring experience within Kumeyaay ancestral territory. The Cultural

Resources Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City of Santee and the South Coastal Information Center.

CUL-6: ***Native American Construction Monitoring. A minimum of one Native American monitor shall be present during ground-disturbing activity for project construction, including but not limited to site clearing, grubbing, trenching, and excavation, for the duration of the proposed project or until the qualified archaeologist determines monitoring is no longer necessary. The Native American monitors shall be of Kumeyaay descent with ancestral ties to the San Diego region and at minimum 1 year of monitoring experience within Kumeyaay ancestral territory. The Native American monitors shall prepare daily logs and submit weekly updates to the qualified archaeologist and the Project Planner at the City of Santee. In addition, the Native American monitors shall prepare and submit a summary statement upon completion of monitoring to include in the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report prepared for the proposed project (see Mitigation Measure CUL-5). The Project Planner at the City of Santee shall review and include the summary statement as part of the cultural resources monitoring report prepared for the proposed project.***

CUL-7: ***Previously Unidentified Archaeological Resources. If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area shall be halted, and the qualified archaeologist shall evaluate the resource in consultation with the Native American monitor. If necessary, the evaluation may require preparation of a Treatment Plan and archaeological testing for California Register of Historical Resources or National Register of Historic Places eligibility. If the City of Santee, in consultation with the qualified archaeologist, determines that the discovery is significant and cannot be avoided by the proposed project, additional work, such as the data recovery excavation described in Mitigation Measure CUL-2, shall be completed prior to the resumption of ground-disturbing activities in the immediate area to mitigate any significant impacts to cultural resources.***

CUL-8: ***Curation of Archaeological Resources. Upon completion of project construction, archaeological collections that have not been repatriated or buried on site (per Mitigation Measure CUL-11), along with final reports, field notes, and other standard documentation collected, shall be permanently curated at a facility in San Diego County that meets the State Historical Resources Commission's Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collections. A qualified archaeologist who***

meets or exceeds the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology shall be required to secure a written agreement with a recognized museum repository regarding the final disposition and permanent storage and maintenance of all archaeological resources recovered as a result of the Phase III archaeological investigations and monitoring activities that have not been repatriated or buried on site. The written agreement shall specify the level of treatment (preparation, identification, curation, cataloging) required before the collection would be accepted for storage. The cost of curation is assessed by the repository and is the responsibility of the applicant.

CUL-9: ***Cultural and Tribal Cultural Impacts Associated with Biological Restoration. Prior to the execution of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-12, and BIO-15, the supervising biologists and applicant shall consult with the City of Santee, a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology, and the Native American groups who have participated in consultation for the proposed project to complete the following tasks to address potential impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources:***

1. ***After the identification of possible biological restoration areas, the archaeologists and a Native American monitor of Kumeyaay descent with ancestral ties to the San Diego region and at minimum 1 year of monitoring experience within Kumeyaay ancestral territory shall complete a cultural resource records search of the California Historical Resources Information System and in-fill pedestrian surveys of any areas not previously investigated by Atkins (December 2017) or Rincon (May 2020) as part of the proposed project.***
   - ***The survey shall include the biological mitigation area and a 100-foot buffer.***
   - ***The survey shall be carried out using transects spaced no greater than 10 meters apart to be consistent with the standard field methods used by the previous studies (Atkins [December 2017] or Rincon [May 2020]).***
   - ***A Native American monitor shall be present and shall participate in the survey effort.***
   - ***Any cultural and or tribal cultural resources identified during the restoration effort shall be documented using California Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 forms and be filed at the South Coastal Information Center.***

- ***A Phase I report that documents the survey locations and the results of the survey and includes California Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 forms for any resources identified during the survey effort shall be completed by the qualified archaeologist. The report shall be prepared in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation's 1990 Archaeological Resource Management Report's: Recommended Contents and Format and California Environmental Quality Act; California Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1; and California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Section 15126.4(b). The final report shall be electronically submitted to the City of Santee and the South Coastal Information Center.***

2. ***If human remains are identified on the surface during the pedestrian survey, the location of the human remains and a 50-foot buffer shall be avoided. Steps outlined in Mitigation Measure CUL-10 shall be followed in the event human remains are identified.***
3. ***If a resource not containing human remains cannot be feasibly avoided, then a Phase II evaluation of the resource shall occur to determine the eligibility of the resource for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. The Phase II evaluation shall be implemented by a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology and observed by a Native American monitor.***
    - ***If the resource is recommended eligible by the qualified archaeologist and the City of Santee concurs with the recommendation, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 shall be carried out.***
        - ***Following completion of Mitigation Measure CUL-2, Mitigation Measures CUL-3 through CUL-8, CUL-10, and CUL-11 shall be implemented.***
    - ***If the resource is recommended ineligible by the qualified archaeologist, and the City of Santee concurs with the recommendation, no further testing shall be required. A determination of eligibility shall be made by the qualified archaeologist in consultation with the City of Santee and Native American groups who have consulted on the proposed project. Upon completion of the determination of eligibility, Mitigation Measures CUL-5 through CUL-11 shall be implemented.***

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measures **CUL-1** through **CUL-9** are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to archeological resources. Accordingly, the City Council finds that,

pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to archeological resources, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to archeological resources. (EIR, § 4.4.5.2.)

2. Human Remains

Threshold: Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.4.5.3.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: Human remains are known to occur on the project site. Both the Phase I survey and Phase II testing revealed human remains within the proposed APE at sites CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345. The coroner during the Atkins survey identified 4 bone fragments as likely human and 76 as possibly human bone. Rincon's Phase I survey and Phase II testing revealed human remains at site CA-SDI-8243 consisting of 11 bone fragments identified as human or possibly human. These human remains would be repatriated to the most likely descendant upon completion of the proposed project.

Projects that result in substantial grading or excavations in native soils have the potential to impact archaeological resources that may contain human remains. The proposed project would occur in currently undeveloped land resulting in grading and excavation into native terrain where human remains are known to occur. Therefore, the potential exists for previously undiscovered human remains to be discovered during project grading and excavation. If human remains are inadvertently discovered, the impact would be considered significant unless the appropriate procedures were implemented.

California law recognizes the need to protect Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code, Sections 7050.5 and 7052, and California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.

The City received a comment expressing concerns for the identification, treatment, and protection of human remains and requesting the use of "cadaver dogs during a more extensive survey of the area". The City, based on recommendations from its qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the consulting tribe and representative of the MLD, disagrees that the use of cadaver dogs is required to adequately determine the presence of human remains associated with CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI 8345. Use of cadaver dogs is not standard practice for Phase I surveys or Phase II testing and evaluation, and neither the MLD nor the consulting tribe recommends it. The use of cadaver dogs to accurately identify prehistoric cremations over 400 years in age has not been thoroughly vetted in our region (climate, vegetation, soil conditions as well as disturbance can affect a dogs ability to alert to human remains). Additionally, there is not always a one-to-one correspondence between the dog alert location and the victim's remains, which can be offset by hundreds of feet. Given the known localities where human remains exist, it is possible that cadaver dogs would alert up to several hundred feet away from known localities creating false positives around those areas. See, Advanced Scientific Methods and Procedures in the Forensic Investigation of Clandestine Graves, Daniel O. Larson, Arpad A. Vass, and Marc Wise, 2011. Moreover, it has already been established that human remains are present in these areas and, therefore, would not change the California Register of Historical Resources eligibility of these resources.

Due to the identification of human remains on the project site and extensive disturbance set to take place in the on-site native terrain, Mitigation Measure **CUL-10** would be implemented to reduce impacts to the disturbance of human remains in recorded and unrecorded sites to a less than significant level.

CUL-10: ***Discovery of Human Remains. If human remains are found, State of California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of being granted access and shall provide recommendations for the treatment of the remains.***

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measure **CUL-10** is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to human remains. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to human remains, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to human remains. (EIR, § 4.4.5.3.)

D. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Soil Erosion

Threshold: Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.6.5.2.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: Erosion Impacts. Construction of the proposed project would involve extensive excavation and grading into the native terrain. Earthwork would involve approximately 27 million cubic yards of cut and fill materials, which would be balanced on site. The on-site aggregate plant would help balance the cut and fill by producing approximately 300,000 cubic yards of building materials required for the proposed project. Construction would include cuts up to 165 feet and fills up to 142 feet. Although over 63 percent of the project site would be retained as Habitat Preserve, those areas to be developed (graded) would be subject to wind and water erosion hazards due to the proposed project's removal of stabilizing vegetation and the construction of manufactured slopes. Construction activity would potentially accelerate erosion rates in currently undeveloped areas, and the erosion potential would be the highest in drainages or manufactured slopes. Soil removal associated with grading and excavation activities would reduce soil cohesion due to the generally loose and unconsolidated nature of graded areas and fill materials. Furthermore, excavated soils would be stockpiled for subsequent construction phases, which would be potentially exposed to erosive forces such as wind and water. The erosion effects of the proposed project would depend largely on the nature of the areas disturbed, the quantity of disturbance, and the length of time soils are subject to conditions that would be affected by erosion processes.

Construction of the three proposed villages would have the potential to cause erosion or loss of topsoil due to the extensive amount of cut and fill required in the native terrain (27,000,000 cubic yards). In the proposed Fanita Commons site, grading would primarily consist of filling operations to create large sheet-graded pads that would support commercial/retail uses and the residential Active Adult area. It is anticipated that a significant portion of the embankment material that would be needed to create the proposed Fanita Commons would originate from a large excavation in Stadium Conglomerate in the Orchard Village site, which would provide adequate materials for capping and slope construction. Relatively significant excavations are also planned along the northeastern and eastern boundaries of the proposed Fanita Commons site. The primary geotechnical consideration for grading in the Fanita Commons site is the extent of remedial grading that would be required to remove and compact potentially compressible surficial deposits beneath the proposed embankments and the rippability of the rock excavation planned in the northeastern corner of the village site.

Proposed grading in the Orchard Village site would generally consist of significant excavations in the central portions of the site and fill placement along the flanks of the ridges. The majority of the excavations would occur in Stadium Conglomerate which would provide adequate materials for capping the site and grading shear keys and buttresses in the event that stabilization procedures are necessary. Orchard Village contains areas underlain by the Friars Formation and ancient landslides that would have the potential to result in a significant impact related to soil erosion or topsoil loss and, thus, require mitigation.

In the proposed Vineyard Village site, significant excavations are proposed in Stadium Conglomerate and gabbroic rock along the ridge tops which would be used to fill canyon areas. The primary geotechnical considerations for grading in the proposed Vineyard Village site are the excavation characteristics of the Stadium Conglomerate and underlying granitic and gabbroic rocks, and the thickness and extent of surficial deposits (alluvium, colluvium). Thus, a potentially significant soil erosion or topsoil loss impact may occur, which would require mitigation.

Improvements associated with Fanita Parkway would consist of grading along the eastern side of the proposed parkway from Mast Boulevard to Ganley Road, and placing additional embankments at several locations along the western edge of the existing roadway. Proposed grading would generally consist of cut and fill slopes of less than 10 feet. Several retaining walls measuring equal to or less

than 12 feet in height are also proposed. Improvements to Cuyamaca Street would cross at least three easterly draining ravines. Cut and fill on the order of 85 feet and 70 feet, respectively, are proposed. It is anticipated that the proposed embankments would be constructed from materials excavated from the roadway cut areas. For the proposed extension of Magnolia Avenue, cut and fill on the order of 60 feet and 45 feet, respectively, are proposed. Due to extensive alteration of the natural ground surface during grading operations associated with the construction of the proposed villages and roadway improvements, there is a high possibility for erosion and topsoil loss.

Hydrologic Erosion Impacts. Erosion can also occur in connection with the hydrology of a project. Increases in flow, typically associated with increased impermeable surfaces, can result in increased erosion to on- and off-site drainage courses. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase of impervious surfaces throughout the site from construction of new development and roadways. As stated in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, the proposed project would comply with the City's Stormwater Permit and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System general permit for construction activities. The proposed project would also implement several erosion control BMPs including preserving existing vegetation, mulching, and hydroseeding, which would be included as part of a stormwater pollution prevention plan prepared for the proposed project. Examples of wind erosion control BMPs include applying water or other dust suppressants to exposed soils on the site or applying coverings to stockpiles located throughout the site. Additionally, all construction activities under the proposed project would comply with the City's Excavation and Grading Ordinance as well as the CBC, specifically Chapter 18, Soils and Foundations, which regulates excavation activities, grading activities, and the construction of foundations and retaining walls. However, due to the extensive amount of earth disturbance and grading required for the proposed project, the potential for substantial erosion to occur associated with construction activities would be potentially significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **GEO-1**, which requires the proposed project to implement the recommendations set forth in the geotechnical investigations including remedial grading, as well as compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, implementation of BMPs, and compliance with the City's Excavation and Grading Ordinance, would reduce the proposed project's impacts to a less than significant level.

GEO-1: ***Geotechnical Recommendations. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate that the recommendations and specifications contained in the geotechnical investigations conducted for the project site and off-site areas have been incorporated into the final project design and construction documents as minimum project requirements to the satisfaction of the City of Santee Development Services Director. The recommendations are discussed in detail in the following reports prepared by Geocon Consultants, Inc. in 2020: Geotechnical Investigation for Fanita Ranch – Fanita Commons, Orchard Village, and Vineyard Village; Geotechnical Investigation for Fanita Ranch – Fanita Parkway Widening and Extension Station 9+35 to 111+50; Geotechnical Investigation for Fanita Ranch – Off-Site Improvement to Cuyamaca Street; and Geotechnical Reconnaissance for Fanita Ranch – Off-site Improvements to Magnolia Avenue. The geotechnical recommendations include but are not limited to general geotechnical recommendations, recommendations for the Special Use area, soil and excavation characteristics, terrace drains, grading, seismic design criteria, slope stability, corrosive potential, foundation and concrete slab on-grade, retaining walls and lateral loads, slope maintenance, site drainage and moisture protection, Fanita Parkway flexible pavement, Cuyamaca Street pavement design, Lake Canyon Road Pavement section recommendations, grading plan review, and recommended grading specifications.***

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measure **GEO-1** is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to soil erosion. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to soil erosion, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to soil erosion. (EIR, § 4.6.5.2.)

2. Unstable Soils

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

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.6.5.3.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project

which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: The geotechnical investigations prepared for the proposed project identified that the surficial soil units, including topsoil, undocumented fill, artificial fill, alluvium, colluvium, debris flow deposits, and terrace deposits, are not suitable for support of fill or structural loads, such as the proposed residences and street improvements, in their current condition and are incapable of supporting the proposed project development.

Undocumented fill is found along the majority of the proposed Fanita Parkway improvement area. These fills likely contain vegetation and debris unsuitable for use in properly compacted fill. Artificial fill is found on the northern end of existing Magnolia Avenue and within the proposed Cuyamaca Street off-site improvement area. Only a minor portion of this fill would be impacted by the proposed alignment of Cuyamaca Street. The upper portions of the undocumented fill are considered unsuitable for support of fill or structural loads in their current condition and are incapable of supporting the proposed roadway improvements.

Topsoil essentially blankets the project site and proposed off-site improvement areas. Topsoil deposits are considered unsuitable for support of fill or structural loads in their current condition. The clayey topsoil possesses a medium to high expansion potential and should be placed in deeper fill areas. This topsoil is incapable of supporting the proposed project and road improvements in its current condition.

Alluvium and colluvium soils are found throughout the project site and off-site improvement areas, not including Fanita Parkway. The alluvial and colluvium deposits are poorly consolidated and compressible, generally possess a medium to high expansion potential, and are not considered suitable for support of fill or structural loads in their current condition and are incapable of supporting the proposed villages and roadway improvements.

Debris flow deposits cover portions of the project site primarily in drainage and tributary channels and pose a condition of concern for some areas of the future development. Should reactivation of the debris flow occur, it is unlikely that the roadway embankment would be breached by the flow. In areas of proposed village development, the presence of these materials is not likely to impact the proposed improvements. However, other areas of the development may be affected.

Terrace deposits would likely be encountered during grading for the westernmost portion of the Fanita Commons site. The proposed Fanita Parkway improvement area includes terrace deposits in several trenches, which are suitable for the support of fill or structural loads in their current condition.

The Friars Formation and Stadium Conglomerate underlying the proposed Orchard and Vineyard Village site, the central and northern portions of Fanita Parkway, and the Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue off-site improvement areas off-site improvement area include the random occurrence of highly cemented zones. The Friars Formation is prone to surficial instability where exposed in cut slopes on the project site, which poses a condition of concern for some areas of the future development. Excavating in the granitic materials on the project site would generally vary in difficulty with the depth of excavation.

It is anticipated that several of the proposed on-site cuts would encounter hard granitic rock on the project site and in the Cuyamaca Street off-site improvement area. To evaluate the rippability characteristics of the rock, a geophysical survey consisting of seismic refraction traverses was performed in the proposed Fanita Commons site, Vineyard Village site, and Cuyamaca Street off-site improvement areas. The results determined that the depths to nonrippable material in the granitic rock are variable on the project site. Excavations beyond the depths indicated at specific locations would likely require blasting to efficiently excavate the materials.

The stability and potential impacts of ancient landslides located on the project site and off-site improvement areas were evaluated in the geotechnical investigations prepared for the proposed project. The reports identified that development is proposed on known landslide areas mapped on the site. These areas specifically include the north- and south-facing slopes of prominent ridges in the proposed Orchard Village site and southern border of the proposed Fanita Commons site, within the proposed Special Use area, and along the southerly end of the proposed Cuyamaca Street off-site improvement area. No obvious signs of slope instability were observed along the proposed Fanita Parkway improvement area and no evidence of landslides were detected on the Magnolia Avenue off-site improvement area. Proposed project construction would have the potential to disturb the stabilized conditions in these areas and could expose people and structures to landslides.

Furthermore, existing slopes that are 3:1 (horizontal: vertical) or steeper would potentially be susceptible to near-surface slope instability. The instability is typically limited to the outer 3 feet of the

slope and does not directly impact the improvements on the pad areas above or below the slope. The occurrence of surficial instability is more prevalent on fill slopes and is generally preceded by a period of heavy rainfall, excessive irrigation, or the migration of subsurface seepage. Because the proposed project proposes an extensive amount of earthwork in native terrain, it has the potential to result in significant impacts associated with unstable soils, potentially resulting in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **GEO-1**, described above, in compliance with the CBC would reduce the proposed project's impacts associated with geologic instability to a less than significant level. Upper portions of these undocumented fill deposits found along Fanita Parkway shall require remedial grading prior to placement of structural fill or settlement-sensitive improvements. Where encountered during grading of the roadway, such fills shall be cleaned of debris and deleterious matter, removed, and properly compacted or exported from the site. Remedial grading in the form of removal and compaction of artificial fills in Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue shall be required.

Topsoil, colluvium, and alluvium deposits found throughout the project site and street improvement areas are considered unsuitable in their current condition and shall require removal and compaction in areas planned to receive structural fill or settlement-sensitive structures. Areas of colluvium and alluvium shall require remedial grading. The anticipated maximum depth of removal based on the exploratory excavations is approximately 11 feet. Deeper removals may be encountered in the main drainage areas.

Stadium Conglomerate found under the majority of the proposed development areas and along the majority of the proposed Cuyamaca Street off-site improvement area shall require moderately heavy to very heavy ripping and possible blasting during grading due to randomly occurring highly cemented zones. Blasting would likely be required for most excavations deeper than 10 to 20 feet.

The Friars Formation is prone to surficial instability where exposed in cut slopes and shall require stability fills. Where weak, waxy, or highly weathered portions of the Friars Formation are exposed, deeper remedial grading shall be required to provide a competent surface to support the fills. In addition, blasting would likely be required in the granitic rocks in the Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue off-site extensions as well as certain areas of the village development.

The debris flow deposits found throughout the project site and street

improvement areas shall require remedial grading. The anticipated maximum depth of removal, based on the exploratory excavations, is approximately 5 feet with deeper removals possible in the main drainage areas. The existing debris flow deposits shall be removed below the proposed Cuyamaca Street embankment and the roadway shall be elevated above the deposit. Remedial grading measures such as complete removal and compaction of landslide materials or grading of shear keys or buttresses is anticipated to remove landslide deposits. Development plans for the Special Use area shall be reviewed by a geotechnical engineer prior to final design to comply with a focused geotechnical study that no significant grading or introduction of water shall be introduced into the unstable soil. The introduction of irrigation or infiltration of water as part of landscaping or stormwater BMPs would be restricted as part of the development conditions.

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measure **GEO-1** is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to unstable soils. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to unstable soils, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to unstable soils. (EIR, § 4.6.5.3.)

3. Expansive Soils

Threshold: Would the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.6.5.4.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: According to the project-specific geotechnical investigations, the soil conditions encountered on the project site and off-site roadway improvement areas vary from low expansion, sandy gravel and cobble conglomerate and silty sands to highly expansive, clayey topsoil, and claystones/siltstones within the Friars Formation. Due to the potential for highly expansive soils on the project site, portions of the Friars Formation and Stadium Conglomerate would be subject to expansion effects due to the water holding capacity of clay materials.

Relatively minor natural surface seeps were observed in other portions of the site along where the Friars Formation and Stadium Conglomerate meet. A static, near-surface groundwater table was not encountered on the project site. The existing perched groundwater levels in alluvial areas can be expected to fluctuate seasonally and may affect remedial grading. Remedial grading may encounter wet soils and excavation and compaction difficulty, particularly if construction is planned during the winter months. Areas where perched water or seepage were not encountered may exhibit groundwater during rainy periods.

No seeps or groundwater were observed along the proposed Fanita Parkway improvement area. However, during previous studies, standing water and vegetation suggestive of shallow groundwater were noted along the drainage swales that presently border the western side of Fanita Parkway. In addition, on-site geologic units have permeability characteristics that are conducive to water transmission, natural or otherwise, and may result in future seepage conditions. Therefore, localized seepage or perched groundwater may be encountered. Materials within drainages may be very moist to saturated during the winter or early spring depending on preceding precipitation.

Shallow groundwater is expected to occur in the Magnolia Avenue off-site improvement area during the winter months where the proposed roadway alignment crosses the two younger alluvial areas. Perched groundwater levels in drainages could seasonally affect on-site excavations and site grading, causing a condition of concern in some areas of the project site.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the CBC, which includes provisions for construction on expansive soils. Complying with the provisions of the CBC requires that a geotechnical investigation be performed to provide data for the architect and engineer to responsibly design the proposed project in a manner that mitigates or avoids concerns related to expansive soils. This mandate has been satisfied through the Geocon investigations for the proposed project.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **GEO-1**, described above, which sets forth site-specific geotechnical recommendations for expansive soils in compliance with the CBC, would reduce the proposed project's impacts associated with geologic instability to a less than significant level. Recommendations for expansive soils shall include the use of subdrain systems in areas of proposed development to intercept and convey seepage migrating along

impervious strata. In particular, subdrains shall be required in the main drainages, in stability/buttress fill areas, and where impervious layers daylight near the ultimate graded surface. This measure shall also require remedial grading of surficial deposits and materials within drainages to mix with drier material or drying prior to use as compacted fill along Fanita Parkway. Localized dewatering along Magnolia Avenue may be required in order to perform remedial grading operations during construction.

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measure **GEO-1** is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to expansive soils. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to expansive soils, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to expansive soils. (EIR, § 4.6.5.4.)

4. Paleontological Resources

Threshold: Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.6.5.6.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: Development of the proposed project would involve the excavation and grading into the native terrain of approximately 27 million cubic yards with cuts up to 165 feet and fills up to 142 feet. Though paleontological resources are known to reside within a 1-mile radius of the project site, no known paleontological sites have been identified on the project site.

The project site is underlain by artificial fill, young alluvial deposits, landslide deposits, terrace deposits, Stadium Conglomerate, Friars Formation, and plutonic rocks. These geologic units are assigned paleontological potential ratings based on their potential to yield significant fossil remains. According to the Paleontological Resource Assessment prepared for the proposed project, artificial fill, young alluvial deposits, and plutonic rocks have been assigned a no to low potential and are not anticipated to reveal paleontological resources. However, young alluvial deposits and landslide deposits are

considered to have a moderate potential, while Stadium Conglomerate and Friars Formation are assigned a high potential for significant fossil remains.

Mass grading on the proposed Fanita Commons site would primarily involve the importation of fill materials from the proposed Orchard Village site to create large sheet-graded pads for the proposed development. Remedial grading to prepare areas for placement of fill materials and removal and recompaction of young alluvial deposits, ancient landslide deposits, and fine-grained portions of the Friars Formation is likely to be extensive. It appears that the majority of earthwork proposed in this area would primarily impact geologic units of no paleontological potential, such as those underlying the proposed Community Park and the Active Adult area. However, a portion of the proposed earthwork would impact geologic units of moderate (ancient landslides, older terrace deposits) and high paleontological potential (Friars Formation) occurring in the vicinity of the proposed fire station and the K–8 school. If the school is not developed, the underlying Medium Density Residential land use would take effect, and 59 residences would be constructed on this site. Due to similar ground disturbance, the physical geological impacts on this site would be the same whether it is developed with a school or residences.

Preliminary earthwork plans for the proposed Orchard Village site indicate large areas of proposed cuts along east–west-trending ridgelines to generate fill material for importation to the other two proposed villages and to create level sheet-graded pads for the development proposed in Orchard Village. Remedial grading to remove and stabilize a series of ancient landslides along the southern side of Sycamore Canyon Creek is likely to be extensive. Mass grading on the proposed Orchard Village site would primarily impact geologic units of high paleontological potential, including the Stadium Conglomerate along ridgelines generally above 675 feet in elevation and the Friars Formation along canyon slopes generally below 675 feet in elevation. It is likely that remedial grading associated with the ancient landslides would also impact high paleontological potential geologic units (Friars Formation) in those portions of landslides that have moved as large, intact blocks of unbroken strata.

Preliminary earthwork plans for the proposed Vineyard Village site indicate significant excavations along ridgelines and large fills along canyon heads to create level sheet-graded pads for the proposed development. Remedial grading for removal and recompaction of young alluvial deposits is likely to be relatively minor. Mass grading of the proposed Vineyard Village site would largely impact geologic

units of high paleontological potential (Stadium Conglomerate) that compose the highest peaks in the proposed project but would also impact geologic units of no paleontological potential (plutonic rocks) that occur on the western flanks of these peaks.

In addition to the earthwork in the three proposed villages, there would be off-site mass grading activities associated with construction of the Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue extensions, which would require locally extensive cuts and fills to create the roadway alignments. The majority of this grading would impact geologic units of no paleontological potential (plutonic rocks). However, mass grading in the extreme northern and southern portions of the proposed Cuyamaca Street alignment would impact geologic units of high paleontological potential, including the Stadium Conglomerate to the north and the Friars Formation to the south.

Finally, widening and the northward extension of Fanita Parkway would involve relatively minor grading that would primarily impact geologic units of no paleontological potential (existing artificial fill) or low paleontological potential (young alluvial deposits) but could impact units of moderate potential (older terrace deposits) and high potential (the Friars Formation) in the vicinity of Lake Canyon Road and northward.

Development of the proposed project would have the potential to reveal paleontological resources because it would involve excavation and grading at depths that would impact underlying formations with moderate to high paleontological potential. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **GEO-2** would reduce potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources to below a level of significance.

GEO-2: ***Paleontological Monitoring Program. To address potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources, a monitoring program shall be implemented and involve the following:***

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

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

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

4. ***During-Construction Monitoring: A project paleontologist or paleontological monitor shall be present during all earthwork in formations with moderate to high paleontological sensitivity. A paleontological monitor (working under the direction of the project paleontologist) shall be on site on a full-time basis during all original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits of Pleistocene terrace deposits (moderate paleontological potential), ancient landslide deposits (moderate paleontological potential), Stadium Conglomerate (high paleontological potential), and Friars Formation (high paleontological potential) to inspect exposures for unearthed fossils. Areas to be monitored shall include but would not be limited to the majority of the proposed Orchard Village and Vineyard Village footprints and approximately the southern half of the Fanita Commons footprint, the improvements to Fanita Parkway in the vicinity of Lake Canyon Road and northward, and the northern half and southernmost end of the off-site extension of Cuyamaca Street.***

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

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

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

8. ***Post-Construction Final Report: A final summary paleontological mitigation report that outlines the results of the mitigation program shall be completed and submitted to the City of Santee within 2 weeks of the completion of each construction phase of the proposed project. This report shall include discussions of the methods used, stratigraphic section(s) exposed, fossils collected, inventory lists of cataloged fossils, and significance of recovered fossils.***

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measure **GEO-2** is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to paleontological resources. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to paleontological resources, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to paleontological resources. (EIR, § 4.6.5.6.)

E. GREENHOUSE GASES

1. Emissions Generation

Threshold: Would the Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.7.5.1.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: The proposed project would result in a significant impact if calculated project-generated GHG emissions would exceed annual per capita emissions of 1.77 MT CO_2e.

Construction. During project construction, GHGs would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and vendor vehicles, each of which typically uses fossil-based fuels to operate. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHGs (e.g.

CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O). Furthermore, CH_4 is emitted during the fueling of heavy equipment. Construction activities would be the same for the preferred land use plan with school and the land use plan without school because the activities would occur in the same footprint, require the same equipment, and have the same duration. Therefore, GHG emissions would be the same for either land use plan. Therefore, construction of either land use plan would result in total GHG emissions of 37,442 MT CO_2e, or approximately 1,248 MT CO_2e per year over the 30-year life of the proposed project.

Operation. Long-term operation of the proposed project would generate GHG emissions from area and mobile sources and indirect emissions from stationary sources associated with energy consumption. Mobile-source emissions of GHGs would include project-generated vehicle trips. Area-source emissions would be associated with activities such as landscaping and maintenance of the proposed project, natural gas for heating, and other sources. Increases in stationary-source emissions would also occur at off-site utility providers as a result of demand for electricity, natural gas, and water by the proposed project.

Implementation of the preferred land use plan with school would result in GHG emissions of approximately 36,105 MT CO_2e per year, including amortized construction emissions. Per capita emissions would be 4.29 MT CO_2e and would exceed the threshold of 1.77 MT CO_2e. Implementation of the land use plan without school would result in GHG emissions of approximately 36,690 MT CO_2e per year, including amortized construction emissions. Per capita emissions would be 4.40 MT CO_2e and would exceed the threshold of 1.77 MT CO_2e. All public, homeowner association and private landscape installations shall be subject to the Solar Shade Control Act of 1979, Public Resources Code Sections 25980–25986.

Mitigation Measures **GHG-1** through **GHG-6**, as well as Mitigation Measures **AIR-5** through **AIR-8** and **AIR-10** as set forth below, would reduce GHG emissions from construction and operation of the proposed project. The development of mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions focused on mobile sources, which compose over 60 percent of project emissions, as well as energy, waste diversion, and review of the sequestration potential of additional trees and drought-tolerant landscaping practices. After applying Mitigation Measures **GHG-1** through **GHG-6**, **AIR-5** through **AIR-8**, and **AIR-10**, there would be a reduction in GHG emissions of 37 percent compared to unmitigated emissions (unmitigated emissions include reductions from project design features and state regulations) for the preferred land use plan with school and a 36 percent reduction compared to

unmitigated emissions for the land use plan without school. Per capita emissions from the preferred land use plan with school would be 1.50 MT CO_2e after mitigation, and per capita emissions from the land use plan without school would be 1.61 MT CO_2e. Therefore, per capita emissions would be reduced to below the 1.77 MT CO2e threshold for either land use plan, and impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level.

GHG-1: ***Solar Panels. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the City of Santee that the project shall include both fixed-position rooftop photovoltaic (PV) solar energy panels on residential structures and commercial buildings, and in the Special Use area PV panels mounted on racks that have motorized tilt positions that follow the sun unless the installation is infeasible due to poor solar resources established in a solar feasibility study prepared by a qualified solar consultant submitted to City. The proposed project shall provide on-site PV renewable energy generation with a total design capacity of at least 12.147 megawatts (MW) for the Preferred Land Use Plan with School, or 12.083 MW capacity for the Land Use Plan without School at full buildout.***

GHG-2: ***Recycling and Composting Services. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant or its designee shall provide the following evidence to the City of Santee:***

- ***Between 2020 and 2030, at least 70 percent of construction and demolition waste is diverted, and***
- ***Starting in 2030, at least 80 percent of construction and demolition waste is diverted.***

Long term, at least 90 percent of the waste generated at the proposed project shall be diverted. To achieve this mandate, the proposed project shall include but not be limited to the following:

- ***Recycling containers in all multi-family residential communities and non-residential buildings, and***
- ***Composting containers and compost collection services in commercial and office facilities.***

GHG-3: ***Water Conservation. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the City of Santee that the proposed project will implement water conservation strategies that are designed to be as efficient as possible with potable water supplies and will achieve at least 20 percent indoor and outdoor water reduction compared to the***

average statewide water consumption rate at the time of project approval.

GHG-4: ***All-Electric Homes. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the City of Santee that the proposed project will include all-electric homes. No natural gas shall be provided to the residential portion of the proposed project.***

GHG-5: ***On-Site Tree Planting. Prior to the issuance of the precise grading permit for each phase, landscape and irrigation plans shall show evidence of tree planting in support of the overall master tree planting plan that requires at least 26,705 trees and at least 237.4 acres of bushes and hedges on site. The landscape plans will ensure that the trees and acres of bushes and hedges onsite do not shade photovoltaic (PV) solar panel installation onsite in compliance with Public Resources Code, Division 15, Chapter 12 (PRC D15 Ch12), Solar Shade Control (1974).***

GHG-6: ***Private Electric Vehicles. Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the 500th low-density residential (LDR) unit, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the City of Santee that one electric vehicle has been provided with the purchase of a LDR unit until a total of 100 electric vehicles have been delivered.***

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measures **GHG-1** through **GHG-6**, as well as Mitigation Measures **AIR-5** through **AIR-8** and **AIR-10** are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project regarding greenhouse gas emissions, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. (EIR, § 4.7.5.1.)

2. Emission Reduction Plans

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.7.5.2.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: The proposed project would result in a significant impact if it would conflict with the Sustainable Santee Plan, which is the applicable plan for demonstrating local consistency with statewide emissions reduction goals. The proposed project was reviewed for consistency with the Sustainable Santee Plan's growth assumptions, GHG reduction targets, and GHG reduction strategies. The growth assumptions in the Sustainable Santee Plan are based on demographic and land use forecasts in the Santee General Plan. In addition, to account for approved and pending residential development applications, a 2,000-residential dwelling unit buffer was added into the growth assumptions of the Sustainable Santee Plan. The Fanita Ranch Development Plan is included in the pending project list that was considered in the growth buffer. Therefore, the proposed project would fall within the growth assumptions of the Sustainable Santee Plan.

The Sustainable Santee Plan's emissions reduction goals include a 2030 goal that demonstrates consistency with SB 32 (reduce emissions to 40 percent below 2005 levels), and a 2035 goal to reduce emissions to 49 percent below 2005 levels. These goals put the City on a path toward the state's long-term goal to achieve net carbon neutrality statewide by 2045. Achievement of the per capita GHG threshold derived from the Sustainable Santee Plan would quantitatively demonstrate that the proposed project would conform to the GHG reduction targets identified in the Sustainable Santee Plan and would help the City meet its GHG reduction commitments. Implementation of the preferred land use plan with school or land use plan without school would, prior to mitigation, result in annual GHG emissions that would exceed the applicable per capita threshold of 1.77 MT CO_2e for plan compliance. The projected increase in GHG emissions prior to mitigation would potentially conflict with the City's GHG reduction goals identified in the Sustainable Santee Plan.

As shown in EIR Table 4.7-12, the proposed project would be inconsistent with some applicable GHG reduction strategies identified in the Sustainable Santee Plan prior to mitigation. The proposed project would result in potential conflicts with Goals 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Sustainable Santee Plan related to GHG emissions reduction goals and GHG reduction strategies.

EIR Table 4.7-13 demonstrates consistency with the GHG reduction strategies from the Sustainable Santee Plan with implementation of Mitigation Measures **GHG-1**, **GHG-2**, **GHG-6**, **AIR-6** through **AIR-8**, and **TRA-16**. With implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable GHG reduction strategies in the Sustainable Santee Plan, and this impact would be mitigated to a less than significant level.

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measures **GHG-1**, **GHG-2**, **GHG-6**, as well as Mitigation Measures **AIR-6** through **AIR-8** and **TRA-16** are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to emission reduction plans. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project regarding greenhouse gas emission reduction plans, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to greenhouse gas emission reduction plans. (EIR, § 4.7.5.2.)

F. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Accident or Upset

Threshold: Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.8.5.2.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: Construction. Construction activities associated with the proposed project could release hazardous materials into the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions. There is a possibility of accidental release of hazardous substances such as petroleum-based fuels or hydraulic fluid used for construction equipment. Incidents that result in an accidental release of hazardous substance into the environment can cause contamination of soil, surface water, and groundwater, in addition to any toxic fumes that might be generated. If not cleaned up immediately and completely, the hazardous substances can migrate

into the soil or enter a local stream or channel, causing contamination of soil and water. The construction contractor would be required to implement such regulations relative to the accidental release of any hazardous materials, including the use of standard construction controls and safety procedures to avoid a significant hazard to the public or environment that would avoid or minimize the potential for accidental release of such substances into the environment.

On-site hazards observed include remnants of a car in the northwestern portion of the site. However, due to the lack of stains or stressed vegetation near the car remnants, it was determined that the car is non-hazardous waste/debris. The other feature observed on site is a groundwater well located 800 feet northeast of the PDMWD Ray Stoyer WRF and depicted in the 1953 topographic map included in the Phase I ESA. According to the Phase I ESA, this well has been welded closed. Though not a REC, the applicant is required to comply with the County's requirements to ensure the groundwater well is properly abandoned in accordance with the County's Well Ordinance (Section 67.441 of the Regulatory Ordinances) (County of San Diego 2013). If not properly abandoned, a hazardous condition associated with the groundwater well may result from the proposed project, such as inadvertent groundwater contamination from construction activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **HAZ-1** would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

Operation. Potential releases (unforeseen and reasonably foreseeable) of hazardous materials during operation of the proposed project would be limited to household cleaning products, landscaping chemicals and fertilizers, and other substances associated with residential, commercial, agricultural, recreational, and civic uses. Without development of the school site, the potential accidental release of hazardous materials typically associated with schools would not contribute to the proposed project's potential impacts related to the accidental release of hazardous materials.

Any hazardous materials would be handled in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials. The proposed project would not include any businesses, operations, or facilities that would handle hazardous substances in excess of the threshold quantities listed in Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code, generate hazardous waste regulated under Chapter 6.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, or store hazardous substances in USTs regulated under Chapter 6.7 of the California Health and Safety Code. Therefore, on-site operational impacts related to unforeseen or reasonably foreseeable conditions would be less than significant.

The PDMWD Ray Stoyer WRF's process of treating effluent includes the use of chlorine and sulfur dioxide gases, which are also stored at the facility. The risk management plan (RMP) for the PDMWD Ray Stoyer WRF (SCS Tracer Environmental 2017) lays out a comprehensive plan for the protection of public health and relates the chemicals of concern associated with the facility.

According to the RMP, since reconstruction of PDMWD in 1996/1997, there has been no reportable release of chlorine or sulfur dioxide from the PDMWD Ray Stoyer WRF. Regardless, the facility has an aggressive and active safety program, known as the Accidental Release Prevention Program and Chemical-Specific Prevention Steps, in place to manage the handling of chlorine and sulfur dioxide gas (SCS Tracer Environmental 2017). Two sensors are located in the chlorine storage room which immediately trigger audio and visual alarms when one part per million (ppm) of chlorine is unceremoniously released. A scrubber capable of scrubbing 2,000 pounds of chlorine with a 99.9 percent efficiency rate further protects the storage tanks. With the accidental release of sulfur dioxide, gas sensors trigger audible and visual alarms followed by immediate sprinkler knockdown and the activation of the auto-dialer systems. The chlorine and sulfur dioxide systems were designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations including the Uniform Mechanical Code, Uniform Building Code, and the Uniform Fire Code. With these measures in place, the likelihood of gas escaping beyond the facility is very low (SCS Tracer Environmental 2017). In addition, the PDMWD Ray Stoyer WRF has an effective Emergency Response Plan.

PDMWD has taken a proactive approach to emergency response and safety at the Ray Stoyer WRF. Annual emergency response drills are conducted, documented, and continually reviewed to improve team response. PDMWD has implemented recommendations from the latest RMP for PDMWD, which include training all employees in process safety management (SCS Tracer Environmental 2017). Therefore, with continued implementation of the safety measures in the Emergency Response Plan and the RMP for the PDMWD Ray Stoyer WRF, the proposed project would not exacerbate the risk of accidental release of hazardous materials from this facility. As such, impacts associated with the release of chlorine and sulfur dioxide gases from the adjacent WRF are considered less than significant.

HAZ-1: ***Groundwater Well Abandonment. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Santee Development Services Department showing the proper abandonment of the on-site groundwater well located***

approximately 800 feet northeast of the Padre Dam Municipal Water District Ray Stoyer Water Recycling Facility, in accordance with the County of San Diego's Well Ordinance (Section 67.441 of the Regulatory Ordinances). Section 67.441 outlines the permit application requirements and conditions for the purpose of construction, repair, reconstruction, and destruction of any well. These requirements include but are not limited to locational information, waste disposal systems, drainage patterns, depth of the wells, and completion of work. This section also includes the conditions of approval for a permit that must be adhered to by the applicant.

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measure **HAZ-1** is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to accident or upset. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project regarding accident or upset, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to accident or upset. (EIR, § 4.8.5.2.)

G. NOISE

1. Vibration

Threshold: Would the Project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.12.5.2.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: Groundborne vibration occurring as part of the proposed project would result from construction equipment and blasting. Following construction, the proposed residential and commercial uses would not require heavy equipment anticipated to generate groundborne vibration. Additionally, the use of tractors is anticipated to be required for the proposed Farm.

Farm Equipment. Operation of farm equipment would result in a significant impact if it would generate vibration levels greater than 72 VdB at the nearest existing residence. FTA reference vibration levels are not available for the small tractor anticipated for Farm use. The

typical vibration level for a small bulldozer is assumed to be representative of small tractor use. Small bulldozer use would not exceed 72 VdB at 25 feet from the source. There are no existing receptors within 25 feet of the proposed Farm area. Therefore, operational impacts from farm equipment would be less than significant.

Construction Equipment. Vibration levels from all construction equipment would be reduced to 80 VdB or below beyond 75 feet from construction. The residences closest to the boundary of a village development area are approximately 850 feet east of the proposed Vineyard Village boundary near Oak Creek Drive. Therefore, due to distance to the nearest sensitive receptors, construction for on-site land development would not result in potentially significant vibration. However, some residences are located within 75 feet of the construction area for the extensions and off-site improvements to Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue, and dead-end roadway improvements at the southern boundary of the site. At 45 feet from construction, only operation of equipment equal to a vibratory roller would have the potential to exceed the significance criteria of 80 VdB at surrounding land uses during typical construction. Vibration levels would have the potential to exceed the applicable FTA criteria; therefore, construction activities that would require the use of a vibratory roller would have the potential to exceed the vibration impact criteria related to human response and result in a significant impact.

In addition to human annoyance, an impact related to architectural and structural damage to buildings would occur if existing buildings were affected by a PPV in excess of 0.2 in/sec. Vibration levels from vibratory construction equipment would be reduced to below 0.2 in/sec within 45 feet of the construction area. There are no existing structures within 45 feet of construction areas requiring use of vibratory equipment. Therefore, although construction would have the potential to result in significant nuisance impacts, project construction equipment would not result in a significant impact related to structural damage.

Blasting. Blasting during construction would be infrequent and subject to the event criteria of 80 VdB at the nearest existing residence. Vibration levels from blasting would be reduced to 80 VdB or below beyond 235 feet from the blast area. No existing receptors are within 235 feet of potential blast areas. Due to distance to the nearest sensitive receptors, blasting would not exceed the applicable FTA criteria and would not result in a potentially significant vibration impact.

Regarding structural damage to buildings, the details for individual project blasting operations cannot be known at this time, but would comply with applicable specifications prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Mines or Office of Surface Mining and Reclamation Enforcement. The estimated vibration from hard rock blasting for a major rail tunnel construction project has been used as a reference level for this analysis (FRA 2017). Vibration levels from blasting would be reduced to below 0.2 in/sec within 45 feet of the construction area. There are no existing structures within 45 feet of construction areas requiring blasting. Therefore, blasting would not result in a potentially significant impact related to structural damage.

Vibration impacts would be temporary and would cease following construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **NOI-8** and **NOI-9**, in addition to Mitigation Measures **NOI-3** and **NOI-4** set forth below, would minimize temporary groundborne vibration impacts from construction activities at the nearby receptors. Therefore, impacts related to groundborne vibration during construction would be less than significant after mitigation.

NOI-8: ***Vibration Best Management Practices. Prior to the commencement of construction activities that would involve use of a vibratory roller (or equivalent equipment) within 75 feet of a residence, the applicant shall retain a qualified acoustician to identify best management practices to be implemented by the construction contractor to reduce vibration levels to below 80 vibration decibels at the nearest residence. The best management practices shall be included in project construction documents, including the grading plan and contract with the construction contractor. Practices may include but are not limited to the following:***

- ***Use only properly maintained equipment with vibratory isolators***
- ***Operate equipment as far from sensitive receptors as possible***
- ***Use rubber-tired vehicles as opposed to tracked vehicles***

NOI-9: ***Construction Vibration Notification. The construction contractor shall provide written notification to receptors within 75 feet of construction activities at least 3 weeks prior to the start of any construction activities that would require the use of a vibratory roller or equivalent equipment. The notice would inform them of the estimated start date and duration of daytime vibration-generating construction activities. This notification shall include information warning about the potential for impacts related to vibration-sensitive equipment. The City of***

Santee shall provide a phone number for the affected receptors to call if they have vibration-sensitive equipment on their property. If a complaint is received, a vibration monitoring program will be implemented within 2 working days to reduce vibration to below 80 vibration decibels at the nearest receptor. The vibration monitoring plan shall be prepared and administered by a qualified vibration consultant and submitted to the Director of Development Services for approval. The vibration monitoring plan shall include the location of the vibration monitor, the vibration instrumentation used, a data acquisition and retention plan, and an exceedance notification and reporting procedures. The program shall include but not be limited to the following:

- ***Monitor vibration during construction activities with a seismograph or other instrument capable of measuring and recording displacement and frequency, particle velocity, or acceleration at the closest residence to the construction area***
- ***Use equipment that includes dampeners or other modifications to reduce vibration***
- ***Use of alternative non-vibratory equipment where available***
- ***Limit simultaneous operation of equipment.***

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measures **NOI-3**, **NOI-4**, **NOI-8** and **NOI-9** are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to vibration. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project regarding vibration, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to vibration. (EIR, § 4.12.5.2.)

H. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Tribal Cultural Resources

Threshold: 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 (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?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.4.5.4.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).)

Explanation: A record search of the Sacred Lands File was completed by the NAHC on March 23, 2016. The NAHC provided contact information for 15 tribal groups and individuals who should be contacted regarding the Sacred Lands File results and letters were then sent to each of the listed groups and individuals on April 8, 2016. Viejas responded requesting participation in the Phase I pedestrian survey.

The City prepared and sent SB 18 notification letters to the 24 tribes listed with the NAHC on October 18, 2018. The City received one response from Viejas requesting a Kumeyaay cultural monitor be on site for ground-disturbing activities. No consultation meetings were requested by Viejas or any other tribe contacted under SB 18. Consultation under SB 18 has been closed for the proposed project.

The City prepared and sent AB 52 notification letters to the three tribal contacts that formally requested notification of projects in the City on September 7, 2018. The City received one response to the AB 52 consultation letters from Art Bunce, Tribal Attorney for Barona. In a letter dated September 14, 2018, Mr. Bunce requested consultation for the proposed project on behalf of Barona. Mr. Bunce stated that Barona's primary goal is to preserve the integrity of significant TCRs, in particular ancestral remains, and would likely seek avoidance of portions of sites CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345 that would be impacted by the proposed project. Mr. Bunce and other members of Barona met several times both on and off-site to discuss the proposed project's potential impacts to the resources on the project site as well as review the mitigation measures for the proposed project. The Phase I and II reports prepared for the proposed project identified two prehistoric archaeological resources (CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345) that were eligible for listing on the CRHR. During consultation efforts with Barona, the Tribal Council expressed interest in the potential impacts to these resources, which the tribe considers to have cultural value. As such, CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345 are considered to be TCRs for the purposes of the project.

The construction of the proposed project involves substantial ground disturbance with the potential to alter, remove, or destroy resources associated with sites CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345. Damage to a known TCR as a result of project development would result in a significant impact. In addition, previously unidentified TCRs may be encountered during construction that the lead agency could determine to be eligible for listing on the CRHR. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **CUL-11** would reduce impacts to TCRs to a less than significant level by providing for proper treatment and disposition of TCRs. In addition, Mitigation Measures **CUL-1** through **CUL-10** set forth above would reduce any potential significant impacts to CA-SDI-8243, CA-SDI-8345, and unknown TCRs to a less than significant level.

CUL-11: ***Treatment and Disposition of Tribal Cultural Resources. The applicant shall relinquish ownership of all non-burial related tribal cultural resources collected during the grading monitoring program and to the extent performed by the applicant, from any previous archaeological studies or excavations on the project site to the most likely descendant tribe for proper treatment and disposition per the Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Program (Mitigation Measure CUL-4). Any burial related tribal cultural resources (as determined by the most likely descendant) shall be repatriated to the most likely descendant as determined by the Native American Heritage Commission pursuant to California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98. If none of the consulting tribes accept the return of the cultural resources, then the cultural resources shall be subject to the curation requirements stipulated in Mitigation Measure CUL-8) In the event that curation of tribal cultural resources is required by a superseding regulatory agency, curation shall be conducted by an approved facility and the curation shall be guided by the State Historical Resources Commission's Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collections. In the event the superseding agency is a Federal agency, Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 79 shall be followed.***

In the event on-site reburial of culturally affiliated material is preferred by the Native American groups consulting on the proposed project, the applicant, in consultation with the most likely descendant, shall designate a location on the project site where reburial will take place. The reburial shall take place in a location where future construction shall not impact the buried material, such as an area designated as open space for the proposed project; therefore, a cap shall not be required. The on-site reburial location shall be selected prior to the start of

construction. The reburial of material shall take place following the completion of ground disturbance for the proposed project and shall be observed by the most likely descendant or a Native American monitor representing the most likely descendant and a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology. The location of the reburial shall be documented using a California Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 form completed by the qualified archaeologist who observed the reburial. The qualified archaeologist shall submit the location to the City of Santee and the location and forms to the South Coastal Information Center.

The City Council finds that Mitigation Measure **CUL-1** through **CUL-11** are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to tribal cultural resources. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project to tribal cultural resources, as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Mitigation measures will further reduce impacts related to tribal cultural resources. (EIR, § 4.4.5.4.)

SECTION IV: IMPACTS THAN CANNOT BE FULLY MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The City Council hereby finds that, despite the incorporation of Mitigation Measures identified in the EIR and in these Findings, the following environmental impacts cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level and a Statement of Overriding Considerations is therefore included herein:

A. AIR QUALITY

1. Air Quality Plans and Air Quality Standards

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Finding: Significant and unavoidable. (EIR, § 4.2.5.1.) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3).)

Explanation: The Santee City Council adopted the Santee General Plan on August 27, 2003. The City also adopted a General Plan Housing Element Amendment on April 10, 2013. Development consistent with the Santee General Plan and 2013 General Plan Housing Element Amendment would be consistent with the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and State Implementation Plan (SIP). The project site is zoned and designated as Planned Development in the Santee General Plan. The 2013 Santee General Plan Housing Element Amendment projected approximately 1,380 single-family residential units and 15 live/work units (1,395 units total) within the Fanita Planned Development area, while the proposed project proposes 2,949 housing units under the preferred land use plan with school or 3,008 housing units under the land use plan without school, along with the development of other types of land uses. The proposed project would exceed the number of residential units identified for the project site in the 2013 Santee General Plan Housing Element Amendment projections. Thus, the proposed project would exceed the SANDAG growth assumptions assumed for the project site and would be inconsistent with the emissions projections in the RAQS and the SIP.

Moreover, if a project's emissions would exceed regional thresholds for VOC, NO_x, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$, it follows that the emissions could cumulatively contribute to an exceedance of a pollutant for which the SDAB is in nonattainment (O_3, NO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$) at a monitoring station in the SDAB. An exceedance of a nonattainment pollutant at a monitoring station would not be consistent with the goals of the RAQS to achieve attainment of pollutants. With implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, criteria air pollutant emissions would be reduced but the proposed project would still exceed the regional significance threshold for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ during project construction and would exceed the thresholds for VOC and PM_{10} during project operation. Therefore, the proposed project is considered inconsistent with the RAQS.

AIR-1: ***Rule 55 Dust-Control Measures. As required by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District Rule 55, Fugitive Dust Control, the applicant shall implement dust-control measures during each phase of project development to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air. The following measures shall be implemented by the construction contractor and included in project construction documents, including the grading plan, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Santee prior to issuance of a grading permit.***

- ***Use track-out grates or gravel beds at each egress point, wheel washing at each egress point during muddy***

conditions, soil binders, chemical soil stabilizers, geotextiles, mulching, or seeding.

- ***Use secured tarps or cargo covering, watering, or treating of transported material for outbound transport trucks.***
- ***Remove visible roadway dust as a result of active operations, spillage from transport trucks, erosion, or track-out/carry-out at the conclusion of each workday when active operations cease or every 24 hours for continuous operations. If a street sweeper is used to remove any track-out/carry-out, only respirable particulate matter (PM_{10})-efficient street sweepers certified to meet the most current South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1186 requirements shall be used.***

In addition, visual fugitive dust emissions monitoring shall be conducted during the construction phases. Visual monitoring shall be logged. If high wind conditions result in visible dust during visual monitoring, this demonstrates that the above measures are inadequate to reduce dust in accordance with San Diego Air Pollution Control District Rule 55, and construction shall cease until high winds decrease and conditions improve.

AIR-2: ***Supplemental Dust-Control Measures. As a supplement to San Diego Air Pollution Control District Rule 55, Fugitive Dust Control, the applicant shall require the contractor to implement the following dust-control measures during construction. These measures shall be included in project construction documents, including the grading plan, and be reviewed and approved by the City of Santee prior to issuance of a grading permit.***

- ***The construction contractor shall provide to all employees the fact sheet entitled "Preventing Work-Related Coccidioidomycosis (Valley Fever)" by the California Department of Public Health and ensure all employees are aware of the potential risks the site poses and inform them of all Valley Fever safety protocols, occupational responsibilities and requirements such as contained in these measures to reduce potential exposure to Coccidioides spores.***
- ***Apply water at least three times per day at all active earth disturbance areas sufficient to confine dust plumes to the immediate work area.***
- ***Apply soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (graded areas that would not include active construction for multiple consecutive days).***
- ***Quickly replace ground cover in disturbed areas that are no longer actively being graded or disturbed. If an area has***

been graded or disturbed and is currently inactive for 20 days or more but will be disturbed at a later time, soil stabilizers shall be applied to stabilize the soil and prevent windblown dust.

- ***Reduce vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 20 mph unless high winds in excess of 20 mph are present, which requires a reduced speed limit of 15 mph. Vehicle speeds are limited to 30 mph for onsite haul roads that are paved with gravel to suppress dust or where visual dust is watered and monitored frequently to ensure compliance with SDAPCD Rule 55.***

AIR-3: ***Tier 4 Construction Equipment. The City of Santee shall require heavy-duty, diesel-powered construction equipment used on the project site during construction to be powered by California Air Resources Board-certified Tier 4 (Final) or newer engines and diesel-powered haul trucks to be 2010 model year or newer that conform to 2010 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency truck standards. This requirement shall be included in the construction contractor's contract specifications and the project construction documents, including the grading plan, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Santee prior to issuance of a grading permit. This mitigation measure applies to all construction phases.***

AIR-4: ***Construction Equipment Maintenance. The City of Santee shall require the project construction contractor to maintain construction equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per the manufacturer's specification for the duration of construction. Contract specifications shall be included in project construction documents, including the grading plan, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Santee prior to issuance of a grading permit.***

AIR-5: ***Use of Electricity During Construction. During construction activities, when on-site electricity is available, the City of Santee shall require the contractor to rely on the electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction site rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines. Contract specifications shall be included in project construction documents, including the grading plan, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Santee prior to issuance of a grading permit.***

AIR-6: ***Transportation Demand Management. Prior to recordation of the first final map in each phase, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the City of Santee that the proposed***

project shall implement the following Transportation Demand Management measures identified in the Transportation Impact Analysis (prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, in 2020):

- ***Improve design of development to enhance walkability and connectivity***
- ***Provide pedestrian network improvements***
- ***Provide traffic-calming measures***
- ***Provide bike lanes in the street design***
- ***Provide bike parking for multi-family residential uses***
- ***Implement car-sharing programs***
- ***Provide ride-sharing programs***
- ***Implement commuter trip reduction marketing***
- ***Implement a school carpool program under the preferred land use plan with school***
- ***Implement a neighborhood electric vehicle network***

AIR-7: ***On-Site Electric Vehicle Charging Stations. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the City of Santee that the proposed project shall include a total of 1,203 240-volt Level 2 Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE) in each garage provided for a Low Density Residential (LDR) unit, a total of 354 EVSE within the parking areas of the remaining residential units (Medium Density Residential (MDR), Village Center (VC), and Active Adult Residential (AA)), and 15 EVSE within the proposed project's commercial parking lots.***

AIR-8: ***High-Efficiency Equipment and Fixtures. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the City of Santee that the applicant will utilize high-efficiency equipment and fixtures that exceed 2016 California Green Building Standards Code and 2019 Title 24, Part 6 energy conservation standards by 14 percent. When the standards are updated, the applicant shall use high-efficiency equipment and fixtures meeting or exceeding the latest standards.***

AIR-9: ***Low-Volatile Organic Compound Coating. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the City of Santee that the proposed project will comply with the San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rule 67.0.1, Architectural Coatings, and use paints with no more than 50 grams of volatile organic compound per liter of coating. The applicant shall use water-based paints when possible. In addition, to reduce the exterior area of the buildings that needs***

to be repainted, when possible, the applicant shall use construction materials that do not require painting or pre-painted construction materials. Furthermore, the applicant shall use low-volatile organic compound cleaning supplies to reduce volatile organic compound emissions from area sources. This requirement shall be included in the construction contractor's contract specifications and project construction documents, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Santee prior to issuance of a construction permit.

AIR-10: ***Electric Landscape Equipment. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the City that the design plans for residential structures include electrical outlets in the front and rear of the structure to facilitate use of electrical lawn and garden equipment.***

Mitigation Measures **AIR-1** through **AIR-10** and Mitigation Measure **GHG-4** set forth above would reduce criteria pollutant emissions but not to below applicable regional criteria pollutant thresholds. As such, project emissions would potentially exceed future regional emissions inventories and conflict with air quality plans. This impact is significant and unavoidable after implementation of mitigation measures. (EIR, § 4.2.5.1.)

2. Cumulatively Considerable Pollutant Emissions

Threshold: Would the Project result in 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?

Finding: Significant and unavoidable. (EIR, § 4.2.5.2.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).) However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3).)

Explanation: Construction. Construction activities produce combustion emissions from various sources (e.g., site preparation, grading, utilities construction, surface improvements, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew). Exhaust emissions from construction activities envisioned on site would vary daily as construction activity levels change. The use of construction equipment on site would

result in localized exhaust emissions. As shown in EIR Table 4.2-5, peak annual emissions would be below the annual thresholds for each year of construction, and daily emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, and SO_x would not exceed the daily significance thresholds during any construction year. However, daily exceedances of PM_{10} would occur from 2021 to 2028 and in 2030 during construction phases 1 through 4, and $PM_{2.5}$ from 2021 to 2029, and in 2030–2031 during construction phases 1 through 4. The exceedance of the daily County thresholds for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would be primarily due to the hauling trips on internal, unpaved roads during site preparation, grading, and utilities construction. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would be higher in 2023–2024 than in other years because Phase 1 grading would involve a large number of trips within the project boundary due to the large aggregate quantities required by mass grading in Phase 1 for that initial phase.

Some members of the public expressed concerns about potential Valley Fever impacts during construction. In response, a Valley Fever Technical Report on the City's consideration of Valley Fever was added to the Air Quality Analysis (Appendix C1, Appendix E). Valley Fever is a disease caused by the spores of Coccidiodes fungus. The main route of transmission for Valley Fever is breathing in Coccidiodes fungus spores when they are airborne during earth disturbance activities. Areas endemic for Coccidioides include portions of the southwestern United States and northern Mexico. According to the Center for Disease Control and Infection (CDC), San Diego County is a suspected endemic area for Coccidioides.

Soils that are more likely to support Coccidioides are areas with rodent burrows, old (prehistoric) Indian campsites near fire pits, areas with sparse vegetation and alkaline soils, areas with high salinity soils, areas adjacent to arroyos, packrat middens, silty soils, and well aerated soils with relatively high water holding capacities. Areas less likely to support Coccidioides include cultivated fields, heavily vegetated areas, areas where commercial fertilizers have been applied, areas that are paved or oiled, soils containing abundant microorganisms, and heavily urbanized areas where there is little undisturbed virgin soil. The fungal spores are generally found in the upper 20 to 30 centimeters of the soil horizon, especially in virgin, undisturbed soils.

With the exception of the Special Use Area, the southern half of the Fanita Ranch Project site can be eliminated because this area will remain habitat and not be disturbed. The Special Use Area onsite has artificial fill soil associated with the urban development immediately adjacent to this portion of the site. Also, roadway

improvements within the paved right-of-way of existing roads are eliminated from the potential for Coccidioides because they are paved soils that include engineered underlayment of gravel. The remainder of the site cannot be eliminated from the potential to contain Coccidioides fungus. These areas are in the northern half of the project site and include the locations of the Vineyard Village, Fanita Commons, and Orchard Village.

With regard to these villages, the air quality analysis takes into account both dispersion modeling of particulates during construction activities and fugitive dust control measures provided in compliance with SDAPCD Rule 55. Particulate matter dissipated prior to reaching existing residential areas surrounding the proposed project, meaning that distribution of airborne Coccidioides spores offsite is highly unlikely.

Regulatory compliance requiring construction workers to take precautions as outlined by the California Department of Public Health document titled “Preventing Work-Related Coccidioidomycosis (Valley Fever) Fact Sheet” (CDPH 2013), would reduce the potential for construction workers to contract Valley Fever to less than significant. Further, the California Department of Public Health, the County of Los Angeles, and the County of San Diego all recommend watering topsoil prior to and during earth disturbance in order to reduce airborne dust emissions and the spread of Coccidioides spores. Watering during earth disturbance activities significantly reduces airborne spores and the ability of workers to inhale spores, which is the route of infection. The proposed project is required to implement the dust control measures listed in compliance with the SDAPCD Rule 55. Thus, while total peak daily emissions of PM10 and PM2.5 (which includes equipment exhaust from all construction equipment and haul trucks plus fugitive dust) during construction exceed the daily thresholds, impacts concerning Valley Fever are less than significant for both onsite and offsite adjacent uses with implementation of these regulatory requirements. Mitigation Measure **AIR-1**(Rule 55 Dust-Control Measures) memorializes what is required under SDAPCD Rule 55. Mitigation Measure **AIR-2** (Supplemental Dust-Control Measures) will reduce fugitive dust emissions even further and the chance of causing Coccidioides fungus spores to become airborne. Though impacts related to Valley Fever would be less than significant, in response to the comments, Mitigation Measure **AIR-2** has been revised to provide additional clarification on the precautions that would be carried out to reduce the likelihood of Valley Fever even further.

Mitigation Measures **AIR-1** through **AIR-5**, set forth above, would reduce significant construction emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ associated with the proposed project. However, as shown in EIR Table 4.2-8, construction emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would not be reduced to below the applicable daily thresholds. Therefore, construction impacts would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of mitigation measures.

Operation. Operation of the proposed project would result in net increases in stationary, area, and mobile source emissions. Stationary sources of emissions include the use of architectural coatings, consumer products, landscape equipment, and energy use. Area-source emissions would be associated with activities such as natural gas for heating and other sources. Mobile source emissions of air pollutants would include project-generated vehicle trips.

EIR Table 4.2-6 shows that buildout year project-related emissions of VOC, CO, and PM_{10} would exceed daily and annual County thresholds for criteria pollutants. Therefore, criteria air pollutant direct impacts during long-term operation of the preferred land use plan with school would be potentially significant. Impacts related to VOC and PM_{10} emissions would also be cumulatively considerable because of the SDAB's nonattainment status for O_3 and PM_{10}.

EIR Table 4.2-7 shows that the buildout year project-related emissions of VOC, CO, and PM_{10} under the land use plan without school would exceed daily and annual County thresholds for criteria pollutants. Therefore, criteria air pollutant direct impacts during long-term operation of the land use plan without school would be potentially significant. Impacts related to VOC and PM_{10} emissions would also be cumulatively considerable because of the SDAB's nonattainment status for O_3 and PM_{10}.

Mitigation Measures **AIR-6** through **AIR-10** and Mitigation Measure **GHG-4** set forth above would reduce significant daily and annual operational emissions of VOC, CO, and PM_{10} associated with the proposed project. EIR Tables 4.2-9 and 4.2-10 show the mitigated operational emissions under the preferred land use plan with school and the land use plan without school, respectively. Operational CO emissions from implementation of the proposed project would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, VOC and PM_{10} emissions would remain cumulatively considerable and unavoidable under both land use plans after implementation of mitigation measures. (EIR, § 4.2.5.2.)

B. NOISE

1. Noise Standards

Threshold: Would the Project result in the 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?

Finding: Significant and unavoidable. (EIR, § 4.12.5.1.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).) However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3).)

Explanation: *Construction*

Construction Traffic Noise. Construction of the proposed project would have the potential to result in temporary noise level increases as a result of increased traffic volumes and the operation of heavy equipment. EIR Table 4.12-7 provides the estimated traffic noise levels for Phase 1 construction activities other than building construction, including site preparation, grading, paving, utilities installation, and surface improvements. EIR Table 4.12-8 provides estimated traffic noise levels compared to existing noise levels during the building construction period of any phase. As shown in EIR Table 4.12-7, no significant increase in traffic noise levels would occur during construction activities other than building construction during Phase 1. However, as shown in EIR Table 4.12-8, the additional construction traffic that would occur during the building construction phase would cause a significant increase in traffic noise levels on two segments of Fanita Parkway. Therefore, building construction would result in a temporary significant increase in traffic noise to existing receptors on two roadway segments.

Following completion of Phase 1, area roadways would experience an increase in vehicle trips as a result of incremental increases in operational trips, as well as construction traffic through project buildout. The Near-Term + Interim Operation + Construction Scenario assumes 50 percent of traffic volumes from full operation of the proposed project to determine whether construction would result in a significant temporary increase in noise level compared to

noise levels without construction. As shown in EIR Table 4.12-9 and EIR Table 4.12-10, compared to existing conditions, noise levels on several roadways would experience a significant increase in noise level in the Near-Term + Interim Operation + Construction scenario. However, these increases would be primarily attributable to the increase in permanent operational traffic rather than construction traffic. As shown in in EIR Table 4.12-9, no significant impacts associated with construction traffic noise would occur during activities without building construction. As shown in EIR Table 4.12-10, construction traffic noise levels during building construction would result in temporary significant noise impacts on one segment of Fanita Parkway and two segments of Magnolia Avenue.

Construction Equipment Noise. Construction of the proposed project would generate noise that could expose nearby receptors to elevated noise levels that may disrupt communication and routine activities. The magnitude of the impact would depend on the type of construction activity, equipment, duration of the construction phase, distance between the noise source and receiver, and intervening structures. Temporary construction activity noise would be considered significant if it would violate the limits established in Section 5.04.090 of the City's Noise Ordinance. The ordinance prohibits operation of any construction equipment outside the hours of 7:00 a.m. through 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, excluding legal holidays, without approval from the Director of Development Services. Also, construction equipment with the potential to exceed 85 dBA at the construction site shall not be operated at the same location for more than 10 consecutive workdays without notification to properties within 300 feet of the site.

Standard equipment, such as dozers, loaders, graders, backhoes, scrapers, and miscellaneous trucks would be required for most construction days. Noise levels from construction on the project site were determined based on typical equipment noise levels determined by the RCNM (FHWA 2008). A semi-portable rock crushing/processing facility is anticipated to be used for aggregate plant operations during on-site grading activities so that excavated material may be used on site rather than exported. Temporary aggregate plant operations are anticipated to be stationed in the northern portion of Fanita Commons during Phase 1 and Phase 2 of construction, in approximately the middle of the eastern boundary of Vineyard Village during Phase 3, and in approximately the northeast corner of Vineyard Village during Phase 4. Based on estimated noise levels for a quarry project that would include rock crushing and processing, noise levels from these activities would be approximately 85 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from equipment (91 dBA at 50 feet). The eight noisiest pieces of construction equipment (excavator,

dozer, grader, dump truck, loader, scraper, rock crusher, and aggregate processing plant[2]) that could be required for on-site construction were assumed to operate in the same location, and would have the potential to generate noise levels up to approximately 92.7 dBA at 50 feet from the construction site. These estimates are conservative because construction equipment for a single construction activity would likely be spread out over several acres.

Standard construction operation would have the potential to exceed 85 dBA at the construction site for more than 10 consecutive workdays, and would require notification in accordance with the City's Noise Ordinance (City of Santee 2020). However, the bulk of construction activities would occur within the three proposed villages, which would be separated from existing development by the Habitat Preserve. The closest sensitive receptors to the villages are located approximately 850 feet east of the proposed Vineyard Village boundary along Oak Creek Drive in the unincorporated County. Construction of phases would have the potential to overlap. However, due to the distance between the villages, it would be unlikely for noise from simultaneous construction to be simultaneously audible at a given receptor. Additionally, off-site residences would continue to be located outside the 300-foot notification boundary. Therefore, typical construction activities within the villages would not require construction notification because no City receptors would be located within the 300-foot notification boundary. Additionally, at this distance, noise levels from worst-case construction with rock crushing would attenuate to 68 dBA and would not exceed the County's Noise Ordinance limit of 75 dBA for construction. Construction within the villages would take place during the allowable City Noise Ordinance hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. A significant impact would not occur to off-site receptors during the on-site construction of Phase 1 (Fanita Commons and the easterly portion of Orchard Village), or during construction of Phases 2, 3, or 4. The timing of the construction of Magnolia Avenue will be tied to the certificate of occupancy of the 1,500th equivalent dwelling unit in the proposed project; however, the exact date of this in unknown.

However, on-site and off-site construction of Phase 1 would include development of new segments and improvements to Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street, including the widening of Fanita Parkway north of Lake Canyon Drive, which would include construction adjacent to existing residential areas and near the campground at Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve. Construction of Magnolia Avenue would also be adjacent to existing residential and school

[2] The RCNM model does not include an option for rock crushing or processing. Sand blasting equipment, which is estimated to have an Lmax of 95.7 at 50 feet, is conservatively assumed to represent this equipment.

areas. Additionally, dead-end roadway improvements along the southern boundary of the site in the existing neighborhood north of Mast Boulevard would potentially require some heavy construction equipment. Construction for roadway improvements would be linear and the active construction area would be much smaller than on-site land development. For roadway improvements, the four noisiest pieces of construction equipment (excavator, dozer, loader, and scraper) that are assumed for paving operations were anticipated to operate simultaneously in the same location. Construction of new segments and improvements to Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street would have the potential to generate noise levels up to approximately 85 dBA at 50 feet from the construction area.

Operation of heavy equipment during roadway construction would potentially create a substantial short-term noise increase affecting residences near the construction site and notification would be required to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. The noise levels generated by construction equipment would vary greatly depending upon factors such as the type and specific model of the equipment, the operation being performed, and the condition of the equipment. The average sound level of the construction activity also depends upon the amount of time that the equipment operates and the intensity of the construction during the time period. Construction activities are anticipated to occur during the City's allowable hours of operation; however, some nighttime construction within roadways may be required to avoid traffic impacts. Existing residences are located within 300 feet of the construction areas along Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue, and dead-end roadway improvements on the southern boundary of the site. Because construction would be linear, individual receptors may not be exposed to construction noise for 10 consecutive workdays. However, operation of heavy equipment during construction would have the potential to create substantial short-term noise increases that require notification, and nighttime construction may be required that would conflict with the City's Noise Ordinance without approval from the Director of Development Services.

Blasting Operation. Blasting may be required at locations in the development area. Construction blasting generates a maximum noise level of approximately 94 dB at a distance of 50 feet that is very short in duration. Drilling would also be necessary to bore holes for the blasting materials. Rock drills generate noise levels of approximately 85 dBA at a distance of 50 feet and may be in operation for several hours in a day. It is anticipated that no more than one blast would occur in one area per day. However, even if more than one blast would occur in any one area per day, several hours would pass between blasts because of the time required to drill

the holes and insert and connect the blasting materials.

Drilling and blasting are not anticipated to occur in the same area for more than 10 consecutive workdays. Additionally, the residences closest to village development are approximately 850 feet east of the proposed Vineyard Village boundary near Oak Creek Drive in the unincorporated County. At this distance, noise levels from blasting would be reduced to 69 dBA and would not exceed the County's Noise Ordinance limit of 75 dBA for construction noise. There are no existing City receptors within the 300 feet notification boundary for construction noise impacts. Additionally, drilling and blasting would occur during daytime hours. Therefore, temporary noise impacts as a result of drilling and blasting in the village development area would be consistent with the Noise Ordinance, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure **NOI-1** would limit the speed on construction access routes. However, a limit on the maximum number of truck trips on Fanita Parkway during this phase would also be required. The anticipated increase in noise levels on Fanita Parkway and Magnolia Avenue during interim operation and construction would primarily be a result of the increase in vendor truck trips during building construction. Mitigation Measure **NOI-2** would prohibit medium- and heavy-duty truck trips on Magnolia Avenue and require all truck traffic to use Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street only for site access. Vendor truck trips would be allowed but limited on Fanita Parkway. Worker vehicle trips would be allowable on all roadways. Diversion of truck trips from Fanita Parkway and Magnolia Avenue to Cuyamaca Street would not result in an impact to Cuyamaca Street because use of Cuyamaca Street for 100 percent of all construction traffic would not result in a significant increase in ambient noise levels. As shown in EIR Table 4.12-15, implementation of Mitigation Measures **NOI-1** and **NOI-2** would reduce temporary noise impacts to Fanita Parkway and Magnolia Avenue to a less than significant level during building construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **NOI-3** and **NOI-4** would reduce temporary construction noise from operation of heavy equipment to a less than significant level. (EIR, § 4.12.5.1.)

NOI-1: ***Construction Access Road Speed Limitations. As a condition of approval for the proposed project, the applicant shall not seek to increase the posted speed limit on Fanita Parkway south of Ganley Road from the existing posted speed limit of 40 miles per hour to the post-project improvement design speed of 50 miles per hour until the building construction phase of Phase 1 is complete. The speed limit for construction-related traffic shall***

be stipulated in project construction documents, including the grading plans and the contract with the construction contractor. Construction-related traffic shall not exceed existing posted speed limits.

NOI-2: ***Vendor Trip Route Limitations. During building construction activities, the construction contractor shall prohibit the use of Magnolia Avenue for medium-duty and heavy-duty truck trips. During building construction activities, all trucks shall access the site via Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street only. Additionally, medium- and heavy-duty truck trips shall be limited on Fanita Parkway. Truck trips shall be limited to 170 one-way trips (85 two-way trips) on Fanita Parkway during Phase 1 building construction activities and to a maximum of 140 one-way trips (70 two-way trips) on Fanita Parkway during simultaneous building construction activities and project operation. These requirements shall be included in project construction documents, including the grading plan and the contract with the construction contractor. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, temporary signage prohibiting proposed project truck access shall be installed at the Magnolia Avenue and Mast Boulevard intersection.***

NOI- 3: ***Roadway Construction Notification. In accordance with Section 5.04.090 of the Santee Municipal Code, the construction contractor shall provide written notification to any existing uses within 300 feet of roadway construction activities. The notification shall be provided no later than 10 days before the start of construction activities. The notice shall describe the nature of the construction activities, including the expected duration, and provide a point of contact to resolve noise complaints. If a complaint is received, construction noise shall be monitored by a qualified acoustical consultant at the nearest affected receptor for the duration of a normal day of construction. If the hourly average monitored noise level from construction exceeds a normal conversation level (65 A-weighted decibels) at the nearest sensitive receptor or the ambient noise level at the receptor if the ambient noise level exceeds 65 A-weighted decibels, construction activities in the immediate area of the affected receptor shall cease. Construction shall not resume until activities can be adjusted or noise reduction measures are implemented to reduce noise at the affected receptor to below normal conversation levels (65 A-weighted decibels) or the ambient noise level at the receptor if the ambient noise level exceeds 65 A-weighted decibels. Monitoring results shall be submitted to the Director of Development Services prior to the resumption of construction***

activities. Measures to reduce noise shall include but not be limited to the following:

- ***Stationary construction noise sources, such as temporary generators, shall be located as far from nearby noise-sensitive receptors as possible.***
- ***Trucks shall be prohibited from idling along streets serving the construction site where noise-sensitive residences are located.***
- ***Construction equipment shall be outfitted with properly maintained, manufacturer-approved or recommended sound abatement tools on air intakes, combustion exhausts, heat dissipation vents, and the interior surfaces of engine hoods and power train enclosures.***
- ***Construction laydown and vehicle staging areas shall be positioned (to the extent practical) as far from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.***
- ***Simultaneous operation of construction equipment shall be limited, or construction time within an hour shall be limited, to reduce the average noise level.***
- ***Temporary noise barriers, such as noise blankets, shall be implemented around the perimeter of the construction area to minimize construction noise at affected receptors.***

NOI- 4: ***Nighttime Noise Sound Management Plan. The construction contractor shall be required to obtain authorization from the Director of Development Services for any construction activities that would occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. As part of the authorization process, the construction contractor shall prepare a Sound Management Plan to be included in construction documents, including the grading plan and construction contract. The Sound Management Plan shall include all or a combination of the measures listed in Mitigation Measure NOI-3, as deemed necessary by a qualified acoustical engineer, to minimize noise at nearby receptors. In addition to the measures listed in Mitigation Measure NOI-3, construction activities that must take place between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. that could generate high noise levels at residences shall be scheduled during times that would have the least impact on sensitive receptor locations, such as the evening hours between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. rather than the nighttime hours between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.***

Operation

The proposed project would include a range of uses that have the potential to generate noise that may affect existing noise-sensitive

receptors. These uses include commercial and retail development, residential development, agricultural operations, special events, recreational facilities, maintenance activities, a school, a fire station, Special Uses, and on-site infrastructure.

Commercial Development. Proposed commercial development would be located primarily in the areas designated as Village Center on the eastern side of Fanita Commons and in the middle of Vineyard and Orchard Villages. The Village Center component would comprise a total of approximately 36.5 acres across the site. The approximately 28-acre Village Center in Fanita Commons would accommodate commercial uses to serve the entire proposed development. The smaller Village Center areas in Vineyard and Orchard Villages would consist of smaller-scale mixed-use retail, service, or office spaces to serve the residents of the surrounding villages. Allowable uses would include retail stores, offices, retail nursery, restaurants, live entertainment establishments, craft breweries or other gourmet food shops, studios and galleries, pet services, business or trade schools, civic uses, health and wellness services, private recreation facilities, religious or spiritual facilities, daycare, tutoring facilities, museums or cultural facilities, and education or event facilities associated with the Farm.

The future mix of retail and office uses is currently unknown, along with the specific noise producing equipment associated with each use. The noise level generated by commercial uses on site would vary depending upon the specific types of commercial uses that would occupy available space. The exact noise level generated cannot be specifically quantified at this time because of many variables involved. These include the specific land use type, size of equipment, location and orientation of equipment, number and location of loading docks, and parking areas. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the level of noise impact of individual commercial uses at specific locations at this time.

The specifications and locations of the HVAC systems that would be installed at commercial or mixed-use buildings are unknown at this time. Therefore, it is assumed that the HVAC systems of a mixed-use commercial and residential project would be typical of a community-serving retail and office building. HVAC units not installed within an enclosure would have the potential to generate a noise level of up to 79 dBA Leq at the unit (approximately 3 feet). A single HVAC unit could have the potential to generate noise that may exceed typical conversation noise levels of 65 dBA up to 15 feet from the unit. The nearest existing NSLUs to the proposed Village Center areas on the project site are the off-site single-family residences located off Oak Creek Drive, approximately 2,090 feet east of the

Village Center planned for Vineyard Village. Due to distance and intervening structures and topography, noise from HVAC units in the proposed Village Centers would not be audible at existing, off-site receptors and impacts would be less than significant.

In addition to HVAC systems, commercial land uses also have the potential to generate noise from truck deliveries, such as engines idling and beeping from back up warning signals at commercial loading docks. Truck trips to the proposed project site would involve deliveries of supplies and products to commercial uses. State law (13 CCR 2485) currently prohibits heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks from idling more than 5 minutes. Therefore, noise from idling would be limited to 5 minutes during truck deliveries. Noise levels measured at a typical loading dock registered 78 dBA Leq at a distance of 5 feet outside an open loading dock. A loading dock that generates a noise level of 78 dBA at 5 feet would have the potential to generate noise that may exceed typical conversational noise levels of 65 dBA up to 25 feet from the unit. Noise levels would be reduced on the project site because the Land Use and Development Regulations in Chapter 3 of the Fanita Ranch Development Plan require loading areas to be designed and located to minimize impacts on adjoining properties, including use of sound baffling. Additionally, as previously stated, the nearest existing NSLUs to a proposed Village Center are residences approximately 2,090 feet east of the Village Center planned for Vineyard Village. Due to design guidelines, distance, and intervening structures and topography, impacts to off-site NSLUs related to truck deliveries and loading would be less than significant.

Noise sources from parking areas include car alarms, door slams, radios, and tire squeals. These sources typically range from about 51 to 66 dBA at a distance of 10 feet, and are generally short-term and intermittent. Parking lots have the potential to generate noise levels that are audible above ambient levels depending on the location of the source; however, noise sources from a parking lot would be different from each other in kind, duration, and location, so that the overall effects would be separate and in most cases would not affect noise-sensitive receptors at the same time. Similar to truck delivery noise, due to distance and intervening structures and topography, impacts to the nearest off-site NSLUs related to parking areas would be less than significant.

Noise from human activity within outdoor seating areas, restaurants, and public gathering places would be limited to normal conversation noise levels, which would generally be consistent with the City's Noise Ordinance and Santee General Plan Noise Element compatibility standards for surrounding land uses. However, the proposed project would accommodate restaurant uses and live

entertainment venues that would have the potential to result in intermittent noise that could exceed Noise Ordinance standards. This may include bars or nightclubs that operate into late night hours (10:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m.). Section 4.12.090 of the Santee Municipal Code prohibits music at dancehalls between 2:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. If these establishments would include outdoor areas, nighttime use could result in loud conversation or amplified music that would be annoying or disturbing to nearby residents. Section 3.2.11.10(B) of the Fanita Ranch Development Plan establishes performance standards for the sale of alcohol on the project site. These standards require that all alcoholic beverages sales, offerings, and consumption be conducted completely within an enclosed building on premises, except for permitted outdoor seating areas. Nighttime uses would mostly be located within enclosed buildings, although permitted patios may result in crowds or amplified sound that would exceed normal conversation levels. The nearest existing off-site NSLUs to a proposed Village Center are residences approximately 2,090 feet away in the unincorporated County. Reference noise levels for loud conversation and amplified music are available for indoor noisy restaurants (85 dBA) and school dances (100 dBA) (Center for Hearing and Communication 2020). Based on these reference noise levels, noise levels from loud conversation and amplified music in the proposed Village Center would be reduced to approximately 28 dBA and 43 dBA, respectively, at 2,090 feet away at the nearest off-site NSLUs. These noise levels would not exceed normal conversation levels at City receptors and would not exceed the County's nighttime hourly average sound level limit of 45 dBA at residences along Oak Creek Drive. Impacts would be less than significant.

Residential Development. A variety of residential densities would be accommodated in all three development villages. Noise generated from residential uses is generally described as nuisance noise. Nuisance noise impacts are more likely to occur in higher density areas (such as Village Center and Medium Density Residential areas). Section 5.04.040 of the City's Noise Ordinance prohibits nuisance noise. Specific sources of nuisance noise covered by the City's Noise Ordinance include, but are not limited to, devices for producing or reproducing sound, drums and other musical instruments, yelling, and animals. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would limit exposure to excessive nuisance noise. The County Sheriff's Department enforces the nuisance noise provisions of the City's Noise Ordinance, in accordance with Section 5.04.180 of the City's Noise Ordinance, Enforcement. Nuisance noises would also be different from each other in kind, duration, and location, so that the overall effects would be separate and in most cases would not affect receptors at the same time. Nuisance noise would be a

less than significant impact.

Residences may include HVAC units. A single HVAC unit would generally not exceed typical conversation noise levels of 65 dBA beyond 15 feet from the unit. The nearest existing off-site receptors to a proposed residential area are the existing residences along Crazy Horse Drive in the County, approximately 700 feet east of Vineyard Village. Therefore, due to distance and the interment nature of noise sources, HVAC noise from proposed residential neighborhoods would not result in significant impact to existing receptors.

Agricultural Operations. The Farm is a central feature of the proposed land use plan. The working farm is planned to include terraced vegetable fields, pasture lands, limited housing for employees, raised gardens, and small-scale animal husbandry. Regular agricultural-related events would be hosted at the Farm, including commercial and educational events. Other special events at the proposed event barn on the Farm are addressed below. The 27.3-acre Farm would be located along the eastern border of Fanita Commons near the center of the proposed development. Additional agricultural areas are designated at the entrances to Vineyard Village on either side of Street “V” and Street “W.” Community gardens and community-supported agriculture are allowable land uses in all proposed development areas except the Special Use area. Orchards, vineyards, and crops are allowed in the Open Space designation.

The primary sources of noise associated with agricultural use would be use of one or two tractors in agricultural fields and approximately two utility task vehicles (UTVs) across the Farm site. Fans, pumps, and generators may also be required. The proposed community-scale Farm would not require the use of industrial farm equipment for harvesting or processing. Hand tools would generally be used on the Farm and would not generate noise. Equipment used in agricultural spaces outside the Farm, such as community gardens, would be limited to hand tools.

Regular events at the Farm would include farmers markets and farm-based education in the form of tours, volunteer opportunities, camps, workshops related to gardening and farmer training, nutrition, cooking, herbal medicines, home preservation of food, and more. Farmers market and educational activity hours would be limited of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and 7:00 a.m. and 10 p.m. on weekends and are anticipated to be similar to nearby commercial uses in the Village Center. With the exception of farm equipment, noise associated with orchards and vineyards, regular events, and

limited employee housing would be generally limited to normal conversation and occasional nuisance noise, similar to noise anticipated from surrounding proposed residential development, described previously.

The design plan for the Farm includes a condition of operation that the use of mechanical equipment such as tractors, exhaust fans, circulating pumps, or generators, and other exterior noise-generating operations that result in a 1-hour average sound level of 50 dB or more, as measured at the nearest adjacent on-site residential property line, shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. every day. Noise barriers shall be installed around any stationary noise-generating equipment if necessary to meet the required limitations. A tunnel would be constructed under Street “W” to connect the two sections of the Agricultural Overlay to allow for the movement of agriculture equipment to and from the Farm. Because conditions of operation would limit noise from farm equipment to less than nuisance levels on the project site, noise levels would be less than significant levels at existing sensitive receptors.

The use of UTVs and tractors are anticipated to generate the highest equipment noise levels from farm operation. The average noise level for UTVs for farm use is 86 dBA and the average noise level for a tractor is 92 dBA. Noise level is reported at the driver’s seat. Noise levels from UTVs would be reduced to below normal conversation levels of 65 dBA approximately 35 feet from the source, and tractors approximately 70 feet from the equipment. Additionally, when UTVs are in use, they would be in motion across the Farm and individual receptors would only be exposed to UTV noise briefly during any given pass-by. Due to the modest size of the orchards and vineyards, duration of tractor use would be limited to a portion of a day, when needed. Therefore, use of farm equipment would not result in a significant impact.

The Farm would primarily be cultivated with crops but may include limited livestock, such as poultry, sheep, goats, or aquaponics (fish). Livestock would not exceed five animals per acre. Livestock noise would include intermittent animal noises that may occasionally be a source of nuisance noise. Noise levels with poultry noise did not exceed 54 dBA. However, poultry at the Farm may also include roosters. Rooster crowing can produce sound levels up to 100 dBA at 1 meter (3.3 feet) (Claes et al. 2018). The nearest existing receptors to the Farm are along Summit Avenue, approximately 2,290 feet from the Farm. At this distance, noise from rooster crowing would be reduced to 43 dBA and would not exceed typical ambient noise levels. Due to the limited number of animals allowed, and because animals would be spread out across the pasture area

throughout the day, intermittent animal noise would not be anticipated to exceed average ambient community noise levels. Regular Farm operations are not anticipated to be audible off site. A significant impact would not occur from Farm operation.

Special Events. The Farm is planned to include a large iconic barn that would set the architectural theme of the community and provide a venue for special events and farm operations. The Farm would allow for a range of special events including farm-to-table events, community harvests, weddings, and other celebrations and festivals, such as pumpkin patches. Special events would potentially involve the use of amplified noise or crowds that would result in noise levels above typical conversation levels. As a condition of operation, events would be permitted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekends. Therefore, weekday events would not result in nighttime noise impacts, and weekend events would not extend into late night hours. The event barn and associated outdoor event areas would be located directly east of the Village Center, approximately 3,090 feet from the nearest existing residences, located along Summit Avenue. Activity hours for events would be similar to the commercial uses in the Village Center.

Special and temporary event attendance would be limited to a maximum of 300 attendees. Based on the results of the analysis for the similar event venue, and conservatively assuming the existing measured ambient noise level is approximately 41 dBA in the Farm area, events attended by 300 guests would have the potential to result in a 1-hour average noise level of 95 dBA at 10 feet from the source. Event noise would have the potential to exceed the average conversation noise level of 65 dBA up to 315 feet from the event. The nearest existing NSLUs to the event area are the residences along Summit Avenue, approximately 3,090 feet south of the event area. Therefore, event noise would not exceed the noise level limits at off-site NSLUs. This impact would be less than significant.

Recreational Facilities. The proposed project would provide a variety of recreational opportunities, including the Community Park, Neighborhood Parks, Mini-Parks, and trails throughout the project site. According to the Santee Municipal Code, Section 8.08.150, parks are permitted to operate dawn to dusk or such alternative hours as designated by the Director of the Community Services Department. Therefore, it is assumed that all proposed recreational facilities would have similar operating hours from dawn to dusk, with the exception of trails. Trails would be available at all hours for transportation and access in the development area; however, nighttime use of open space primitive trails would be limited because lighting is not proposed.

Community Park. Visitors to the Community Park in the center of Fanita Commons would participate in active and passive recreational activities. The Community Park would include two multipurpose ballfields, sport courts, restrooms, parking, playground, open play areas, and passive picnicking areas, and may include an aquatic element, community gathering plaza, and a dog park. Within the Community Park, a community center would provide multipurpose, flexible spaces to support recreation, learning, arts and crafts, social, and service functions. The community center would also provide support spaces such as staff offices, reception area, restroom, and storage areas. The park is designed so that passive uses would occupy the eastern portion of the Community Park, adjacent to the Village Center. The northern edge of the park would be bordered by a designated Open Space riparian area. Active uses would be concentrated in the southwestern portion of the park, including lighted sports fields adjacent to the proposed school.

Recreational activity participants are expected to generate a range of noise levels typical of recreational activities. Active uses such a playgrounds and sports fields typically generate incidental recreational noise such as cheering for sports activities or children at play. Passive recreational activities such as walking, reading, and dining in open turf and picnic areas typically generate lower noise levels as compared to active sports play.

Noise levels typically generated by multipurpose fields, one of the most active proposed uses, are assumed to be representative of worst-case noise levels from daily use of the Community Park. The noise impact analysis for the City of Lake Forest Sports Park and Recreation Center, which proposed a similar mix of active and passive uses, including multiple sports fields and play areas, determined that noise levels from simultaneous use of the sports fields would generate noise levels of 47 dBA at approximately 400 feet from the fields, or 59 dBA at 100 feet (City of Lake Forest 2010). Similarly, the noise analysis for a new 4-acre sports field complex in San José determined that average noise levels resulting from active use of the fields would be approximately 60 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the center of the field, with maximum noise levels from shouting as high as 67 dBA (Illingworth & Rodkin 2016). The active Community Park uses would be located at the far west edge of development on the project site, and active uses would be located more than 6,000 feet from existing residences on Strathmore Drive, which are the nearest existing NSLU. Due to distance, activity at the park would be reduced to below an audible level at the nearest existing receptors. Impacts would be less than significant.

Electronic amplification equipment would not be permanently

installed at any of the parks, but temporary systems may be used in conjunction with permitted active sports leagues or events. Public events may also occur that require temporary permitted amplified noise. Activities that require permitted amplified noise would be limited to normal park operation hours in compliance with the Santee Municipal Code, Section 8.08.150. Additionally, amplified noise would not be a constant source of noise. Activities would occur on various dates and times and at varied locations, and would typically not occur after dusk, in conformance with the Santee Municipal Code. Therefore, use of amplified noise from permitted uses would not result in a significant impact.

Future uses at the community center are unknown; however, activities would be enclosed within the center and would not be anticipated to generate excessive noise outside the facility. It can be reasonably assumed that the community center would require an HVAC unit. HVAC equipment would have the potential to generate noise that may exceed conversational noise levels up to 15 feet from the unit. Due to distance, operation of the HVAC system at the community center would not be audible at the nearest off-site NSLUs located along Fanita Parkway, more than 6,000 feet from the proposed Community Park. Additionally, the Community Park would be separated from off-site receptors by on-site development that would provide a noise barrier to further attenuate noise levels. This impact would be less than significant.

Neighborhood Parks. Eight Neighborhood Parks are proposed throughout all three villages. Specifically, Neighborhood Parks 1 and 2 would be located between Medium Density Residential and Low Density Residential development in Orchard Village. Neighborhood Park 3 would be located adjacent to the riparian open space feature between Fanita Commons and Orchard Village. Neighborhood Park 4 would be located along the western edge of Vineyard Village. Parks 5 and 6 would be located on either side of the Village Center in Vineyard Village. Neighborhood Park 7 would be located at the southern edge of Vineyard Village, and 8 would be located adjacent to the School Overlay in Fanita Commons. Neighborhood Parks may be active-recreation oriented, or non-sports use oriented with more passive uses. Sports-oriented Neighborhood Parks would include amenities similar to the Community Park, but at a smaller scale, including open play fields, playgrounds, sport courts, gardens, picnic facilities, and restrooms. Neighborhood Park 5 adjacent to the Village Center in Vineyard Village would be a sports-oriented park, while Neighborhood Park 3 adjacent to the riparian area along Street “A” in Orchard Village would be a passive Linear Park. It is unknown which of the remaining Neighborhood Parks would be sports-oriented. Passive Neighborhood Parks would not be expected to

generate noise other than general conversational levels and would not be expected to be audible outside of the park. However, noise levels for use of sports-oriented Neighborhood Parks are conservatively assumed to be 47 dBA at approximately 400 feet. The nearest off-site receptors to a Neighborhood Park are the residences located at the northern terminus of Summit Avenue, approximately 1,250 feet south of the proposed Neighborhood Park at the southwestern boundary of Vineyard Village. Due to distance, noise from the use of the Neighborhood Parks would not be audible off site. Noise impacts from Neighborhood Parks would be less than significant.

Other Recreational Facilities. Additional parks and trails would be located throughout the site, including Mini-Parks and trails such as the AgMeander circuit. The proposed trails would be used for walking and bicycling. Mini-Parks, with the exception of the Village Green discussed below, would include passive recreation features, such as seating, trail connections, and interpretive stations. These amenities would generally not support activities that generate noise levels higher than normal conservation. Therefore, these facilities would not generate noise levels that would result in excessive noise levels. Impacts from the trails and Mini-Parks would be less than significant.

Village Green. The Village Green would be a special Mini-Park located directly west of the Farm in Fanita Commons that would provide a public gathering and event space. The park would provide a large open turf area, with possible shade trellises and seating along the perimeter. When not in use for community events, the Village Green would provide passive use space for Fanita Commons residents and would not generate excessive noise levels, similar to the other Mini-Parks in the proposed project. However, the turf area would also serve as a multipurpose space to accommodate events such as performances, art fairs, outdoor movies, and other social functions. In addition, it would potentially provide a focal point for larger community festivals and concerts, with connections to the Farm and farmers markets east of Cuyamaca Street, the mixed-use Village Center, and Community Park.

Similar to events at the Farm, regular ongoing events such as community gatherings, farmers markets, and art shows would generally not result in noise levels higher than normal conservation and would be similar to ongoing activity in the Village Center. It is not anticipated that the Village Green would be able to accommodate events with a larger capacity that events at the Farm event area. Development in the Village Center would also provide a noise buffer between events in the Village Green and development outside the Village Center. As such, because events in the Village Green would

be smaller and located farther from off-site receptors than the Farm, events would not be expected to exceed noise level limits at existing off-site NSLUs. This impact would be less than significant.

Trash Collection. Commercial and residential trash hauling would be provided by Waste Management, Inc., under a contractual franchise agreement with the City. Single-family residences would have individual trash and recycling bins subject to weekly pickup. Commercial and multi-family residences would be expected to have on-site garbage and recycling dumpsters that may require multiple pickups per week. As trash service would be provided by Waste Management, Inc., noise associated with operation of refuse collection vehicles is beyond the control of the proposed project. However, Waste Management, Inc., currently operates in Santee and is subject to Section 5.04.130 of the City's Noise Ordinance, Loading and Unloading Operations, which prohibits waste collection vehicles from operating between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. in such a manner as to cause a noise disturbance within or adjacent to a residential district. Additionally, individual pickup events would be short in duration and occur at most a few times per week in the vicinity of an individual receptor. Due to its intermittent nature, short duration, and compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance limitations, waste collection in the proposed project would not generate excessive noise levels at the nearest off-site NSLUs. This impact would be less than significant.

Landscape Equipment. Scheduled maintenance would occur on a regular basis across the proposed project, including maintenance of proposed recreational facilities, decorative landscaping, and private residences. Maintenance activities would potentially include the use of gasoline-powered mowers, trimmers, blowers, and edgers resulting in intermittent short-term temporary noise increases. Maintenance equipment would not be operating at any one location for more than a few minutes, and all equipment would not be operating simultaneously. Due to the limited amount of time equipment would be operating in one location, and distance to off-site receptors, operation of landscape equipment would generally not exceed average community ambient noise levels at a particular existing receptor. Therefore, landscape maintenance would result in a less than significant impact.

School. A school site land use overlay is proposed for the western portion of Fanita Commons, south of the proposed Community Park. If acquired by the Santee School District, the site could accommodate up to 700 students. A school would potentially generate amplified noise such as bells and loudspeaker announcements. Bells or other announcements would typically be

brief and intermittent throughout the school day. Speaker volume would be audible above typical activity on the campus but not to a level that would be a nuisance or uncomfortable to staff and students on-site in the immediate vicinity of the speakers. As such, the use of the school announcement and bell system would not generate noise levels that would violate the City's Noise Ordinance by exceeding conversational noise levels at the nearest off-site NSLUs.

If developed, a school would also likely include recreational facilities such as playgrounds and play fields. The level of activity during recess and afterschool activities is assumed to be similar to active use of the sports fields at the Community Park, and no amplified speakers would be installed. Therefore, the proposed school would have the potential to generate noise levels up to 47 dBA at approximately 400 feet. Similar to the Community Park, the school site would be located at the western edge of development in the proposed project, approximately 5,500 feet north of the nearest sensitive receptors, located along Strathmore Drive. Additionally, the school would be separated from off-site receptors by on-site development that would provide a noise barrier to further attenuate noise levels. Due to distance, activity at the school would not be audible off site at the nearest existing NSLUs. This impact would be less than significant.

Fire Station. A new fire station is proposed in the Village Center in Fanita Commons, although the precise location is currently unknown. Routine operations such as vehicle maintenance and periodic training activities would occur during daytime hours and would not be expected to generate noise levels above ambient noise levels in the active Village Center. Potential nuisance noise impacts of the Fire Station would primarily be limited to on-site emergency address systems and sirens from vehicles leaving the station, although not all emergency calls would require a siren, depending on traffic conditions. Similar to the school alarm or announcement system, the fire station address system would be set at a volume loud enough to be clear and noticeable to fire station personnel, but not so loud to be harmful or an unnecessary nuisance to neighboring land uses. Additionally, the fire station would be located more than 0.5 mile from any off-site noise-sensitive uses and would not be expected to be audible off-site. Emergency vehicle sirens typically generate a noise level of 124 dBA at 10 feet. As such, individual emergency sirens would be a potential noise nuisance, if required for a particular emergency, but would be short-term and intermittent in nature. Sirens would be less likely to be required at night, when receptors would be more sensitive to siren noise, due to lighter traffic conditions. However, off-site receptors are currently served by emergency services and occasional emergency sirens are an

existing part of the ambient noise environment in the City. The occasional response of emergency service vehicles originating from the project site would be similar to existing conditions throughout the City and would not be a significant impact.

Special Use Area. The Special Use area is adjacent to an existing residential area on Carlton Hills Boulevard, Swanton Drive, Las Lomas Drive, and Settle Road. The specific use of the Special Use area in the southern area of the project site would be limited to primarily passive uses such as a solar farm, recreational vehicle (RV) and boat storage, aboveground agriculture without irrigation, or other similar uses not exceeding a height of 35 feet. As such, utilization of this area would not be anticipated to generate noise levels at surrounding land uses in excess of average conversation noise levels. Any use of the site would likely include an automatic gate system for access. Newer model gates may generate minimal noise, 56 dBA or below, that would generally not be noticeable to surrounding existing residences. However, because gate specifications are currently unknown and existing receptors are located within 50 feet of the boundary of the Special Use area, this impact is considered potentially significant.

Due to the close proximity of off-site NSLUs (within 50 feet of the project site boundary), activities at the Special Use area would be considered a potential nuisance if access would occur during nighttime hours in close proximity to sensitive receptors. Noise levels would have the potential to exceed 65 dBA within approximately 40 feet of pickup and drop-off activities. Assuming a 10 dBA penalty to account for nighttime sensitivity to noise, consistent with Ldn methods, pickup and drop-off noise would have the potential to exceed 55 dBA up to 125 feet from the source. This impact would be potentially significant.

Solar panels are passive; however, the associated inverters or transformers typically generate some noise. The noise is typically described as buzzing or humming white noise. The exact specifications of solar panels, if installed, at the Special Use area are unknown at this time. However, a similar project that proposed solar panels on an over 300-acre site in the County determined that noise levels from inverters and transformers would generate noise levels of up to 60 dBA at 5 feet (County of San Diego 2016). As such, operation of a solar facility on a smaller (approximately-32 acre) site would not be expected to generate noise levels that exceed 65 dBA at existing residences located adjacent to the Special Use area. A more conservative estimate of 70 dBA at 3 feet for transformer noise has also been reported; however, noise levels would still be expected to attenuate to below 65 dBA less than 6 feet from the transformer.

This impact would be less than significant.

On-Site Water Infrastructure. Development of the proposed project would involve construction of water infrastructure improvements, including pipelines, storage tanks, and pump stations. Following construction, proposed underground pipelines and aboveground storage tanks would be passive and would not generate operational noise. However, two pump stations are proposed to provide potable water to the project site. Noise sources at typical pump stations include air compressors, motors, air bleed valves, and backup generators. One pump station would be located along Fanita Parkway, adjacent to the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve. The second pump station would be located at the eastern edge of Fanita Commons at Street "W." The size and specifications of the pump stations are currently unknown. A review of a variety of pump stations proposed by PDMWD and other local jurisdictions indicate that typical pump station equipment generates a noise level of approximately 90 dBA at 3 feet. The proposed pump stations would be installed in a masonry enclosure to provide noise shielding to surrounding land uses. A typical equipment enclosure can provide 40 dBA or more of noise reduction. As such, noise levels at each pump station would be approximately 50 dBA. The nearest pump station to existing NSLUs would be approximately 1,230 feet north of residences on Strathmore Drive and approximately 2,050 feet north of the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve camping area. Even without shielding, at this distance, noise levels would be reduced to 40 dBA or below and impacts would be less than significant.

Open Space Preserve Area. The proposed project would retain 256 acres of Open Space and approximately 1,650.4 acres of Habitat Preserve, primarily along the perimeter of the project site, separating the proposed development area from off-site uses. These areas would be primarily passive, but would include existing and new trails for pedestrians and bicycles. Noise from these activities would be limited to normal conversation levels. Occasional maintenance activities would be required along the trails at the edge of development, such as vegetation and sediment removal; however, these activities would not require heavy construction equipment that would generate excessive noise. Occasional maintenance vehicle trips would not result in a substantial increase in noise levels. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Permanent Increase in Traffic Noise Levels from Project Operation.

Existing + Project Scenario. Existing noise levels and future increases in traffic with implementation of the proposed project are provided in EIR Table 4.12-11. As shown in this table, 12 of the 24

existing roadway segments currently generate noise levels at 50 feet from the roadway centerline that exceed applicable thresholds. A significant project-related traffic noise impact would occur on one of these already impacted segments, Magnolia Avenue from Woodglen Vista to El Nopal, because there would be an increase in noise level of 3 dBA Ldn. An additional five roadway segments would be significantly impacted because the project-related traffic noise would cause the existing noise level to exceed the applicable threshold. Therefore, a total of six segments would be significantly impacted.

EIR Table 4.12-11 also identifies three segments that exceed applicable thresholds but are not identified as significant. The segment of Cuyamaca Street from the project site to Magnolia Avenue currently does not exist. It would be constructed as part of the proposed project, and noise levels with project operation at 50 feet from the roadway would exceed the applicable threshold of 65 dBA Ldn with implementation of project. However, actual noise levels at the nearest receptors to the impacted segments of Cuyamaca Street would be reduced by distance compared to the estimated noise level in EIR Table 4.12-11. The nearest residences, located on Summit Avenue, are located more than 900 feet east of the centerline of Cuyamaca Street. At this distance, noise levels would be reduced to less than 65 dBA Ldn and a significant impact would not occur to this segment. Noise levels on Cuyamaca Street from Chaparral Drive to El Nopal would exceed 65 dBA with operation of the proposed project. However, the existing residential subdivision on Cuyamaca Street north of El Nopal was constructed with masonry and glass barriers along the edge of development on Cuyamaca Street that would likely reduce noise levels compared to the estimated noise level in EIR Table 4.12-11. At a minimum, noise barriers that break the line of sight to the source, such as the existing barriers, typically provide at least 5 dBA noise reduction (Caltrans 2013a). Therefore, the existing noise barriers at residences along Cuyamaca Street would reduce the estimated roadway noise level of 68 dBA Ldn on Cuyamaca Street from Chaparral Drive to Woodglen Vista Drive to the acceptable noise level of 63 dBA Ldn and the estimated roadway noise level of 69 dBA Ldn from Woodglen Vista Drive to El Nopal to the acceptable noise level of 64 dBA Ldn. Impacts to these segments would be less than significant.

Near-Term Scenario. The Near-Term scenario includes development of the proposed project and 55 cumulative projects. Near-Term traffic noise levels, with and without the proposed project, are provided in EIR Table 4.12-12. As shown in this table, 12 of the 24 study area roadway segments would exceed applicable thresholds without implementation of the proposed project.

Significant impacts are identified in EIR Table 4.12-12 for project-related traffic noise increases that would cause noise along a total of five roadway segments on Fanita Parkway, Magnolia Avenue, and Cuyamaca Street to exceed the applicable threshold. A significant impact is also identified for project-related traffic noise that would result in an increase in noise levels of 3 dBA Ldn along one roadway segment of Cuyamaca Street (Woodglen Vista Drive to El Nopal) that would exceed the applicable threshold without project implementation.

EIR Table 4.12-12 also identifies three segments that exceed applicable thresholds but are not identified as significant. Cuyamaca Street from the project site to Magnolia Avenue currently does not exist and would exceed the applicable threshold of 65 dBA Ldn at 50 feet with implementation of project. However, due to distance, the actual noise levels at the nearest receptors to the proposed Cuyamaca Street alignment would be reduced compared to the noise level shown in EIR Table 4.12-12. The nearest residences, located along Summit Avenue, would be located more than 900 feet east of the proposed centerline of Cuyamaca Street. At this distance, noise levels would be reduced to less than 65 dBA Ldn and a significant impact would not occur. As previously described, the existing barriers constructed at the subdivision on Cuyamaca Street north of El Nopal would reduce the estimated roadway noise level of 68 dBA Ldn from Chaparral Drive to Woodglen Vista Drive to the acceptable noise level of 63 dBA Ldn and the estimated roadway noise level of 69 dBA Ldn from Woodglen Vista Drive to El Nopal would be reduced to the acceptable noise level of 64 dBA Ldn. Therefore, impacts to these segments would be less than significant.

Year 2035 Scenario. The Year 2035 scenario compares buildout of the adopted Santee General Plan and buildout of the Santee General Plan with the proposed project. Year 2035 traffic noise levels, with and without the proposed project, are provided in EIR Table 4.12-13. As shown in this table, 17 of the 24 study area roadway segments would exceed applicable thresholds without implementation of the proposed project. EIR Table 4.12-13 identifies significant impacts from project-related traffic noise on three segments of Fanita Parkway.

EIR Table 4.12-13 also identifies two segments that would exceed applicable thresholds but are not ultimately identified as significant. Traffic noise on Cuyamaca Street from the project site to Magnolia Avenue would exceed 65 dBA Ldn with project implementation. However, actual noise levels at the nearest receptors to the proposed Cuyamaca Street extension would be reduced compared to the noise level in EIR Table 4.12-13 by distance. These residences

along Summit Avenue would be located more than 900 feet from the proposed centerline of Cuyamaca Street. At this distance, noise levels would be reduced to less than 65 dBA Ldn and a significant impact would not occur to this segment. Project-related traffic noise would result in an increase in noise levels of 3 dBA Ldn along one segment of Cuyamaca Street. As previously described, the existing barriers constructed at the subdivision on Cuyamaca Street north of El Nopal would reduce the estimated roadway noise level of 66 dBA Ldn from Princess Joann Road to Chaparral Drive, and from Chaparral Drive to Woodglen Vista, to the acceptable noise level of 61 dBA Ldn. Therefore, impacts to this segment would be less than significant. Three roadway segments of Fanita Parkway would result in a potentially significant noise impact under the Year 2035 scenario.

If the proposed school that is the preferred land use plan analyzed in this EIR is not developed on the project site, the school site would be developed with 59 additional single-family units. Traffic noise level impacts under the land use plan without school would be identical to the preferred land use plan with school, with the exception of two segments: Fanita Parkway from Ganley Road to Lake Canyon Road, and Magnolia Avenue from Cuyamaca Street to Princess Joann Road. The potentially significant impacts identified previously for the preferred land use plan with school would also occur under the land use plan without school, and no additional significant impacts have been identified for this scenario.

On-Site Exposure to Ambient Noise Levels. As shown in EIR Table 4.12-3, the results of the ambient noise survey reflect daytime noise levels that range between 40 dBA and 60 dBA Leq on the project site. A normally acceptable ambient community noise level of up to 65 dBA Ldn is considered compatible with residential developments as specified in the Santee General Plan and is the applicable threshold of significance for NSLUs (City of Santee 2003). An ambient community noise level of up to 70 dBA Ldn is the applicable significance threshold for Neighborhood Parks and commercial buildings. As shown in EIR Table 4.12-13, traffic noise levels along major roadways would be approximately 66 dBA Ldn at 50 feet from the centerline of Fanita Parkway and 67 dBA Ldn at 50 feet from the centerline of Cuyamaca Street. Ambient noise levels would be compatible with parks and commercial buildings. Noise levels at Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street would attenuate to acceptable levels of 65 dBA Ldn beyond approximately 65 feet of the centerline of Fanita Parkway and 75 feet from the centerline of Cuyamaca Street. Noise levels on other roadways on the project site would serve fewer vehicles and would generate lower noise levels. Additionally, masonry and glass walls are proposed along roadways

throughout neighborhoods that would provide additional noise attenuation at receptors. Therefore, noise levels throughout the project site more than 75 feet from Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street would be compatible with the proposed development. However, development within 75 feet of these roadways would be potentially exposed to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA Ldn.

Low Density Residential units proposed along Cuyamaca Street in Orchard Village would be separated from Cuyamaca Street by more than 75 feet and would not be exposed to noise levels above acceptable limits from Cuyamaca Street. However, the Low Density Residential units and Active Adult units that would be located adjacent to Fanita Parkway, and multi-family residential units located adjacent to Cuyamaca Street in the Village Center in Fanita Commons, would potentially be exposed to conditionally compatible noise levels. According to the Santee General Plan, conventional construction with closed windows is typically sufficient for compatibility. However, noise insulation features would potentially be required for these residences for consistency with the Santee General Plan. This on-site impact would be potentially significant.

Implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to result in excessive noise levels as a result of potential nighttime nuisance noise at the Special Use area, temporary and permanent increases in ambient noise level, and exposure of proposed NSLUs to noise levels in excess of Santee General Plan compatibility standards. Mitigation Measure **NOI-5** would eliminate commercial nighttime access in the Special Use area and reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

As shown in EIR Table 4.12-16, vehicle noise levels on Fanita Parkway and Magnolia Avenue under all scenarios would be within the conditionally compatible noise level range of 70 dBA Ldn or below for residential development but would exceed the applicable threshold of significance of 65 dBA Ldn (the normally acceptable noise level). Noise levels on the segment of Cuyamaca Street from El Nopal to Mast Boulevard would also potentially exceed the conditionally compatible noise level range. Mitigation Measure **NOI-6** requires the installation of a noise barrier on some impacted segments of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue, as shown on Figure 4.12-4 of the EIR, Noise Mitigation Locations. Noise barriers that break the line of sight between receptors and the roadway would provide at least 5 dBA in noise reduction, and additional reductions can be achieved with additional height or material selection. Typical noise barriers constructed for the purpose of reducing vehicle noise can provide 30 dBA of noise reduction (Caltrans 2013a).

Due to the difference in elevation between the proposed Fanita Parkway improvements and the sensitive receptors at the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve campground (vertical difference of approximately 12 feet), it is calculated that a 4-foot wall at the western edge of the Fanita Parkway roadway right-of-way for the entire length of the campground would break the line of sight between the source and receptor. Taking distance, change in elevation, and barrier height into account, a 4-foot wall at the roadway right-of-way is calculated to reduce noise levels to 60 dBA Ldn at the nearest campsites (Appendix L). Noise barriers in the roadway right-of-way are anticipated to be feasible on the western side of Fanita Parkway from the project entrance to Mast Boulevard (as mentioned previously), from El Nopal to Mast Boulevard on the eastern side of Cuyamaca Street, and at individual neighborhoods north of El Nopal on Magnolia Avenue.

It is not feasible to construct noise barriers on all impacted segments identified in EIR Table 4.12-16, however, due to existing cross streets, driveways, and differences in grade between the roadways and receptors that would make barriers installed within the roadway right-of-way ineffective. Noise walls up to approximately 20 feet in height in the roadway right-of-way would be required on the eastern side of Fanita Parkway to break the line of sight and provide noise attenuation at adjacent receptors. Noise walls up to approximately 23 feet in height would be required on the western side of Cuyamaca Street (Appendix L). At these heights, noise walls would be visually incompatible with the surrounding community and above the Caltrans maximum noise barrier height of 14 to 16 feet, depending on distance from travel lanes (Caltrans 2019). Additionally, the City's Zoning Ordinance generally limits noise walls to a maximum height of 8 feet (Santee Municipal Code, Section 13.10.050[F][2]). Therefore, noise walls are not considered feasible along these segments of Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street. Additional noise barriers may be feasible on Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street if barriers can be negotiated with private property owners to be installed at existing fence lines rather than in the roadway right-of-way; however, such agreements cannot be guaranteed at this time, and even if some property owners agree, the barriers would need to be continuous across multiple properties to be effective. Therefore, this is not considered to be a feasible mitigation measure. EIR Table 4.12-17 shows project noise levels with implementation of noise barriers on either side of impacted roadways, where feasible.

As discussed in Appendix L, the installation of asphalt rubber pavement was considered for mitigation on impacted segments

where installation of a noise barrier would not be feasible. Studies have demonstrated that asphalt rubber pavement can reduce on-board sound intensity (noise level where tire meets the pavement) by 3 dBA at the time of installation, although the reduction in sound intensity varied based on material. In some instances, compared to traditional asphalt, asphalt rubber pavement has achieved community noise level reductions of 5 dBA and up to 14 dBA in several case studies. The noise-reducing properties of asphalt rubber pavement cannot be demonstrated with certainty to reduce noise levels to below the threshold of 65 dBA Ldn, and the success of asphalt rubber pavement to reduce noise level varies between available case studies. Additionally, the noise-reducing properties of asphalt rubber pavement deteriorate over time, and the effectiveness of community noise reduction cannot be guaranteed prior to installation. Based on review of available research, it is anticipated that asphalt rubber pavement would require replacement approximately every 7 to 9 years to maintain noise reduction benefits (Appendix L). This replacement schedule would result in additional impacts compared to regular pavement, which the City currently replaces at an average of every 15 years or more. Unlike traditional pavement, the entire length of asphalt rubber would need to be removed and replaced rather than limiting maintenance to worn areas. More frequent replacement would cause nuisance impacts and disruption from more frequent street closures, additional exposure to construction noise, and additional criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions. Finally, PDMWD has major water and sewer facilities within affected roadways that require frequent maintenance. PDMWD emailed comments to the City on March 10, 2020 (Mael pers comm. 2020), related to the frequency of maintenance and replacement of asphalt rubber pavement, including nuisance noise impacts to Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve campground and undue burden to PDMWD's operations and budget. Therefore, it was determined that the potential adverse impacts of asphalt rubber pavement outweigh potential benefits in this circumstance. After careful consideration, weighing all the factors for the proposed project, the use of asphalt rubber pavement as a mitigation measure to reduce traffic noise levels has been determined to be infeasible. Impacts to some segments of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation is necessary to minimize on-site exposure to noise generated from Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street to achieve Santee General Plan compatibility. According to the Santee General Plan, conventional construction with closed windows and air conditioning is normally sufficient to achieve acceptable interior

noise levels. As such, Mitigation Measure **NOI-7** requires a detailed analysis to demonstrate that interior noise levels would be at or below 45 dBA Ldn, in accordance with federal and state guidance. Because the design of buildings is currently unknown, this level of analysis cannot be completed at this time. However, according to Caltrans, typical building construction with closed windows reduces interior exposure to exterior noise levels by approximately 30 dBA (Caltrans 2013a). Exterior noise levels are not predicted to exceed 67 dBA Ldn; therefore, it is reasonable to assume that an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn could be achieved and impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure **NOI-7**.

NOI-5: ***Special Use Area Noise Measures. The following requirements for the Special Use area shall be included as conditions of approval in the development review permit between the applicant and the City of Santee:***

- ***Any electronic or automatic gate installed at Special Use area access points shall not generate noise levels that exceed 65 A-weighted decibels at the access point. The site operator shall provide specifications from the manufacturer prior to gate installation, and the site operator agreement shall include proper maintenance of the gate. Proper maintenance shall include response within 1 business day to complaints received by the site operator from residents or received from the City as a result of a complaint regarding nuisance noise as a result of disrepair. The response shall detail measures that the site operator will take to address the complaint and a timeline, such as a scheduled maintenance appointment.***
- ***Use of the Special Use area as a storage facility shall limit access to the site to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., with the exception of a special after-hours pickup and drop-off location. Stored property shall be relocated to or from the after-hours location during normal business hours because access to the regular storage facilities shall be restricted to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. The after-hours location shall be secured with an additional access gate that can only be opened with a temporary gate code provided through pre-arrangement with the site operator. The after-hours location shall be more than 125 feet from the nearest existing receptors and shall be screened from existing receptors by the regular storage facilities.***

NOI-6: ***Noise Barrier Installation. A permanent noise barrier shall be installed on the western side of Fanita Parkway from Mast***

Boulevard to the project site, on the eastern side of Cuyamaca Street from Mast Boulevard to El Nopal, and at individual neighborhoods on Magnolia Avenue north of El Nopal in conjunction with proposed improvements to these roadways. Installation of a noise barrier on Magnolia Avenue may interfere with current access from apartment buildings to the existing sidewalk. In these areas, noise barrier installation would include providing a new walkway adjacent to the wall to provide sidewalk access at existing driveways. The noise barriers shall be designed by a qualified acoustical engineer. The applicant shall submit an analysis to the Director of Development Services prior to the start of construction that demonstrates that the proposed noise barriers would reduce traffic noise exposure at residential receptors to 65-A-weighted-decibel community noise equivalent level or below on Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street. The noise level on Magnolia Avenue is estimated to exceed 65 A-weighted decibels without project traffic. The barrier on Magnolia Avenue shall demonstrate a reduction in noise exposure to a 66-A-weighted-decibel day-night average sound level or below. Noise barriers shall be installed concurrently with the following proposed roadway improvements:

- ***Extension and widening of Fanita Parkway prior to the commencement of building construction activity on site***
- ***Extension and widening of Cuyamaca Street prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy***
- ***Extension of Magnolia Avenue prior to construction and certificate of occupancy of the 1,500th equivalent dwelling unit***

NOI-7: ***On-Site Ambient Noise Exposure. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any first-row Low Density Residential units or Active Adult units that would be located adjacent to Fanita Parkway and first-row multi-family residential units located adjacent to Cuyamaca Street in the Village Center, the applicant shall prepare an acoustical analysis ensuring that interior noise levels due to exterior noise sources would be at or below 45-A-weighted-decibel day-night average sound level. The analysis shall be submitted to the Director of Development Services for approval. One or a combination of the following measures shall be incorporated as necessary to ensure interior noise would be at or below 45-A-weighted-decibel day-night average sound level***

1. ***Use non-noise-sensitive structures such as garages to shield noise-sensitive areas***

2. ***Orient bedrooms away from noise sources***

3. ***Limit opening and penetrations on portions of buildings impacted by noise***

4. ***Apply noise insulation to walls, roofs, doors, windows, and other penetrations***

5. ***Enclose patios or balconies using a clear material, such as glass***

6. ***Install dual-paned windows***

For some units, it may be necessary for the windows to be able to remain closed to ensure that interior noise levels meet the interior standard of 45-A-weighted-decibel day-night average sound level. Consequently, a ventilation or air conditioning system shall be required for these units to provide a habitable interior environment with the windows closed.

Due to the difference in elevation between the proposed Fanita Parkway improvements and the sensitive receptors at the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve campground (vertical difference of approximately 12 feet), it is calculated that a 4-foot wall at the western edge of the Fanita Parkway roadway right-of-way for the entire length of the campground would break the line of sight between the source and receptor. Taking distance, change in elevation, and barrier height into account, a 4-foot wall at the roadway right-of-way is calculated to reduce noise levels to 60 dBA Ldn at the nearest campsites (Appendix L). Noise barriers in the roadway right-of-way are anticipated to be feasible on the western side of Fanita Parkway from the project entrance to Mast Boulevard (as mentioned previously), from El Nopal to Mast Boulevard on the eastern side of Cuyamaca Street, and at individual neighborhoods north of El Nopal on Magnolia Avenue.

However, it is not feasible to construct noise barriers on all impacted segments identified in EIR Table 4.12-16 due to existing cross streets, driveways, and differences in grade between the roadways and receptors that would make barriers installed within the roadway right-of-way ineffective. Noise walls up to approximately 20 feet in height in the roadway right-of-way would be required on the eastern side of Fanita Parkway to break the line of sight and provide noise attenuation at adjacent receptors. Noise walls up to approximately 23 feet in height would be required on the western side of Cuyamaca Street. At these heights, noise walls would be visually incompatible with the surrounding community and above the Caltrans maximum

noise barrier height of 14 to 16 feet, depending on distance from travel lanes (Caltrans 2019). Additionally, the City's Zoning Ordinance generally limits noise walls to a maximum height of 8 feet (Santee Municipal Code, Section 13.10.050[F][2]). Therefore, noise walls are not considered feasible along these segments of Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street. Additional noise barriers may be feasible on Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street if barriers can be negotiated with private property owners to be installed at existing fence lines rather than in the roadway right-of-way; however, such agreements cannot be guaranteed at this time, and even if some property owners agree, the barriers would need to be continuous across multiple properties to be effective. Therefore, this is not considered to be a feasible mitigation measure.

The installation of asphalt rubber pavement was considered for mitigation on impacted segments where installation of a noise barrier would not be feasible. Studies have demonstrated that asphalt rubber pavement can reduce on-board sound intensity (noise level where tire meets the pavement) by 3 dBA at the time of installation, although the reduction in sound intensity varied based on material. In some instances, compared to traditional asphalt, asphalt rubber pavement has achieved community noise level reductions of 5 dBA and up to 14 dBA in several case studies. The noise-reducing properties of asphalt rubber pavement cannot be demonstrated with certainty to reduce noise levels to below the threshold of 65 dBA Ldn, and the success of asphalt rubber pavement to reduce noise level varies between available case studies. Additionally, the noise-reducing properties of asphalt rubber pavement deteriorate over time, and the effectiveness of community noise reduction cannot be guaranteed prior to installation. Based on review of available research, it is anticipated that asphalt rubber pavement would require replacement approximately every 7 to 9 years to maintain noise reduction benefits. This replacement schedule would result in additional impacts compared to regular pavement, which the City currently replaces at an average of every 15 years or more. Unlike traditional pavement, the entire length of asphalt rubber would need to be removed and replaced rather than limiting maintenance to worn areas. More frequent replacement would cause nuisance impacts and disruption from more frequent street closures, additional exposure to construction noise, and additional criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions. Finally, PDMWD has major water and sewer facilities within affected roadways that require frequent maintenance. PDMWD emailed comments to the City on March 10, 2020 (Mael pers comm. 2020), related to the frequency of maintenance and replacement of asphalt rubber pavement, including nuisance noise impacts to Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve

campground and undue burden to PDMWD's operations and budget. Therefore, it was determined that the potential adverse impacts of asphalt rubber pavement outweigh potential benefits in this circumstance. After careful consideration, weighing all the factors for the proposed project, the use of asphalt rubber pavement as a mitigation measure to reduce traffic noise levels has been determined to be infeasible. Impacts to some segments of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue would remain significant and unavoidable. (EIR, § 4.12.5.1.)

C. RECREATION

1. Construction and Expansion

Threshold: Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Finding: Significant and unavoidable. (EIR, § 4.15.5.2.) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3).)

Explanation: The proposed project would include the construction of recreational facilities, including parks and trails. Specific recreational facilities proposed include the construction of approximately 78 acres of Community, Neighborhood, and Mini-Parks and over 35 miles of various trails. Environmental impacts associated with construction of the proposed parks, recreational facilities, and trails was addressed throughout the EIR under the various resource topics including air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, transportation, and wildfire.

Mitigation measures necessary to reduce project impacts from construction of recreational facilities are addressed throughout the EIR under the various resource topics including Air Quality; Biological Resources; Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources; Geology, Soils and Paleontological Resources; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Noise; Transportation; and Wildfire. Some impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation, while others (air quality, noise, and transportation) would remain significant and unavoidable after all feasible mitigation is applied. No additional mitigation measures are required. Therefore, the construction of proposed recreational facilities would result in significant and unavoidable air quality, noise, and transportation impacts.

D. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

1. Plans, Policies, and Ordinances

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

Finding: Significant and unavoidable. (EIR, § 4.16.5.1.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).) However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(2).) Additionally, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3).)

Explanation: Project Trip Generation. The residential portion of the proposed project is calculated to generate a gross total of 24,490 ADT with 1,914 trips (499 inbound/1,415 outbound) during the AM peak hour and 2,393 trips (1,663 inbound/730 outbound) during the PM peak hour. The non-residential development, including commercial, school, and parks, is calculated to generate a gross total of 6,723 ADT with 1,284 trips (689 inbound/595 outbound) during the AM peak hour and 563 trips (261/302 outbound) during the PM peak hour. The entire proposed project is calculated to generate a gross total of 31,213 ADT with 3,198 trips (1,188 inbound/2,010 outbound) during the AM peak hour and 2,956 trips (1,924 inbound/1,032 outbound) during the PM peak hour. With respect to commercial trip generation, pass-by and diverted link trips account for 55 percent based on published SANDAG rates. For the school trip generation, pass-by and diverted link trips account for 40 percent based on published SANDAG rates. Although there are studies showing substantial reductions in trip generation for projects with a mix of different land use types similar to the proposed project, an internal capture reduction rate of 8.5 percent was applied to the primary trips generated by the project to provide for a conservative trip generation estimate. The proposed project is estimated to generate a total of 26,272 net external daily trips with 2,472 trips in the AM peak hour

(843 inbound and 1,629 outbound) and 2,509 trips in the PM peak hour (1,670 inbound and 839 outbound).

Existing + Project Intersection Operations. EIR Table 4.16-11 summarizes the peak-hour intersection operations under the Existing + Project scenario evaluated at 66 intersections. Twelve study area intersections are calculated to operate at LOS E or F with the addition of proposed project traffic because the project-induced increase in delay is greater than 2 seconds for LOS E or F operating intersections. Based on the established significance criteria, 12 significant direct intersection impacts would occur.

Existing + Project Street Segment Operations. EIR Table 4.16-12 summarizes the daily street segment operations under the Existing + Project scenario evaluated at 64 street segments. There are six study area street segment that are calculated to operate at LOS E or F with the addition of proposed project traffic because the proposed project-induced change in V/C is greater than 0.02 for these LOS E or F operating street segments. Segment 41 is not deemed to be a significant impact as the intersection operations at both ends of this segment are calculated to operate at LOS C or better. Based on the established significance criteria, six significant direct impacts would occur.

Existing + Project Freeway Segment Operations. EIR Table 4.16-13 summarizes the freeway segment operations under the Existing + Project scenario evaluated at seven freeway segments. There are five study area freeway mainline segments that are calculated to operate at LOS E or F with the addition of proposed project traffic. However, the proposed project-induced change in V/C is not greater than 0.01 at three study area freeway mainline segments. Therefore, based on the established significance criteria, two significant direct impacts would occur.

Near-Term Cumulative Operational Impacts. Based on the most recent information received from local agencies, 55 cumulative development projects are planned for the area for the near-term condition. EIR Table 4.16-14 summarizes the Existing + Cumulative Projects + Project intersection operations evaluated at 66 intersections. There are 15 study area intersections that are calculated to operate at LOS E or F conditions with the addition of proposed project traffic. Based on the established significance criteria, 15 significant direct impacts would occur since the proposed project-induced increase in delay is greater than 2 seconds for the LOS E or F operating intersections.

Existing + Cumulative Projects + Project Street Segment Operations. EIR Table 4.16-15 summarizes the Existing + Cumulative Projects + Project street segment operations evaluated at 64 street segments. Nine study area street segments are calculated to operate at LOS E or F conditions with the addition of proposed project traffic. However, Segment 41 is not deemed to be a significant impact as the intersection operations at both ends of this segment are calculated to operate at LOS C or better. Based on the established significance criteria, eight significant direct impacts would occur since the proposed project-induced change in V/C is greater than 0.02 for these LOS E or F operating street segments.

Existing + Cumulative Projects + Project Freeway Mainline Operations. EIR Table 4.16-16 summarizes the Existing + Cumulative Projects + Project freeway mainline segment operations evaluated at seven freeway mainline segments. There are five study area freeway mainline segments that are calculated to operate at LOS E or F conditions with the addition of proposed project traffic. However, because three segments do not result in a project-induced change in V/C greater than 0.01, these segments do not result in a significant impact. Based on the established significance criteria, two significant direct impacts would occur.

Year 2035 + Project Operational Impacts. The Year 2035 baseline traffic volumes represent the buildout of the adopted Santee General Plan land uses.

Year 2035 + Project Intersection Operations. EIR Table 4.16-17 summarizes the Year 2035 + Project intersection operations evaluated at 66 intersections. Twenty-three study area intersections under the Year 2035 + Project scenario are calculated to operate at LOS E or F with the addition of proposed project traffic. However, because six of these intersections do not have a project-induced delay greater than 2 seconds, they are not considered a significant impact. Based on the established significance criteria, 17 significant cumulative impacts would occur since the proposed project-induced change in delay is greater than 2 seconds for these LOS E or F operating intersections.

Year 2035 + Project Street Segment Operations. EIR Table 4.16-18 summarizes the Year 2035 + Project street segment operations evaluated at 64 street segments. Twelve study area street segments under the Year 2035 + Project scenario are calculated to operate at LOS E or F with the addition of proposed project traffic. However, because three segments do not result in a project-induced change in V/C greater than 0.02 seconds, these street segments would not result in a significant impact. Based on the established significance

criteria, nine significant cumulative impacts would occur since the proposed project-induced change in V/C is greater than 0.02 seconds for these LOS E or F operating street segments.

Year 2035 + Project Freeway Segment Operations. EIR Table 4.16-19 summarizes the Year 2035 + Project freeway segment operations evaluated at seven freeway mainline segments. There are nine study area freeway mainline segments under the Year 2035 + Project scenario that are calculated to operate at LOS E or F with the addition of proposed project traffic. However, because seven segments would not result in project-induced change in V/C is greater than 0.01 seconds, they would not result in a significant impact. Based on the established significance criteria, two significant cumulative impacts would occur since the proposed project-induced change in V/C is greater than 0.01 seconds for these LOS E or F operating freeway segments.

Land Use Plan Without School. Without the school and with the additional 59 single-family residential units, the project's primary trip generation would decrease compared to the preferred land use plan with school. The primary trip generation would decrease under the land use plan without school due to the classification of the school as a "charter school" land use, which generates a higher number of external trips. The non-residential gross ADT would decrease about 27.5 percent from 6,723 ADT under the preferred land use plan with school to 4,873 ADT under the land use plan without school. Thus, the internal capture rate applied to the land use plan without school was proportionally decreased from 8.5 percent to 6.2 percent. With this lower internal/mixed-use capture rate, there would be a reduction in the primary trip generation, and the total external trip generation for the land use plan without school would increase from a total 26,272 ADT under the preferred land use plan with school to 26,445 ADT for a net difference in 173 ADT.

The Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared by LLG analyzed the same three scenarios: Existing + Project, Near-Term Cumulative + Project, and Year 2035 + Project without the presence of the school and with the addition of the 59 units. The analysis determined that the land use plan without school would not result in any new impacts beyond those identified under the preferred land use plan with school. The only difference in impact that would occur is the timing of the impact at Intersection 8, El Nopal/Ranchitos Road, which is calculated as an impact under the Existing + Project (Without School) scenario. However, Intersection 8 is calculated to be a significant direct impact under Existing + Cumulative Projects + Proposed Project conditions under the preferred land use plan with school.

Therefore, an impact would occur to this intersection under either land use plan.

Transit Facilities. The project site is currently undeveloped, and there is no existing roadway infrastructure; therefore, there is currently no transit service to the site. However, there are existing public transit bus stops along Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue and on Fanita Parkway at Mast Boulevard operated by the MTS. Upon development of the proposed project improvements, the local circulation system would be interconnected between the project site and the City land uses to the south. Once constructed, bus transit routes may use Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the City's policies and objectives addressing transit facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities. Bicycle circulation throughout the project site would be provided through a combination of on-street bike lanes and off-street multi-purpose trails. The Habitat Preserve would offer hiking and mountain biking trails primarily on existing trail routes to avoid sensitive habitat areas. Bicycle trails would be designed for both recreation and to provide direct access between the villages. Bicycle parking would be provided in all multi-family neighborhoods and for all commercial uses. The TDM Plan would also include community-wide bicycle facilities and services, including shared bicycle parking facilities in the Village Centers. Each village would provide a bike station where riders would have access to water and air pumps, electric bike charging stations, and a bicycle sharing system.

Outside of the village development areas, the proposed project design of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue would facilitate the movement of transportation to/from off-site locations in the south. Sidewalks would be constructed parallel to each roadway to facilitate linkages between the project site and existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities. For Fanita Parkway, improvements to the street would be carried all the way to Mast Boulevard and would include on-street bike lanes, a multi-purpose trail on the western side, and a sidewalk on the eastern side of the street. Both the sidewalk and multi-purpose trail would be separated from the street by a landscaped parkway. The proposed extension of Cuyamaca Street between the project site and Chaparral Drive would also include on-street bike lanes, a multi-purpose trail on the western side, and a nature trail on the eastern side of the street. The multi-purpose trail would be separated from the street by a landscaped parkway. The proposed extension of Magnolia Avenue

would include a sidewalk on the western side with bike lanes and emergency parking on both sides.

Pedestrian circulation throughout the project site would be provided through a network of sidewalks, multi-purpose trails, and hiking trails. Every street on the project site would include a sidewalk or multi-purpose trail to accommodate pedestrian travel. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the City's policies and objectives addressing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

On-Site Circulation. As there are currently no improved streets within the project site boundary, the internal roadways would be constructed as part of the proposed project. The on-site network of streets and intersections would consist of different design types based on expected traffic volumes. The internal roadways would vary within the parameters of the City's standard design for local streets and Residential Collectors and be designed to meet City standards for street geometry. Local streets would be designed to carry up to 2,200 ADT and Residential Collectors would be designed to carry up to 8,000 ADT. It is not anticipated that any on-site roadway would exceed the ADT thresholds by these design standards.

The TIA assessed intersections of key internal project roadways at 11 locations. On-site traffic volumes were distributed and assigned to the project site using the total internal site trip generation noted as the "Primary Trip Generation" from EIR Table 4.16-10. Internal pass-by and diverted link trips were also included in the on-site traffic volumes. On-site trip distribution was developed by assessing the land use plan and assigning trips generated by the various proposed land uses for the site. As shown in EIR Table 4.16-21, all locations are forecasted to operate at LOS C or better conditions with the addition of proposed project traffic. Impacts would be less than significant.

Fanita Parkway. Fanita Parkway is an on-site roadway that would provide access to the developed portion of the project site. Fanita Parkway is forecasted to serve 47 percent of project trips to and from the City streets to the south. The project proposes improvements to the existing section of Fanita Parkway starting at Mast Boulevard, traveling to the existing terminus at Ganley Road to avoid potential project impacts. From there, the roadway would be fully constructed by the proposed project as a project design feature. For the segment of Fanita Parkway between Mast Boulevard and Lake Canyon Road, the roadway would be widened to a four-lane parkway with an LOS E capacity of 40,000 ADT to accommodate future traffic volumes.

From Lake Canyon Road to Ganley Road, Fanita Parkway would be constructed as a modified three-lane parkway, which would accommodate future traffic volumes. Two 12-foot-wide travel lanes would be provided in the southbound direction with one 12-foot-wide lane in the northbound direction. The intersection of Lake Canyon Road at Fanita Parkway would be improved to install a traffic signal. In addition, the gated vehicular entrance south of Ganley Road currently used by the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve as an entry/exit to their campground and RV storage areas would be abandoned and realigned to complete the west leg of the Fanita Parkway/Ganley Road intersection. This new four-way intersection would accommodate trips in and out of PDMWD facilities, including Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve, currently accessed via Sycamore Canyon Road. LOS A is calculated at the Fanita Parkway/Ganley Road intersection with a three-lane configuration. From Ganley Road to the first on-site roundabout at Street "E," Fanita Parkway would narrow to a two-lane parkway with a LOS E capacity of 15,000 ADT to accommodate future traffic volumes.

Off-Site Circulation. The project proposes to construct the northern extension of Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue to provide access to the project site as project design features. The extension of Cuyamaca Street is necessary to provide access to the site, while the construction of Magnolia Avenue would provide an additional north-south route to Cuyamaca Street.

Cuyamaca Street. Cuyamaca Street is forecasted to serve 53 percent of proposed project trips prior to splitting off to Magnolia Avenue, where it would then carry 29 percent of proposed project trips to and from the City streets to the south. Cuyamaca Street currently terminates at Chaparral Drive. From Chaparral Drive to the first on-site roundabout with Street "Y," the roadway would be constructed as a two-lane parkway with a LOS E capacity of 15,000 ADT to accommodate future traffic volumes.

Magnolia Avenue. Magnolia Avenue is forecasted to serve 24 percent of proposed project trips south of its future intersection at Cuyamaca Street. Magnolia Avenue currently terminates just north of Princess Joann Road. Magnolia Avenue is classified as a four-lane parkway per the adopted Santee General Plan Mobility Element. The traffic volumes forecasted on this future connection do not require the full construction of the roadway to four-lane standards. The Year 2035 traffic volumes both without and with the proposed project are less than 8,000 ADT. Therefore, from its current terminus to Cuyamaca Street, the roadway is proposed to be constructed as a two-lane collector with a LOS E capacity of 10,000 ADT, which would adequately accommodate future traffic volumes.

The Magnolia Avenue extension would be implemented as a project design feature prior to the certificate of occupancy of the 1,500th equivalent dwelling unit.

Carlton Hills Boulevard. The Special Use area located in the southern portion of the project site would take access solely from the current terminus of Carlton Hills Boulevard north of Lake Canyon Road. Very few proposed project trips (approximately 50 ADT) are expected to use this access because the special uses allowed for the site, such as RV storage, aboveground agriculture, and solar panel operations, would be low trip generators. Therefore, no improvements to Carlton Hills Boulevard are necessary to accommodate future traffic volumes.

Construction Impacts. The proposed project is anticipated to be constructed over a 10- to 15-year timeframe beginning in 2021. Staging for all equipment and construction personnel would occur on the project site in designated areas. To minimize the impact of haul trucks on the off-site street network and to avoid the need to import or export dirt, grading for the proposed project has been designed to achieve an overall earthwork balance. Cut materials from the first phase of development would be placed as fill where required on the construction access streets. The grading operation would all occur on site. No outside dirt hauling would be necessary because the site, as designed, would balance cut and fill materials. Once mobilization is complete, heavy machinery traveling off the site would be limited until the completion of the grading operation.

The proposed project would be developed in four construction phases. The proposed phases are conceptual and non-sequential and may occur simultaneously. Phases may overlap or vary depending on market conditions. Each phase would take approximately 2 to 4 years to complete.

Haul trucks used for site preparation and grading activities would operate on site only and not result in new trips to the City roadway network; therefore, they are not included in the trip generation calculations. There would be days when worker trips and vendor trips would access the site each day. Based on the anticipated construction schedule, a maximum of 1,411 daily trips (1,099 daily worker trips, 312 daily vendor trips, 0 haul trips) is estimated to occur.

The level of construction impacts would be minimized because earthwork would be balanced on site, reducing the need for haul trips to and from the site. The number of construction trips on local streets would be limited to construction workers and vendor trips. Further, the construction trips would be inbound to the City during the morning

and outbound from the City in the afternoon, which is counter flow (opposite) to existing traffic patterns. A maximum 35.8 percent of traffic occurs in the non-peak direction, which is the direction that construction trips would be using. In other words, the construction traffic would be added to the direction of traffic where excess capacity exists.

Adequate capacity is available on existing streets to serve construction traffic. However, the temporary increase in construction traffic would have the potential to result in a significant impact if not properly managed. Therefore, project construction could result in a temporary significant construction traffic impact to local street facilities. It is recognized that there will be an interim scenario when construction of later phases is occurring simultaneously with occupancy and operation of earlier phases. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-1** would reduce temporary construction impacts to below a level of significance.

TRA-1: ***Construction Traffic Control Plans. Prior to beginning construction, work zone traffic control plans and construction transportation management plans shall be prepared in accordance with all applicable requirements of the City of Santee and County of San Diego encroachment permits and applicable City of Santee and County of San Diego plans, ordinances, and policies. The plans shall include provisions for the following:***

- ***The applicant shall comply at all times with the following work hour requirements:***

  - ***No site work, building construction, or related activities, including equipment mobilization shall be permitted to start on the project prior to 7:00 a.m. and all work for the day shall be completed by 7:00 p.m., subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.***
  - ***No work is permitted on Sundays or City holidays.***
  - ***No deliveries, including equipment drop-off and pick-up, shall be made to the project except between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, excluding Sundays and City holidays, subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Deliveries of emergency supplies or equipment necessary to secure the site or protect the public would be permitted.***
  - ***If the applicant fails or is unable to enforce compliance with their contractors, subcontractors and materials suppliers regarding the specified work hours, additional reduction of***

work hours shall be imposed by the City Department of Development Services.

- ***In addition to the above, the applicant shall erect one or more signs stating the work hour restrictions. Signs shall be installed as required, in the vicinity of the project construction trailer if a job site trailer is used, or at such other locations as may be deemed appropriate by the Department of Development Services. The sign shall be a minimum of 24 inches by 36 inches and shall be weatherproofed. The sign content shall be provided by the Department of Development Services.***

- ***Coordinate with public transit providers (where necessary).***

- ***Provide off-site construction worker parking areas and shuttles for workers to/from the job site, if necessary.***

- ***Implement standard safety practices, including installing appropriate barriers between work zones and transportation facilities, placement of appropriate signage, and use of traffic control devices.***

- ***Coordinate with the jurisdictions prior to construction to determine specific traffic handling layouts.***

- ***Protect traffic by using flaggers, warning signs, lights, and barricades to guide vehicles through or around construction zones.***

- ***Restore roadway capacity to the extent feasible during hours when construction activities are not occurring, which could include the use of street plates or temporary paving.***

- ***Clean and restore roadways upon completion of work.***

- ***Limit the length of open trenches to the length allowed by County of San Diego and City of Santee encroachment permits.***

- ***Implement construction schedules and techniques that minimize roadway closures, including the number of cross streets and side streets that may be blocked or otherwise impacted by construction activities.***

- ***Detours for cyclists and pedestrians when bike lanes or sidewalks must be closed.***

- ***Install steel plates over open trenches in inactive construction areas to maintain existing bicycle and pedestrian access after construction hours.***

- ***Coordinate with local schools prior to construction within close proximity of school property to ensure entryways are not blocked during peak drop-off and pick-up times.***

- ***Enforce speed limits of construction vehicles on all streets.***

- ***Notify emergency response providers of street closures at least one week prior to closures and include the location, date, time and duration of the closure.***

- ***Abide by encroachment permit conditions, which shall supersede conflicting provisions in the plans.***

- ***In addition, vendor trip limitations shall be imposed, which would prohibit vendor truck trips on Magnolia Avenue and require all truck traffic to use Fanita Parkway or Cuyamaca Street for site access. Additionally, medium- and heavy-duty truck trips shall be limited on Fanita Parkway. Truck trips shall be limited to 170 one-way trips (85 two-way trips) on Fanita Parkway during Phase 1 building construction activities and to a maximum of 140 one-way trips (70 two-way trips) on Fanita Parkway during simultaneous building construction activities and project operation. Worker vehicle trips would be allowed on all roadways.***

Direct impacts were calculated under Existing + Project and Existing + Cumulative Projects + Project conditions where proposed project-added traffic would result in the degradation from acceptable LOS D or better operations to LOS E or F conditions or, for those locations currently operating at LOS E or F, in an increase greater than the allowable thresholds identified in EIR Tables 4.16-6 through 4.16-9. Cumulative impacts were calculated where proposed project-added traffic would result in a significant increase in intersection delay or street segment volume-to-capacity ratios over the allowable thresholds mentioned above under Year 2035 + Project conditions. The equivalent dwelling unit triggers were developed in a mitigation phasing analysis in the Traffic Impact Analysis. EIR Figure 4.16-2, Project Design Features, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, illustrates where the project design features and impacts would be distributed and where the mitigation measures would mitigate those impacts. The phasing of the following operational mitigation

measures is based on the mitigation phasing analysis included in the TIA.

Intersections

TRA-2: ***Princess Joann Road/Cuyamaca Street Intersection (Year 2035 Cumulative). As part of the proposed project, this intersection would be constructed as a project design feature. By year 2035, with ambient growth assumed from buildout of the Santee General Plan land uses, a cumulative impact would occur. Therefore, to mitigate the cumulative impact, prior to occupancy of the 890th equivalent dwelling unit the proposed project shall install a traffic signal, provide protected southbound left-turn phasing and provide the following lane geometry: southbound – 1 left lane, 1 thru lane; westbound – 1 shared left lane/right lane; and northbound – 1 thru, 1 right lane. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-3: ***Ganley Road/Fanita Parkway Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 1,917th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall install a traffic signal at this intersection and provide southbound/northbound left-turn protected phasing. Provide the following lane geometry: southbound – 1 left lane, 1 shared thru/right-turn lane; northbound – 1 left lane, 1 thru lane, 1 right lane; westbound – 1 left lane, 1 shared thru lane/right lane; and eastbound – 1 shared left lane/thru lane/right lane. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-4: ***Woodglen Vista Drive/Cuyamaca Street Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 2,212th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall install a traffic signal at this intersection and provide north–south protected phasing and east–west permissive phasing. The following lane geometry shall be provided: southbound – 1 left lane, 1 thru lane; northbound – 1 left lane, 1 thru lane, 1 right lane; westbound – 1 shared left lane/thru lane/right lane; and eastbound – 1 shared left lane/thru lane/right lane. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-5: ***El Nopal/Cuyamaca Street Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 1,327th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall install a traffic signal at this intersection and provide north–south protected phasing***

and east–west permissive phasing. The following lane geometry shall be provided: southbound – 1 left lane, 1 thru lane, 1 shared thru lane/right lane; northbound – 1 left lane, 1 thru lane, 1 shared thru lane/right lane; eastbound – 1 shared left lane/thru lane/right lane; westbound – 1 shared left lane/thru lane/right lane. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.

TRA-6: ***El Nopal/Los Ranchitos Road Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 2,654th equivalent dwelling unit, the project shall restripe the westbound approach at this intersection to provide the following lane geometry: 1 left lane, 1 thru lane. However, since this intersection is located within the County of San Diego's jurisdiction, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to ensure the construction of the recommended improvements. Therefore, the impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.***

TRA-7: ***Lake Canyon Road/Fanita Parkway Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 1,828th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall install a traffic signal at this intersection and provide northbound–southbound protected phasing. The following lane geometry shall be provided: southbound – 1 left lane, 2 thru lanes; northbound –1 thru lane, 1 shared thru lane/right lane; and westbound – 1 left lane, 1 shared left lane/right lane. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-8: ***Beck Drive/Cuyamaca Street Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 265th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall install a traffic signal and provide northbound–southbound protected phasing. The following lane geometry shall be provided: southbound – 1 left lane, 1 thru lane, 1 shared thru lane/right lane; northbound – 1 left lane, 1 thru lane, 1 shared thru lane/right lane; eastbound – 1 shared left lane/thru lane/right lane; and westbound – 1 shared left lane/thru lane/right lane. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-9: ***Mast Boulevard/State Route 52 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 442nd equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall widen the westbound approach at the intersection to provide the following lane geometry: westbound – 1 shared thru-right lane; and 2 right lanes, consistent with the improvements***

proposed in the Santee General Plan Mobility Element. However, since this intersection is within the City of San Diego's and the California Department of Transportation's jurisdictions, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to ensure the construction of the recommended improvements. Therefore, the impact would considered significant and unavoidable.

TRA-10: ***Mast Boulevard/West Hills Parkway Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 88th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall widen the intersection to provide the following lane geometry: eastbound – 1 left lane, 3 thru lanes, 1 right lane; westbound – 2 left lanes, 2 thru lanes, 1 shared thru lane/right lane; northbound – 2 left lanes, 1 shared thru lane/right lane; and southbound – 1 shared thru lane/left lane, 1 right lane. However, since this intersection is within the City of San Diego's and the California Department of Transportation's jurisdictions, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to ensure the construction of the recommended improvements. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.***

TRA-11: ***Mast Boulevard/Fanita Parkway Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 2,064th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall widen the intersection to provide dual southbound right-turn lanes and restripe the eastbound approach to provide dual eastbound left-turn lanes. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-12: ***Mast Boulevard/Cuyamaca Street Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 2,212th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall widen the intersection to provide the following lane geometry: southbound – 1 left lane, 2 thru lanes, 1 right lane; and eastbound –2 left lanes, 2 thru lanes, 1 right lane. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-13: ***Riverford Road/State Route 67 Southbound Ramps Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to the occupancy of the 442nd equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall install a traffic signal at this intersection. However, since this intersection is within the County of San Diego's and the California Department of Transportation's jurisdictions, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to ensure the construction of the recommended improvements. Therefore, the impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.***

TRA-14: ***Riverford Road/Woodside Avenue Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 442nd equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall restripe the westbound approach to provide the following lane geometry: 1 thru lane, 1 right lane. However, since this intersection is within the County of San Diego's jurisdiction, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to ensure the construction of the recommended improvements. Therefore, the impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.***

TRA-15: ***West Hills Parkway/Mission Gorge Road Intersection (Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 237th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall contribute an 18.5 percent fair share toward restriping the intersection to provide the following lane geometry: westbound – 1 left lane, 1 thru lane, 1 shared thru lane/right lane, 1 right lane, consistent with the improvements proposed in the Santee General Plan Mobility Element. This improvement is not currently identified in the City of Santee Proposed Capital Improvement Program Five-Year Budget, Fiscal Year 2017–2018 through Fiscal Year 2021–2022. Therefore, the applicant shall coordinate with the City to initiate a capital improvement program project for the proposed project and future development to pay into. This impact would be considered significant and unavoidable until a funding mechanism is established for the proposed improvement.***

TRA-16: ***Mission Gorge Road/Carlton Hills Boulevard Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). The intersection of Mission Gorge Road/Carlton Hills Boulevard is currently built to its ultimate Santee General Plan Mobility Element configuration and extends to the limits of the existing right-of-way. To widen this intersection, sidewalks would need to be removed or reduced in width, which would result in impacts to non-vehicular modes of travel (pedestrians). Planning and environmental laws recognize the importance of planning for all modes of transportation, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists. As such, widening the roadway by removing sidewalks is considered infeasible due to policy considerations. Another option for intersection widening would involve the expansion of current rights-of-way through additional property acquisition. Property acquisitions, however, are considered environmentally, financially, and socially infeasible. In many cases, property acquisitions would require demolition of existing buildings, which would generate additional environmental impacts associated with construction, such as air quality, noise, greenhouse gas emissions, solid waste, and traffic. Commercial buildings abutting the sidewalks***

would be displaced for additional rights-of-way, causing a direct impact to existing land owners and tenants. For these reasons, mitigation measures that do not require widening were evaluated.

Prior to occupancy of the 560th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall install an Adaptive Traffic Signal Control system along Mission Gorge Road between Fanita Drive and Town Center Parkway. Adaptive Traffic Signal Control is a traffic management strategy in which traffic signal timing changes, or adapts, based on actual traffic demand. It employs hardware and software to provide real-time adjustments to the signal timing plan based on actual traffic demand. Adaptive traffic signals or "smart" signals communicate with each other and dynamically adjust signal timings, memorize traffic patterns, improve traffic flow, and reduce vehicle stops. The improved conditions resulting from implementation of an Adaptive Traffic Signal Control system are evidenced by a decrease in overall travel time through the subject corridor. Therefore, implementation of an Adaptive Traffic Signal Control system would result in a decrease in overall travel time, similar to the benefit that physical widening of the street would provide from increased physical capacity. However, implementation of Adaptive Traffic Signal Control along Mission Gorge Road would not reduce impacts at this intersection to below significant levels. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

TRA-17: ***Mission Gorge Road/Cuyamaca Street Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 2,123rd equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall widen the intersection to provide a dedicated northbound right-turn lane consistent with the improvements proposed in the Santee General Plan Mobility Element. This improvement is identified in the City of Santee Proposed Capital Improvement Program Five-Year Budget, Fiscal Year 2017–2018 through Fiscal Year 2021–2022, ensuring that it has a funding mechanism. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-18: ***Buena Vista Avenue/Cuyamaca Street Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 206th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall restripe the westbound approach to provide the following lane geometry: westbound – 1 left lane, 1 shared left lane/thru lane/right lane. The signal shall be modified to provide split phasing in the east–***

west direction. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.

Street Segments

TRA-19: ***El Nopal: Magnolia Avenue to Los Ranchitos Road (Year 2035 Cumulative). This segment of El Nopal is currently built to its ultimate Santee General Plan Mobility Element classification. Widening along this roadway would be infeasible given the lack of available right-of-way and residential driveways that front this segment. However, "spot" improvements shall be implemented prior to occupancy of the 224th equivalent dwelling unit. A westbound left-turn lane at the Los Ranchitos Road intersection shall be provided to improve the through flow of vehicles along this segment. Dedicated turn pockets on El Nopal shall be provided to allow for turning vehicles to decelerate and queue outside of the thru lanes. The removal of turning vehicles from thru-traffic lanes have been identified in literature published by the Transportation Research Board as one of several principals that improve "the safety and operations of an arterial roadway" (2014 Transportation Research Board Report S2-C05-RW). However, even with the identified "spot" improvements, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.***

TRA-20: ***El Nopal: Los Ranchitos to Riverford Road (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). This segment of El Nopal is in the County of San Diego and is currently built to its ultimate Mobility Element classification. Widening along this roadway would be infeasible given the lack of available right-of-way and residential driveways that front this segment. However, "spot" improvements shall be implemented prior to occupancy of the 864th equivalent dwelling unit. A westbound left-turn lane at the Los Ranchitos Road intersection shall be provided to improve the through flow of vehicles along this segment. Dedicated turn pockets shall be provided on El Nopal to allow for turning vehicles to decelerate and queue outside of the thru lanes. The removal of turning vehicles from thru-traffic lanes have been identified in literature published by the Transportation Research Board as one of several principals that improve "the safety and operations of an arterial roadway" (2014 Transportation Research Board Report S2-C05-RW). In addition, there is a cumulative development (Parkside, formerly Hillside Meadows) in the County of San Diego that proposes to construct a parallel route to Riverford Road, Hillside Meadows Drive, that would intersect El Nopal and connect to Mast Boulevard in the south. Completion of this roadway could***

relieve traffic congestion on this segment of El Nopal approaching Riverford Road by rerouting trips to Mast Boulevard. However, the timing of completion of this roadway network improvement is unknown, is proposed by a private development project, and cannot be assured. In addition, since this segment is located within the County of San Diego's jurisdiction, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to ensure the construction of the recommended improvements. Therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

TRA-21: ***Mast Boulevard: State Route 52 to West Hills Parkway (Direct). Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-9, Mast Boulevard/State Route 52 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative) , prior to occupancy of the 1,917th equivalent dwelling unit to improve the access to State Route 52 westbound by providing one shared thru lane/right lane and dual right lanes would mitigate the impact along this segment by facilitating the flow of vehicles from Mast Boulevard onto State Route 52 westbound. However, since this segment is located within the City of San Diego's jurisdiction, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to ensure the construction of the recommended improvements. Therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.***

TRA-22: ***Carlton Oaks Drive: Fanita Parkway to Carlton Hills Boulevard (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). This segment of Carlton Oaks Drive is currently built to its ultimate Santee General Plan Mobility Element classification and extends to the limits of the existing right-of-way. To widen the roadway prior to occupancy of the 1,843rd equivalent dwelling unit, sidewalks or bicycle facilities would need to be removed or reduced in width, which would result in impacts to non-vehicular modes of travel (pedestrians and bicyclists). Planning and environmental laws recognize the importance of planning for all modes of transportation, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists. As such, widening the roadway by removing sidewalks and bicycle facilities is considered infeasible due to policy considerations. Another option for roadway widening would involve the expansion of current right-of-way through additional property acquisition. In many cases, property acquisitions would require demolition of existing buildings, which would generate additional environmental impacts associated with construction such as air quality, noise, greenhouse gas emissions, solid waste, and traffic. Residences would be displaced for additional right-of-way causing a direct impact to existing residents. For these reasons, mitigation measures for the impacted roadway segments along Carlton***

Oaks Drive are considered infeasible. Therefore, no additional improvements are recommended and the impact to the roadway would remain significant and unavoidable.

TRA-23: ***Fanita Parkway: Ganley Road to Lake Canyon Road (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 1,485th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall widen this segment of Fanita Parkway to a three-lane parkway with a raised median with one northbound lane and two southbound lanes. The information presented in the Fanita Ranch Traffic Impact Analysis (LLG 2020) indicates that this mitigation to construct Fanita Parkway to three lanes would result in acceptable level of service conditions based on peak-hour intersection, arterial, and queueing analyses between the signalized intersections of Ganley Road and Lake Canyon Road. Nonetheless, in the abundance of caution, a monitoring program consistent with Section 21.3.2, Fanita Parkway Monitoring Program, in the Traffic Impact Analysis, shall be established to identify the need for a fourth lane along this segment should certain traffic thresholds be met. The monitoring program shall be implemented by collecting various data metrics along the roadway based on the following three thresholds: (1) average daily volumes regularly exceed 13,000 average daily traffic, as defined in the monitoring program; (2) the PM peak-hour intersection delay in the northbound direction at the Fanita Parkway/Ganley Road intersection regularly exceeds 20 seconds, as defined in the monitoring program; and (3) peak-hour arterial operations along this segment of Fanita Parkway are equal to or lower than 28 miles per hour taking into account intersection delay at Ganley Road, as defined in the monitoring program. Once the 13,000 average daily traffic threshold 1 is met and the monitoring program commences, if one of the two remaining thresholds (i.e., thresholds 2 and 3) are met, the fourth lane shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-24: ***Fanita Parkway: Lake Canyon Road to Mast Boulevard (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 1,264th equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall widen this section of Fanita Parkway as a four-lane parkway with a raised median with two northbound lanes and two southbound lanes. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-25: ***Cuyamaca Street: Woodglen Vista Drive to El Nopal (Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 155th equivalent***

dwelling unit, the proposed project shall improve this street segment to its ultimate Santee General Plan Mobility Element classification of a four-lane major street. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.

TRA-26: ***Cuyamaca Street: El Nopal to Mast Boulevard (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Prior to occupancy of the 1,481st equivalent dwelling unit, the proposed project shall reconstruct the median and restripe Cuyamaca Street from El Nopal to Mast Boulevard to four-lane major street standards consistent with the Santee General Plan Mobility Element. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-27: ***Cuyamaca Street: Mission Gorge Road to State Route 52 Ramps (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-17, Mission Gorge Road/Cuyamaca Street Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative), at the intersection of Mission Gorge Road/Cuyamaca Street and Mitigation Measure TRA-18, Buena Vista Avenue/Cuyamaca Street Intersection (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative), at the intersection of Cuyamaca Street/Buena Vista Avenue prior to occupancy of the 2,650th residential unit would mitigate this segment impact by improving traffic flow at the key signalized intersections along the segment. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate the impact to below a level of significance.***

TRA-28: ***Riverford Road: Riverside Drive to State Route 67 Ramps (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). The existing section of Riverford Road between Riverside Drive and the San Diego River bridge is primarily a three-lane roadway (two northbound lanes and one southbound lane) with a two-way left-turn lane. South of the bridge at North Woodside Avenue, it is a two-lane roadway. To mitigate the proposed project's impact, prior to occupancy of the 673rd equivalent dwelling unit the proposed project shall restripe Riverford Road to provide a second southbound lane between Riverside Drive and the San Diego River. Currently, there are two southbound lanes on Riverford Road south of the Riverside Drive intersection for approximately 480 feet after which it merges into one lane. The two southbound lanes are proposed to be extended by an additional 320 feet to create additional segment capacity. The current on-street parking and the Class II bike lane in the southbound direction are proposed to be maintained. The proposed 320 feet of widening on the 1,780-foot segment amounts to approximately 18 percent of the***

roadway. The Year 2035 Project volume of 530 average daily trips compared to the total Year 2035 volume of 25,430 is approximately 2 percent of the future traffic on this segment. Thus, the proposed project's contribution to widen 18 percent of the roadway more than exceeds the proposed project's contribution to the future traffic volumes of 2 percent. However, since this segment is within the County of San Diego's jurisdiction, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to ensure the construction of the recommended improvements. Therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Freeway Mainline Segments

TRA-29: ***State Route 52: Santo Road to Mast Boulevard: Eastbound PM Peak Hour (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). The applicant has privately funded a Caltrans Project Study Report – Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) for the evaluation of potential improvements to the SR-52 corridor by Caltrans intended to relieve congestion. Caltrans can and should complete its evaluation and implement all feasible improvements along the impacted corridor. Insofar as SR-52 is within the exclusive jurisdiction of Caltrans, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to implement any such improvements. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.***

TRA-30: ***State Route 52: Santo Road to Mast Boulevard: Westbound AM Peak Hour (Direct and Year 2035 Cumulative). The applicant has privately funded a Caltrans Project Study Report – Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) for the evaluation of potential improvements to the SR-52 corridor by Caltrans intended to relieve congestion. Caltrans can and should complete its evaluation and implement all feasible improvements along the impacted corridor. Insofar as SR-52 is within the exclusive jurisdiction of Caltrans, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to implement any such improvements. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.***

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-1** would reduce traffic impacts during construction to a less than significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **TRA-2**, **TRA-3**, **TRA-4**, **TRA-5**, **TRA-7**, **TRA-8**, **TRA-11**, **TRA-12**, **TRA-17**, **TRA-18**, **TRA-23**, **TRA-24**, **TRA-25**, **TRA-26**, and **TRA-27** would reduce impacts during operation to the aforementioned intersections and street segments to less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **TRA-6**, **TRA-9**, **TRA-10**, **TRA-13**, **TRA-14**, **TRA-19**, **TRA-20**, **TRA-21**, **TRA-22**, **TRA-28**,

TRA-29, and **TRA-30** would reduce operational traffic impacts but not to a level less than significant. These intersections, street segments, and freeway mainline segments lie within one of the following jurisdictions: Caltrans, County of San Diego, or City of San Diego. Therefore, the City of Santee is without jurisdiction to ensure implementation of the recommended improvements. Mitigation Measure **TRA-15** would reduce the impact at the West Hills Parkway/Mission Gorge Road intersection but not to a less than significant level until a proper funding mechanism is established for the improvement. Mitigation Measure **TRA-16** would not be expected to reduce the impact to Mission Gorge Road at Carlton Hills Boulevard because Adaptive Traffic Signal Controls along this corridor may not reduce delays to below pre-project levels. Mitigation Measures **TRA-19** and **TRA-22** would reduce the impacts on El Nopal from Magnolia Avenue to Los Ranchitos Road and Carlton Oaks Drive from Fanita Parkway to Carlton Hills Boulevard, respectively, but not to less than significant as widening of these segments is considered infeasible. Therefore, impacts to these intersections, street segments, and freeway mainline segments would remain significant and unavoidable.

2. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

Threshold: Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines sections 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Finding: Significant and unavoidable. (EIR, § 5.16.5.2.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).) However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3).)

Explanation: The City baseline VMT was developed through population data obtained from U.S. Census Bureau – American Community Survey (2017). The average trip lengths were GPS based and represent a data size of approximately 42,000 people over the course of 1 year between September 1, 2017, and August 31, 2018. For the purposes of determining the significance of VMT impacts, the proposed project VMT per capita would need to be 85 percent below the Citywide average, which would be equal to or less than 19.04 VMT per capita.

Vehicle Miles Traveled for Preferred Land Use Plan with School. Using the same methodology that was done for the Citywide average VMT, the proposed project VMT per capita was determined. The preferred land use plan with school VMT per capita is calculated at 25.6 miles. The preferred land use plan with school existing baseline VMT per capita of 25.6 miles is greater than the Citywide average VMT per capita threshold of 19.04 miles. Therefore, the preferred land use plan with school project VMT is calculated to result in a significant transportation impact.

For the forecast Year 2035, VMT calculations for the proposed project were taken from the SANDAG Series 12 Santee General Plan Mobility Element model, customized for trip distribution of the proposed project. The trip-based preferred land use plan with school project VMT per capita in 2035 was calculated as 23.45 miles. The preferred land use plan with school project Year 2035 VMT per capita of 23.45 miles is greater than the Citywide average VMT per capita threshold of 19.04 miles. Therefore, the preferred land use plan with school project VMT in 2035 is calculated to result in a significant transportation impact.

Vehicle Miles Traveled for Land Use Plan Without School. A separate VMT per capita assessment was conducted for the proposed project without the inclusion of the school. Both an existing baseline and year 2035 VMT per capita were calculated using the same methodologies described under the preferred land use plan with school project VMT. The land use plan without school baseline VMT per capita is 28 miles, which is greater than the Citywide average baseline VMT per capita threshold of 19.04 miles. Therefore, the land use plan without school baseline VMT is calculated to result in a significant transportation impact. The land use plan without school Year 2035 VMT per capita of 25.7 miles is greater than the Citywide average Year 2035 VMT per capita threshold of 19.04. Therefore, the land use plan without school Year 2035 VMT is calculated to result in a significant transportation impact.

Based on the applied VMT significance criteria for the preferred land use plan with school and land use plan without school, a significant impact would occur under both land use plans. Mitigation Measure **AIR-6** would be implemented to reduce project impacts associated with VMT. Mitigation Measure **AIR-6** would require the implementation of the TDM Plan prepared for the proposed project. While this measure would lessen project VMT, it would not reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

With the assistance and guidance of the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) Resource Manual (2010), the VMT reduction that would result from the strategies and measures set forth in the TDM Plan, considering the maximum allowable sub-category, category, and global reductions, has been calculated as 13.7 percent reduction in VMT with a school and 12 percent reduction without a school. After the proposed project occupancy, the implemented measures and strategies would be monitored for their usage and effectiveness. The TDM measures allow for a global maximum reduction in VMT of 15 percent. Thus, by default, any project exceeding the Citywide average VMT per capita would be significant and unmitigable as a reduction greater than 15 percent would be needed to fully mitigate the impact. The proposed project VMT of 25.6 miles (Project Baseline) and 23.45 miles (Year 2035) under the preferred land use plan with school and 28 miles (Project Baseline) and 25.7 miles (Year 2035) under the land use plan without school would exceed the Citywide VMT per capita of 22.4 miles. Since the proposed project would only achieve a maximum 13.7 percent VMT reduction, the implementation of the TDM Plan would not fully mitigate the impact. It is therefore concluded that with implementation of Mitigation Measure **AIR-6**, VMT impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

E. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Relocation and Construction of New Facilities

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

Finding: Significant and unavoidable. (EIR, § 4.17.5.1.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1).) However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3).)

Explanation: Water Infrastructure and Facilities. Development of the project site would increase the demand for potable water to serve the proposed project site land uses. Water service for the proposed project would

be provided by PDMWD. To accommodate the development, the proposed project proposes to construct a new domestic water system consisting of transmission and distribution pipelines, two reservoirs that include tanks, and two pump stations to distribute potable water throughout the project site. Water from the existing Carlton Hills water tank and existing Cuyamaca water tank would provide water to the proposed project.

The proposed water system would be a public water system throughout the project site, designed and installed per PDMWD and Santee Fire Department requirements. Some private hydrants would be installed on the project site in coordination with PDMWD. The proposed project would require a redundant, or looped, water supply system for fire protection and system reliability. Sixteen-inch water mains would be installed in Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street and transition to 12-inch mains in Fanita Commons and Orchard Village and would be looped through the villages to provide adequate domestic and fire flow service in the event of a disruption of water supply from one of the mains. Pipelines in Fanita Commons and Orchard Village would be 12 inches in diameter, while pipelines in Vineyard Village would be 16 inches in diameter. The proposed project would make two connections to PDMWD's system: one at the intersection of Chaparral Drive and Cuyamaca Street to the Cuyamaca Tank, and one at the Carlton Hills Tank at the Gravity Zone.

The proposed project falls within three water pressure zones (880 Zone, 1230 Zone, and 629 Zone). Water would be conveyed from three existing facilities. The proposed project would connect to the existing 880 Zone in Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue. The proposed project would construct new lines connecting to existing lines in Magnolia Avenue, which would convey water from the existing Magnolia Summit Tank (Magnolia Zone) at the terminus of Princess Joann Road. Similarly, new transmission lines would be extended in Cuyamaca Street from the existing 880 Zone (Cuyamaca Tank and Magnolia Pump Station) at the terminus of Woodglen Vista Drive to the project site. Additionally, a redundant feed of 880 Zone water to the proposed project would be formed by connecting to the existing 629 Zone near the Carlton Hills Tank (Gravity Zone) and constructing a new 880 Zone pump station on the project site adjacent to the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve to pump water through a proposed transmission line in Fanita Parkway to serve the proposed project.

The water system for the proposed project would be designed to provide a minimum 2,500 gallons per minute (gpm) for 3 hours of fire flow for single-family and multi-family residential and 3,500 gallons

per minute for 4 hours of fire flow for commercial areas with fire hydrants spaced on average every 300 feet. The proposed 880 tank would be sized to serve the proposed project demands and fire storage equal to the deficit in the existing Magnolia Zone storage. The proposed project would provide 2,500 gpm fire flow for 4 hours at the proposed 880 Zone Tank and 3,500 gpm for 2 hours at the proposed 1230 Zone Tank. The total volume of the proposed 880 Zone Tank is 3.63 million gallons, and the total volume of the proposed 1230 Zone Tank is 2.59 million gallons. The proposed 880 Zone water supplies would feed the proposed on-site 880 Zone water tank that is planned south of Street "W" and east of Cuyamaca Street.

A new on-site 1230 Zone pump station would be constructed north of the proposed 880 Zone water tank at the eastern edge of the Farm along the northern side of proposed Street "W." This second pump station would convey water to an on-site 1230 Zone water tank in Vineyard Village with a capacity that serves the northeastern areas of the project site. Approximately 21 single-family lots (Low Density Residential units) in the southeastern corner of Vineyard Village would receive adequate fire protection service from the 1230 Zone system and would also be equipped with private booster pumps to increase domestic service pressures. The private booster pumps installed at each of these residences would increase pressure in both the domestic plumbing that supplies the residential fixtures and the fire sprinkler system.

Since PDMWD has existing 880 Zone water tanks (Cuyamaca Tank and Magnolia Pump Station and Magnolia Summit Tank) in the system, the new proposed 880 Zone water tank would consist of a single storage reservoir. The proposed 880 Zone pump station, to be north of the existing 629 Carlton Hills Tank, would be sized to serve the entire project site as the primary supply. The 880 Zone pump station would not need to pump full fire flow because this need is already met elsewhere in the system. Therefore, the new 880 Zone pump station would serve the maximum day demand of the entire project plus fire flow recharge in the 880 Zone water tank over 3 days.

Since the 1230 Zone would be formed by constructing a new 1230 Zone water tank, this storage facility would require either two reservoirs at this site or a single reservoir with two storage bays ("tank in a tank" type design). The proposed 1230 Zone pump station would be sized to serve the 1230 Zone fire flow needs of 3,500 gpm. The pump station is anticipated to house three identical pumps, each with a design point near 1,750 gpm. The proposed 880 Zone and 1230 Zone water tank reservoirs would be sized to accommodate the

operational and fire flow storage needs for their respective service areas.

In addition, new buildings would be designed with the latest water-efficient plumbing systems, fixtures, and faucets. Native and drought-tolerant landscaping would reduce the demand for irrigation water. Turf would be limited to active play areas. Irrigation systems would use smart controllers to automatically adjust the amount and frequency of water based on current weather and soil conditions. Mulching, hydrozoning, and other water-conserving planting and maintenance techniques would be implemented in common areas and park landscaping. These techniques and water-wise educational information would be discussed as part of a community education program at the Farm or elsewhere in Fanita Commons.

The proposed project would be constructed in four phases, as analyzed in the Water Service Study. Phase 1: Initial connection to the proposed project would be provided by an extension of both Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street. Phase 1 includes the development of Fanita Commons and the eastern portion of Orchard Village, which includes some Village Center areas, the Active Adult land use, a fire station, agriculture, and several park areas. The connection to the Gravity Zone includes the proposed 880 Zone pump station and associated piping that would take suction from the existing Gravity Zone at the 629 Carlton Hills Tank. Phase 1 would also require the construction of the new 880 Zone Tank, which would be served entirely from the Gravity Zone through the proposed 880 Zone pump station. The connection in Cuyamaca Street at Chaparral Drive to the existing 16-inch pipeline in the Magnolia Zone would be completed during Phase 1. Phase 2: The second phase would construct the western portion of Orchard Village, which includes single- and multi-family residential uses and Village Center areas. Phase 2 would be served by making internal connections to Phase 1 infrastructure. Phase 3: The third phase includes the construction of the southerly half of Vineyard Village. This area would include predominantly single and multi-family residential uses with several internal parks and agriculture. Due to the elevation change within Phase 3, a new 1230 Zone tank would be required, along with a new 1230 Zone pump station. The 1230 Zone pump station would be on the western side of proposed Street “W,” as shown on Figure 3-11. Phase 3 would connect to the Phase 2 water system near the intersection of Street “A” and Cuyamaca Street. Phase 3 would be served entirely by the 1230 Zone. Phase 4: The final phase would build out the remainder of the proposed project north, which includes single- and multi-family residential uses, parks, some Village Center areas, and agriculture. This phase would connect to the Phase 3 water system; no additional off-site facilities would be required to

serve Phase 4. Phase 4 would be served entirely by the 1230 Zone.

A hydraulic analysis was conducted to assess the proposed water system's ability to supply peak-hour demands and maximum day demands plus fire flow conditions based on Water Agency Standard (WAS) design criteria. According to the results of the modeling in the Water Service Study, the proposed project would result in low pressure in some lots in Vineyard Village that are planned to be constructed in Phase 3. The Maximum Day Demand + Fire flows show low node pressures for some of the residential uses in Vineyard Village; however, these areas would remain above the minimum 25 pounds per square inch (psi) pressure requirement. For the Peak-Hour Demand, some of the residential uses (approximately 21 single-family units) in Vineyard Village show low node pressure and are projected to have less than the minimum 40 psi pressure requirement. To meet the minimum requirement of 40 psi for operating pressure, private booster pumps would be installed as a project design feature in the areas that would have Peak-Hour Demand pressure below 40 psi to supply higher pressures for domestic water use. Therefore, the proposed project includes a design feature that would ensure adequate pressures are provided in Vineyard Village. In addition, smaller booster pumps would be needed for certain areas of the project site for parks and landscaping irrigation. The remaining developed areas of the proposed project would achieve adequate pressures without requiring booster pumps.

The proposed project would remain less than the maximum pipeline velocities of 10 feet per second in all areas analyzed, except for a 10-inch pipeline that would serve fire hydrants along proposed Street "V." Velocities would exceed the maximum for the pipeline size (10 feet per second) and would be 10.5 feet per second in Phase 3 and 10.2 feet per second in Phase 4. However, PDMWD staff recommended this size pipeline to minimize oversizing of the pipeline and have agreed to accept this minimal velocity increase over the standard maximum of 10 feet per second.

The proposed project would include water infrastructure improvements in Magnolia Avenue, Cuyamaca Street and Fanita Parkway, which would convey water from two existing water tanks (Carlton Hills Tank and the Magnolia Summit Tank). The pipeline improvements in Magnolia Avenue would serve the proposed hydrants on the extended portion of the street.

The existing PDMWD water system is capable of meeting the demands of the proposed project without compromising pressure or velocity standards to existing customers and has been approved by PDMWD. However, to meet the demands of the proposed project,

new and expanded facilities would be required to accommodate the additional development, the construction of which could result in physical impacts on the environment related to air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, geology/soils, paleontological resources, noise, and transportation.

Wastewater Infrastructure and Facilities. PDMWD would provide sewer service for the proposed project. It should be noted that PDMWD's existing Ray Stoyer WRF does not have adequate capacity alone to serve the sewer demand generated by the proposed project. A combination of the WRF and the available capacity in the San Diego Metropolitan Sewerage System (Metro) would provide sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project. To accommodate project development, a new gravity sewer system consisting of 8-inch, 10-inch, and 12-inch pipelines would be constructed on site to collect and convey wastewater from the highest elevated areas in the eastern portion of the project site to a 15-inch trunk sewer main at the western edge of Orchard Village. Sewer flows produced in Vineyard Village would be conveyed to Fanita Commons by an 8-inch pipeline along proposed Street "V" and to Orchard Village by an 8-inch pipeline along proposed Street "W." Sewer pipeline sizes would increase to 10 and 12 inches in diameter farther west near the proposed intersection of Street "W" and Fanita Parkway. South of the confluence of the sanitary sewers from Fanita Commons and Orchard Village, a 15-inch trunk sewer main would convey wastewater by gravity from the project site to the following two discharge locations identified by PDMWD:

Discharge Location 1. Discharge Location 1 is at the existing PDMWD Ray Stoyer WRF. Connection to the WRF would be provided by gravity but would require the construction of a new headworks facility, on property granted to PDMWD by the project applicant, to provide screening and grit removal for the proposed project's sanitary flow. Due to operation and odor control requirements for the new headworks facility, PDMWD anticipates that this facility would be constructed at the northern end of the existing WRF on PDMWD property, adjacent to the western boundary of the project site. The proposed project would not require a lift station or force main since there would be adequate vertical fall to convey the flow by gravity to the new headworks facility. However, a portion of the new 15-inch trunk sewer main east of the headworks facility would be continuously surcharged. Therefore, this portion of pipeline may need special construction and material requirements.

Discharge Location 2. Discharge Location 2 involves connection of the proposed project's sanitary sewer system to an existing 18-inch and 24-inch sewer system that connects the Ray Stoyer WRF to the

City of San Diego's Metro, ultimately sending wastewater to the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant. The proposed project would not require a lift station or force main for this location either since there would be adequate vertical fall to convey the flow by gravity to the existing 18-inch and 24-inch sewer system to Metro.

Phasing. The four phases of construction were analyzed using the sewer hydraulic model to evaluate sewer flow direction, slopes, size, and connectivity based on proposed surface topography and lot pad elevations. Phase 1 would include the development of Fanita Commons and eastern half of Orchard Village and would require that the southwest portion of the Orchard Village sewer system be constructed. To meet the WAS design criteria, as a project feature, sewer installation along proposed Street "F" and the western portion of proposed Street "E" would be installed during Phase 1 to convey gravity flows from the higher elevated residential lots in Orchard Village to the Ray Stoyer WRF. As a result, the conceptual sanitary sewer plan and limits for Phases 1 and 2 were modified to reflect this project design feature. Sanitary sewer infrastructure in Phases 3 and 4 would meet WAS design criteria and not require phasing modification.

Pipeline Velocities. Under the ADWF, PDWF, and PWWF scenarios, the proposed project would construct 8-inch pipelines generally located in the upstream reaches of the collection system, which would have velocities less than the 2 feet per second required minimum. To address this issue, as a project design feature, pipeline slopes would be adjusted where possible during sewer design to maximize velocities by setting the upper reaches to a minimum slope of 1 percent until 50 equivalent dwelling units are connected upstream to address velocities that are less than 2 feet per second. In the proposed 8-inch sewer pipelines along the steep portions of proposed Streets "V" and "W," maximum pipe velocities would range between 5 and 8.4 feet per second in the ADWF, PDWF, and PWWF scenarios. These velocities would be below the maximum velocity of 10 feet per second and within acceptable ranges.

Steep Slopes. Due to topography in some areas, the Sewer Service Study identified several sewer segments that would exceed 10 percent slopes. To meet the WAS design criteria, as a project design feature, sewer pipelines that are installed at a greater than 10 percent gradient would require lined manholes and odor control measures. Sewer pipelines installed at a gradient of greater than 15 percent would require special review and approval from the PDMWD Director of Engineering. Sewer mains would not be installed at a depth greater than 14 feet without approval by PDMWD. Where pipelines are installed outside of the public right-of-way, easements

would be granted in accordance with PDMWD standards.

Flows. According to the Sewer Service Study, a pipeline segment connecting to the proposed headworks facility would exceed the maximum depth to diameter ratios during the PWWF scenario. To meet the WAS design criteria, as a project design feature, proposed pipelines P-1004, P-1006, and P-1008 would be upsized from 12 inches to 15 inches and pipelines P-1154, P-1156, P-1158, P-1160, and P-1195 would be upsized from 8 inches to 10 inches. With the pipeline size modifications, the collection system would be capable of conveying wastewater during the PWWF scenario to the proposed headworks facility or to Metro's pipeline.

Gravity Discharge Locations. PDMWD anticipates that the proposed sanitary sewer system would connect to Discharge Location 1. However, to ensure operational flexibility, PDMWD is also requiring that the proposed sanitary sewer system be connected to Discharge Location 2. As a project design feature, to accommodate discharge to both discharge locations, a new diversion structure would be constructed to facilitate sanitary sewer flow routing to both locations.

The implementation of the proposed sanitary sewer system, along with the project design features, would ensure that the proposed project would have adequate capacity to convey flows to PDMWD. To meet the demands of the proposed project, new and expanded sewer facilities would be required to accommodate project development, the construction of which could result in physical impacts on the environment related to air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, geology/soils, paleontological resources, noise, and transportation.

Stormwater Infrastructure and Facilities. Implementation of the proposed project would result in land use changes that include drainage modification and changes from pervious to impervious surfaces on approximately 988 acres. Construction of the proposed project would occur over the course of four phases and would include activities such as vegetation clearing, grading, and excavation of project sites. Construction phase activities implemented under the proposed project would be required to comply with Chapter 9.06 of the Santee Municipal Code Construction General Permit, which requires preparation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan. The stormwater pollution prevention plan would include a series of specific best management practices to be implemented during construction to address erosion, accidental spills, and the quality of stormwater runoff, which have been developed in part to reduce the potential adverse effects associated with construction activities.

The proposed project would result in the construction of new building foundations, streets, driveways, and trenches for utilities, which could result in localized alteration of drainage patterns. As discussed in Section 4.9, the proposed project would construct an on-site storm drain system that would collect drainage at various points throughout the site and route it through a series of basins prior to reaching Sycamore Canyon Creek. To meet the demands of the proposed project, new and expanded facilities would be required to accommodate the additional development, the construction of which could result in physical impacts on the environment related to air quality; biological resources; cultural and tribal cultural resources; geology, soils, and paleontological resources; noise; and transportation.

Electric Power, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications Facilities. The SDG&E would provide electricity and natural gas service the proposed project. These utilities would be extended to the proposed project site from existing local distribution systems in the region. The existing east–west SDG&E electrical transmission easement on the project site would not be altered as part of the proposed project. New electricity and natural gas facilities would be installed on the project site in joint utility trenches in public rights-of-way as required by the City. In conjunction with electricity and natural gas facilities, telephone and cable television and internet facilities would also be constructed in the joint utility trenches. Through the project approval process, the applicant would coordinate with the appropriate service providers and City Engineering Department staff to properly connect to existing facilities. Therefore, in order to meet the demands of the proposed project, new and expanded facilities would be required to accommodate the additional development, the construction of which could result in physical impacts on the environment related to air quality; biological resources; cultural and tribal cultural resources; geology, soils, and paleontological resources; noise; and transportation.

Mitigation measures necessary to reduce project impacts from construction of new utilities infrastructure to facilitate water, wastewater, stormwater, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities are addressed throughout the EIR and herein under the various resource topics in Air Quality; Biological Resources; Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources; Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Noise; Transportation; and Wildfire. As described in these EIR sections, some impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation, while others (air quality, noise, and transportation) would remain significant and unavoidable after all feasible mitigation is applied. No additional mitigation measures are required. Therefore,

the construction of new utilities infrastructure would result in significant and unavoidable air quality, noise, and transportation impacts.

SECTION V: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Regarding the Project's potential to result in cumulative impacts, the City hereby finds as follows:

A. AESTHETICS

Scenic Vistas. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts regarding scenic vistas is defined as the City and immediate surrounding areas. A significant cumulative impact would occur if cumulative projects would cause a view blockage of scenic vistas. The City does not currently designate any official scenic vistas as a part of the Santee General Plan. Implementation of the cumulative projects identified in the EIR could potentially impact views as a result of additional new development in the project vicinity and cause an impact on scenic vistas. Similar to the proposed project, each of the cumulative projects would have to conform to building standards, such as density, height, contour grading, and landscaping, in place at the time of entitlement. In addition, public views of each cumulative project would be considered during the entitlement process. As such, development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, would not result in a significant impact to public scenic vistas. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.1.6.1)

Scenic Resources. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to scenic resources within a state scenic highway is defined as the limits of the scenic highway designation. A significant cumulative impact would occur if the cumulative projects would cause combined view blockage of scenic resources within a state scenic highway. The only state designated scenic highway in proximity to the project site is the SR-52 segment from Mast Boulevard to Santo Road in the City of San Diego. Cumulative projects that could affect views of the designated segment of SR-52 include the Sycamore Landfill expansion and the Weston residential development due to their proximity to the highway. These projects could have the potential to impact scenic resources within the limits of a scenic highway. However, all development within the City would be required to comply with the Santee General Plan and Santee Municipal Code, which would avoid significant impacts to state scenic highways. The proposed development would not be visible from the designated segment of SR-52. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.1.6.2.)

Visual Character. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to visual character, quality, and landform alteration is defined as the City limits and immediately surrounding areas. A significant cumulative impact would occur if cumulative projects would change the overall visual character or quality of the area. Cumulative projects would occur in off-site areas throughout the City and could impact the visual character of the City. Because the majority of the cumulative projects would be

situated in the urbanized City boundaries, they would be required to be compatible with surrounding development. Because cumulative projects would be required to comply with the Santee Municipal Code and adhere to policies set forth in the Santee General Plan associated with grading, excavation, and hillside development, a significant cumulative impact would not occur without implementation of the proposed project. Similar to the other cumulative projects, the proposed project would be required to comply with the Santee Municipal Code and adhere to policies set forth in the Santee General Plan associated with grading, excavation, and hillside development. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.1.6.3.)

Light and Glare. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to light and glare is defined as the City limits. A significant cumulative impact would occur if cumulative projects would create new sources of substantial light and glare. Increased light would be generated by streetlights, residential lighting, parking lot lights, new commercial and mixed-use development, and signage. Increased lighting would potentially adversely affect adjacent properties and the overall nighttime lighting levels within the City. Increased glare within the City could potentially occur as a result of new development containing building materials, roofing materials, or windows that would reflect sunlight. If multiple projects were introduced in the City emitting considerable amounts of light and glare, a cumulative impact could occur.

The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative projects identified in the EIR, would have the potential to produce new sources of light and glare as a result of exterior building illumination, residential lighting, parking lots, new landscaped areas, photovoltaic solar panels, and new roadway lighting. In order to minimize light spillover and glare, the proposed project has prepared a Conceptual Lighting Plan, which would ensure the proposed project maintains a "Dark Sky" friendly community. In addition, the proposed project and cumulative projects would be required to comply with lighting design set forth in the Santee Zoning Ordinance and guidelines for lighting in the Santee General Plan Community Enhancement Element. Therefore, with implementation of the City's existing regulations to minimize lighting and glare, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact related to new sources of light and glare. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.1.6.4.)

B. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

The project would have no impact on agriculture and forestry resources, as the project site does not support prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance and would not involve other changes in the existing environment, which would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. In addition, the City has no designated forest land or timberland within its boundaries. No cumulative impact would occur. (EIR, § 5.1.1.)

C. AIR QUALITY

Consistency with Applicable Air Quality Plan. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative air quality impacts is the SDAB. The RAQS and SIP are intended

to address cumulative impacts in the SDAB based on future growth predicted by SANDAG. As described previously, implementation of the proposed project would be inconsistent with the growth projections in the RAQS and SIP. Most cumulative development would not be expected to result in a significant impact in terms of conflicting with the SDAPCD air quality management plans and the California SIP because the majority of cumulative projects would propose development that is consistent with the applicable growth projections incorporated into local air quality management plans. However, because implementation of the proposed project would result in growth that would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the RAQS or SIP air quality plans, any additional incremental unaccounted growth because of cumulative projects would result in a cumulatively considerable impact. The proposed project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.2.6.1.)

Cumulative Increase in Criteria Pollutants. An existing significant cumulative impact related to PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and O_3 precursors (NO_x and VOC) exists in the SDAB because the SDAB is in nonattainment for these pollutants. Even with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, the proposed project would exceed the regional significance threshold for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ during project construction, and would exceed the thresholds for VOC and PM_{10} during project operation. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.2.6.2.)

Sensitive Receptors. Cumulative growth in the planning area, including the cumulative projects listed in EIR Table 4-2 would have the potential to increase congestion and potentially result in CO hot spots. However, the increase in vehicle trips associated with the implementation of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative trips, would not result in significant congestion at any intersection. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact related to CO hot spots would not occur.

The cumulative projects listed in EIR Table 4-2 would also have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact associated with sensitive receptors if, in combination, they would expose sensitive receptors to a substantial concentration of TACs that would significantly increase cancer risk. The proposed project would have the potential to result in a significant incremental increase in cancer risk during construction. The cumulative projects surrounding the project site include approximately two dozen residential projects, a religious facility, visitor-serving uses, several health care facilities, and approximately one dozen commercial and light industrial projects that would not be expected to result in significant emissions of TACs during operation or require extended construction periods like the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **AIR-3**, **AIR-4**, and **AIR-11** would reduce the proposed project's direct impact to below a level of significance. Therefore, cumulative projects, in combination with the proposed project, would not result in an increased risk in exposure to TAC sources due to project construction, and a significant cumulative impact would not occur. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.2.6.3.)

Odors. The geographic context for the analysis of impacts relative to objectionable odors are limited to the area immediately surrounding the odor source and are not cumulative in nature because the air emissions that cause odors disperse beyond the

sources of the odor. As the emissions disperse, the odor becomes decreasingly detectable. The cumulative projects surrounding the project site include residential and commercial projects that would not be expected to result in objectionable odors. In addition, implementation of the proposed project would not generate a new source of objectionable odors. Therefore, a cumulative impact would not occur and the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.2.6.4.)

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Special Status Species. Cumulative projects in the vicinity of the project site would have the potential to result in impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species, including loss of habitat. Several of the cumulative projects presented in EIR Table 4-2 are planned within undeveloped areas and would likely result in loss of habitat or edge effects that would impact special-status plant and wildlife species. Cumulative projects with the potential to result in cumulative impacts to sensitive plant and wildlife species include the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve Expansion project, Parkside (formerly Hillside Meadows), Sycamore Landfill expansion project, Carlton Oaks Country Club, and others.

Adjacent and nearby jurisdictions, including the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and federally managed lands like MCAS Miramar, would be required to comply with applicable federal and/or state regulations that provide protections for special-status plant and wildlife species such as FESA, CESA, and the California NCCP Act. In addition, some projects that affect special-status species require approval from the USFWS and the CDFW. If significant impacts occur from particular cumulative projects, then mitigation measures are implemented to reduce impacts to the extent feasible in compliance with CEQA.

The City and County of San Diego MSCPs and Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan establish conservation goals and objectives to preserve critical biological resources at a sustainable level on a regional scale and set mitigation standards to be applied at the project level to minimize the cumulative effects of projects in the MSCP planning area. The City and County of San Diego have MSCP Subarea Plans in place that are applicable to the cumulative projects within their jurisdictions, and the City is committed to applying the conservation standards of the MSCP Plan and Draft Subarea Plan to development in the City. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan has been prepared to meet NCCP criteria and reduce cumulative project impacts through participation in a regional habitat preservation program that adds an extra level of ongoing habitat management. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan is also intended to provide cumulative mitigation for impacts to Covered Species within the City of Santee's jurisdiction and to ensure sufficient biological resources are conserved to assist in the conservation and recovery of Covered Species under the MSCP. Any projects, including the proposed project, approved within the City's jurisdiction would be required to be consistent with the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan, when adopted, or if not adopted, the MSCP Plan and guiding principles, which are uniform throughout the MSCP area. Because cumulative projects and the proposed project would be required to meet or exceed MSCP requirements directed toward regional conservation, and project-specific mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce the proposed project's impacts to sensitive plant and wildlife

species to below a level of significance, the proposed project would contribute to species recovery. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to effects on species would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.3.6.1.)

Riparian Habitat. Cumulative projects located in the vicinity of the proposed project site have the potential to result in impacts associated with riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities through direct and indirect loss or degradation. Some of the cumulative projects listed in EIR Table 4-2 would occur in undisturbed areas that affect riparian habitat and other sensitive vegetation communities. Example cumulative projects with the potential to result in cumulative impacts to sensitive vegetation communities may include the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve Expansion project, Parkside (formerly Hillside Meadows), Sycamore Landfill expansion project, Carlton Oaks Country Club, and others.

Adjacent and nearby jurisdictions, including the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and federally managed lands like MCAS Miramar, would be required to comply with applicable federal and/or state regulations such as the California Lake and Streambed Alteration Program or the California NCCP Act. These programs provide protections for riparian and other sensitive habitats. In addition, many projects that affect riparian or other protected habitat types require approval from the USFWS and the CDFW. If potentially significant impacts would occur from particular cumulative projects, then mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts to the extent feasible.

Development under the proposed project would have the potential to impact riparian and other sensitive habitats. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan is being prepared for approval by the City and wildlife agencies and would meet NCCP criteria. Any projects, including the proposed project, approved within the City's jurisdiction would be consistent with the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan, when adopted, or if not adopted, the MSCP Plan and guiding principles, which are uniform throughout the MSCP area. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan is also intended to provide cumulative mitigation for impacts to Covered Species within the City's jurisdiction and to ensure sufficient biological resources are conserved to assist in the conservation and recovery of Covered Species under the MSCP. Because cumulative projects and the proposed project would be required to meet or exceed MSCP requirements directed toward regional conservation and project-specific mitigation measures would mitigate the proposed project's impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive communities to below a level of significance, the proposed project would contribute to habitat conservation. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.3.6.2.)

Wetlands. Cumulative projects located in the vicinity of the project site would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with federally or state protected wetlands. Several cumulative projects presented in EIR Table 4-2 would occur in previously developed and undeveloped areas that have the potential to result in disturbances to federally and state protected wetlands. One potential example is the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve Expansion project located to the east of Fanita Parkway near Carlton Oaks Drive.

Adjacent and nearby jurisdictions, including the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and federally managed lands like MCAS Miramar, would be required to comply with applicable federal and/or state regulations such as Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act and the Porter–Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Existing regulations would ensure that a significant cumulative impact associated with federally or state protected wetlands would not occur. If potentially significant impacts would occur from particular cumulative projects, then mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts as required to meet the no-net-loss standard. Similarly, the proposed project would mitigate its direct impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.3.6.3.)

Movement Corridors. Cumulative projects located in the vicinity of the project site would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with wildlife movement corridors and habitat linkages. Several cumulative projects presented in EIR Table 4-2 would occur in previously developed and undeveloped areas that have the potential to result in the regional loss of wildlife movement corridors and habitat linkages. Example projects may include Carlton Oaks Country Club, Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve Expansion project, and Walker Trails. Development of the proposed project in combination with these cumulative projects would potentially impact wildlife movement corridors and habitat linkages within and through the City to neighboring jurisdictions.

Adjacent and nearby jurisdictions, including the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and federally managed lands like MCAS Miramar, would be required to comply with applicable federal and/or state regulations such as the California NCCP Act, which supports the continued provision of wildlife movement corridors. If potentially significant impacts would occur from particular cumulative projects, then mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts to the extent feasible.

The proposed project would have the potential to impact wildlife movement corridors and habitat linkages. The project proposes mitigation measures that would preserve on-site habitat areas designed as wildlife movement corridors and provide links to off-site habitat areas, reducing project impacts to less than significant. Any projects, including the proposed project, approved within the City's jurisdiction would be required to be consistent with the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan, when adopted, or if not adopted, the MSCP Plan and guiding principles, which are uniform throughout the MSCP area. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan is also intended to provide cumulative mitigation for impacts to Covered Species within the City's jurisdiction and to ensure sufficient biological resources are conserved to assist in the conservation and recovery of Covered Species under the MSCP. Because cumulative projects and the proposed project would be required to meet or exceed MSCP requirements, and project-specific mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's impacts to wildlife movement corridors and habitat linkages to below a level of significance, the proposed project would preserve wildlife movement corridors and habitat linkages. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.3.6.4.)

Tree Preservation. Cumulative projects located in the vicinity of the project site would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with conflicts with

regional or local tree preservation policies or ordinances. Several cumulative projects presented in EIR Table 4-2 would occur in previously developed and undeveloped areas that have the potential to result in the regional loss of trees protected under regional or local tree preservation policies or ordinances. Example projects may include Carlton Oaks Country Club, Santee View Estates, Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve Expansion project, and others. Development of the proposed project in combination with these cumulative projects would potentially impact regionally or locally protected trees and result in a conflict with these preservation policies or ordinances.

Adjacent and nearby jurisdictions, including the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and federally managed lands like MCAS Miramar, would be required to comply with applicable regional or local tree preservation policies or ordinances. The City of Santee's Urban Forestry Ordinance contains tree-related policies, regulations, and generally accepted standards for planting, trimming, and removing trees on public property and public rights-of-way (Santee Municipal Code, Section 8.06 [City of Santee 2020]). The ordinance gives the City control of all trees, shrubs, and other plantings in any street, park, public right-of-way, landscape maintenance district or easement, or other City-owned property. City review of development plans for the proposed project would ensure that the proposed improvements conform to the requirements of the Urban Forestry Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project and other cumulative projects would be required to comply with the Urban Forestry Ordinance as condition of project approval. A significant cumulative impact associated with a conflict with a local tree preservation ordinance would not occur. Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with other cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.3.6.5.)

Habitat Conservation Plans. Several cumulative projects presented in EIR Table 4-2 would occur in previously developed and undeveloped areas that would have the potential to result in the regional loss of sensitive biological resources protected under regional or local HCPs. Development of the proposed project in combination with these cumulative projects would potentially impact sensitive biological resources and result in a conflict with regional or local HCPs. Adjacent and nearby jurisdictions, including the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and federally managed lands like MCAS Miramar, would be required to comply with applicable regional or local HCPs or NCCPs, such as the City and County of San Diego MSCPs. If potentially significant impacts would occur from particular cumulative projects, then mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts to the extent feasible.

The proposed project would be designed to meet MSCP Plan Design Criteria and the NCCP Process Guidelines. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan is being prepared for approval by the City and wildlife agencies, and will meet those criteria. Due to lack of any control of the applicant over the Santee MSCP Subarea Plan approval process, the applicant elected to design the proposed project consistent with the higher NCCP standards and MSCP design guidelines, so that the proposed project would attain the conservation standard of NCCP, compared to a lower standard of a project designed without a regional context. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan, once finalized, will contribute to the regional MSCP for preservation, mitigation for impacts, and conservation

of sensitive biological resources within San Diego County. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan is also intended to provide cumulative mitigation for impacts to Covered Species within the City of Santee's jurisdiction and to ensure sufficient biological resources are conserved to assist in the conservation and recovery of Covered Species under the MSCP.

Project impacts would all occur outside the final Habitat Preserve boundary, which would be considered part of the MHPA. However, project impacts would occur immediately adjacent to the Habitat Preserve. Therefore, in addition to project-specific mitigation, the project is required to implement the area-specific management directives (ASMDs), as stated in Table 3-5, Species Evaluated for Coverage under the MSCP, of the MSCP Plan (City of San Diego 1998), for each Covered Species proposed to be impacted. The project must demonstrate how ASMDs (or Conditions of Coverage) would be implemented in order for the species to be considered "Covered" by the MSCP. EIR Table 4.3-20 summarizes each Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan Covered Species impacted on the project site, the applicable ASMD, and the proposed project's compliance with that particular ASMD.

For those special-status species which are not included under the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan but are included as Covered Species under the MSCP Plan (City of San Diego 1998), project-specific mitigation measures would be implemented, as summarized in the EIR Table 4.3-7 for plants and Table 4.3-8a for wildlife, to reduce the proposed project's cumulative impacts to these special-status species to less than significant. For MSCP Covered Species occurring on the project site but with no other status (e.g., mule deer, mountain lion[3], western bluebird), cumulative impacts to these species would be reduced to a less than significant level due to the project-specific mitigation program that would provide wildlife movement corridors and through establishment of the Habitat Preserve, which would conserve suitable habitat in a configuration that preserves genetic exchange and species viability. Additionally, these MSCP Plan Covered Species are known to be covered under other neighboring jurisdictions' Subarea Plans (e.g., City and County of San Diego and the City of Poway). Therefore, additional protections would be provided under these neighboring Subarea Plans, further ensuring cumulative impacts to these species would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Included in EIR Table 4.3-20 are three species (i.e., western spadefoot, Hermes copper butterfly, and Quino checkerspot butterfly) that are covered under the Draft Santee MSCP

[3] To clarify the listing status of this species, the mountain lion was not considered a CESA species at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued for the Fanita Ranch EIR, which was November 10, 2018. The mountain lion was petitioned for listing on July 16, 2019, which initiated a CDFW review process that involves determining if there is enough evidence to warrant elevation to the next step of review. It was listed as a Candidate on April 21, 2020, meaning that it satisfied criteria for additional review, thus providing it with the same interim protections as a listed species until a decision is made. These dates were after the issuance of the NOP for the Fanita Ranch EIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15125, the EIR did not consider mountain lion as a Candidate species. It is acknowledged that the lion is legislatively considered a "specially protected mammal" species under California Department of Fish and Game Code since 1990, which effectively protects it from hunting pressure. However, no hunting is proposed or would be allowed by the proposed project and, therefore, this listing legislation was not considered relevant to the proposed project.

Subarea Plan but are not covered under the MSCP Plan. By implementing the project's mitigation program, as summarized in EIR Table 4.3-20, impacts to these species would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts. Further, any projects, including the proposed project, approved within the City's jurisdiction would be consistent with the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan, when adopted, or if not adopted, the MSCP Plan and guiding principles, which are uniform throughout the MSCP area. Because cumulative projects and the proposed project would be required to meet or exceed MSCP requirements, and project-specific mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's impacts to below a level of significance, the proposed project would contribute to the attainment of conservation goals identified in regional or local HCPs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.3.6.6.)

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic Resources. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to historic resources is defined as the City limits because historic resources where inventoried and evaluated at a cumulative, City-wide level under the Santee General Plan. The Conservation Element of the Santee General Plan identifies specific policies aimed at preserving significant historic and prehistoric sites within the City. The Santee General Plan identifies one historic resource listed on the NRHP and one local historic landmark, which does not qualify for the NRHP. The cultural resources studies for the proposed project evaluated one potential historic resource within the APE. The studies found that this site is not recommended eligible for the NRHP or CRHR. Similar to the proposed project, past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development projects would be required to comply with the goals and policies in the Santee General Plan related to historic resources. Future development projects, including those listed in EIR Table 4-2 would be required to demonstrate that the proposed project includes adequate mitigation measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts to historic resources in accordance with CEQA. Therefore, a cumulative impact related to historic resources would not occur. (EIR, § 4.4.6.1.)

Archeological Resources. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to archaeological resources is considered to be the County. Evidence of human occupation on the project site is represented by numerous archaeological sites throughout the City and overall region. These sites contain artifacts and features of value in reconstructing cultural patterns of prehistoric life and overall history of the region. Due to the scarcity of archaeological resources and the potential for construction activities associated with future development projects to impact these resources, a significant cumulative impact to archaeological resources exists.

The cultural resource studies for the proposed project concluded that several archaeological sites are located within the proposed project's APE and determined that the proposed project would impact two significant archaeological sites. Avoidance or preservation in place through site capping would reduce impacts to these sites to a less than significant level (Mitigation Measure **CUL-1**). In areas of the sites where preservation in place is infeasible, Mitigation Measure **CUL-2**, a Phase III Data Recovery Program, would be implemented to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. The proposed

project would include grading and excavation which could result in impacts to unknown archaeological resources. Depending on the sensitivity of these resources, impacts may be potentially significant. To address the potential for unanticipated archaeological resources discoveries during subsurface excavation activities, Mitigation Measures **CUL-3** through **CUL-9** would be implemented to train construction workers on potential cultural material discovery, employ a cultural resources mitigation and monitoring program, require that an archaeological and Native American monitor be present during all ground-disturbing activities to minimize impacts to buried archaeological resources, and employ proper curation and biological restoration procedures for archaeological resources. Therefore, by applying mitigation, the proposed project's contribution to the significant cumulative archaeological resources impact would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.4.6.2.)

Human Remains. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to human remains is considered to be the County. The presence of numerous archaeological sites indicates that prehistoric human occupation occurred throughout the region. Additionally, historic-era occupation of the area increases the possibility that humans were interred outside of a formal cemetery. Cumulative development projects in the San Diego region would have the potential to encounter unknown, interred human remains during construction activities, which would result in a significant cumulative impact.

Human remains were identified on the project site in two areas as a result of a Phase I survey and Phase II testing. Additionally, unidentified human remains, whether as part of a prehistoric cemetery, an archaeological site, or an isolated occurrence, could be present below the ground surface. If human remains are discovered during construction activities, Mitigation Measure **CUL-10** would be implemented, which details proper protocol and treatments under the California Public Resources Code and California Health and Safety Code to minimize the disturbance of human remains and to appropriately treat any remains that are discovered. Implementation of this measure would reduce the impacts of inadvertent discoveries of human remains to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact associated with disturbance of human remains would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.4.6.3.)

F. ENERGY

Wasteful or Inefficient Energy Use. The geographic scope of the cumulative analysis for natural gas and electricity is the San Diego Gas & Electric Company service area and for petroleum is the state. Regional energy demand would likely increase as growth occurs. However, implementation of the proposed project would result in more efficient use of natural gas, electricity, and fuel compared to typical existing demand in the region. In addition, the proposed project would implement mitigation measures to reduce GHG and criteria pollutant emissions that would minimize energy use, including incentives for electric vehicle use and transportation demand strategies to reduce vehicle miles traveled to reduce fuel use. Further, with implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1, the proposed project would generate approximately 63 percent of the proposed

project's electricity demand on site from renewable sources. Cumulative projects would also be required to demonstrate that their energy use would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary, and would comply with applicable energy efficiency regulations such as Title 24. Therefore, the proposed project and cumulative projects would not combine to result in a significant cumulative impact pertaining to the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy. (EIR, § 4.5.6.1.)

Energy Plans. The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to energy plans is statewide because the applicable plan, the 2019 IEPR, is a statewide plan. Energy use on the project site during construction would be temporary in nature. In addition, energy use associated with operation of the proposed project would be relatively small compared to the state's and County's available energy sources and would be efficient compared to the proposed project's estimated proportion of population. Cumulative projects would also be required to demonstrate that energy use would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. Because California's energy conservation planning actions are conducted at a regional level, and because it can be assumed that other cumulative projects would implement features to reduce inefficient or unnecessary energy use, the proposed project and cumulative projects would not conflict with California's energy conservation plans. A significant cumulative impact would not occur. (EIR, § 4.5.6.2.)

G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Seismic Ground Shaking. The geographic context for the analysis of impacts resulting from seismic ground shaking is generally site-specific, rather than cumulative in nature, because each cumulative project site has unique geologic considerations that would be subject to uniform site development and construction standards. Potential cumulative impacts resulting from geological, seismic, and soil conditions would be minimized on a site-by-site basis to the extent that modern construction methods and code requirements provide. Nevertheless, even though adequate study, design, and construction measures can be taken to reduce potential impacts, cumulative development in the region would contribute to the cumulative increase in the number of persons exposed to these hazards (e.g., the general seismic risk that exists throughout Southern California).

The project site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. Development on the project site would comply with the CBC, which sets stringent seismic safety standards, as well as follow the recommendations set forth in the geotechnical investigations as required by Mitigation Measure **GEO-1**. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed project to impacts associated with exposing people and property to ground shaking effects would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.6.6.1.)

Soil Erosion. The geographic context for the analysis of impacts regarding soil erosion or topsoil loss would be limited to each cumulative project site and the immediately surrounding area. Proposed cumulative projects listed in EIR Table 4-2 directly south of the village development area and north of the proposed Magnolia Avenue

off-site improvement area that could potentially cause a cumulative effect include a six-single-family detached residential subdivision (GA Development, LLC). Erosion, including loss of topsoil, could occur as a result of site preparation activities associated with development of these projects. However, development of cumulative projects in the City, including the adjacent projects, are subject to state and local runoff and erosion prevention requirements, including the general construction permit, applicable BMPs, and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements, as well as implementation of fugitive dust control measures of the San Diego Air Pollution Control District. Construction activities under the proposed project would comply with the aforementioned requirements as well as the City's Excavation and Grading Ordinance and the CBC, specifically Chapter 18 Soils and Foundations, which regulates excavation activities, grading activities, and the construction of foundations and retaining walls. These measures are implemented as conditions of approval for all development projects and are subject to continuing enforcement.

The proposed project would follow the recommendations set forth in the site-specific geotechnical investigations under Mitigation Measure **GEO-1**. Similar to the proposed project, cumulative projects would also be expected to follow recommendations of their site-specific geotechnical studies, the City's Excavation and Grading Ordinance, and the CBC. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with soil erosion and loss of topsoil. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.6.6.2.)

Geologic Stability. The geographic context for the analysis of impacts resulting from unstable soils is generally site-specific rather than cumulative in nature. The cumulative development projects listed in EIR Table 4-2 would result in ground disturbance, including excavation, grading, and soils removal that could potentially result in unstable soils. However, potential geology and soils effects are inherently restricted to the areas proposed for development and would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with other planned or proposed development. Nevertheless, when considering the impacts in a larger geographic context, the project site and surrounding projects are required to undergo analysis of geological and soil conditions applicable to the development site in question. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with the recommendations set forth in the site-specific geotechnical investigations as required by Mitigation Measure **GEO-1**. Because restrictions on development would be applied in the event that geological or soil conditions pose a risk to safety, cumulative impacts from development of other projects on soil subject to soil instability would be less than significant and the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.6.6.3.)

Expansive Soil. The geographic context for the analysis of impacts resulting from expansive soils is generally site-specific rather than cumulative in nature. Potential impacts related to the proposed project are not additive with other projects and are therefore not cumulatively significant. The site-specific geotechnical investigations found that there is potential for highly expansive soils on the project site and portions of the Friars Formation and Stadium Conglomerate, which underlie the site, that would be subject to expansion effects due to the water holding capacity of clay materials. The

proposed project would comply with all requirements regarding expansive soils in the CBC and with the recommendations set forth in in the geotechnical investigations as required by Mitigation Measure **GEO-1**. Therefore, potential geological impacts associated with expansive soils would not be cumulatively significant. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.6.6.4.)

Septic Tanks. The geographic context for the cumulative septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems analysis is defined as the City. The proposed project and cumulative projects would not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems because they would be served by the City's sewer system. Therefore, no significant cumulative impact related to wastewater disposal systems would occur, and the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.6.6.5.)

Paleontological Resources. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to paleontological resources is considered to be the County. According to the San Diego County General Plan, there are a number of distinct geological rock units (i.e., formations) within the County that contain paleontological resources, such as bones, teeth, shells, and wood. Cumulative projects in the County have the potential to disturb these geologic formations and the fossils that they contain. However, previous development has also led to the discovery of many fossil sites that have been documented and added to the natural history records for the region. Nonetheless, future development in the region could impact unrecorded paleontological resources, which would result in a significant cumulative impact.

The continued development of projects in the County has the potential to disturb sensitive paleontological units; however, monitoring for paleontological resources is now typically required for projects that involve significant earthwork in geologic units with higher paleontological sensitivities. Because the proposed project would require implementation of a paleontological monitoring program for areas with the highest potential for buried fossil resources (i.e., Mitigation Measure **GEO-2**), additional discoveries may be added to the regional natural history record as a result of project development. Mitigation would prevent the harm or destruction of potentially highly valuable paleontological resources and allow these resources to be properly documented and preserved. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.6.6.6.)

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The geographic scope of consideration for GHG emissions is on a global scale as such emissions contribute, on a cumulative basis, to global climate change (GCC). Given the nature of environmental consequences from GHGs and GCC, CEQA requires that lead agencies evaluate the cumulative impacts of GHGs, even relatively small additions, on a global basis. By nature, GHG evaluations are a cumulative study. Implementation of the proposed project would result in potentially significant GHG emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures **GHG-1**

through **GHG-6**, **AIR-5** through **AIR-8**, and **AIR-10**, the proposed project would achieve the per capita emissions threshold for consistency with the Sustainable Santee Plan. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.7.6.1.)

Plan Consistency. The plans and policies applicable to the proposed project and cumulative projects for reducing GHG emissions include the Sustainable Santee Plan and statewide emissions reductions targets. Prior to mitigation, the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to plan consistency because it would result in potentially significant GHG emissions and would not implement all applicable GHG reduction strategies. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures **GHG-1**, **GHG-2**, **GHG-6**, **AIR-6**, **AIR-7**, **AIR-8**, and **TRA-16**, the proposed project would not conflict with the applicable plan adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable with mitigation. (EIR, § 4.7.6.2.)

I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Transport, Use and Disposal of Hazardous Materials. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts relative to the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials encompasses nearby facilities that regularly require the use of disposal of hazardous materials and the roadways and freeways used by vehicles transporting hazardous materials to and from the project site. Cumulative projects identified in the City of Santee, the City of San Diego, and the County (see EIR Table 4-2) include the construction of residential properties, agricultural, commercial, and civic uses that would involve transport, use, and disposal of potentially hazardous materials typical of those uses. However, the cumulative projects would be required to comply with regulations applicable to the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, including the RCRA, CERCLA, SARA, Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, and CCRs Title 22 and Title 27, which would ensure they do not result in a significant cumulative impact.

While the proposed project would develop land uses that would transport and use varying amounts and types of hazardous materials in day-to-day activities and operations, the proposed project would also comply with federal, state, and local regulations to minimize the potential for adverse health effects related to the transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials. Consequently, the proposed project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.8.6.1.)

Accidental Release. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts relative to the accidental release of hazardous materials encompasses nearby facilities that regularly require the use or disposal of hazardous materials and the roadways and freeways used by vehicles transporting hazardous materials to and from the project site. Cumulative projects identified in the City of Santee, the City of San Diego, and the County include the construction of residential properties, agricultural, commercial, and civic uses that would involve an unquantifiable use of potentially hazardous materials at risk of accidental release. However, cumulative projects with the potential to accidentally release

hazardous materials would be required to be in compliance with threshold quantities of hazardous substances listed in Chapters 6.95, 6.5, and 6.7 of the California Health and Safety Code. Compliance with these federal and state regulations would ensure that cumulative impacts do not result in a significant cumulative impact.

While the proposed project would develop land uses that would use varying amounts and types of hazardous materials that may be subject to accidental release in day-to-day activities and operations, the proposed project would also comply with federal, state, and local regulations to minimize the potential for adverse health effects related to the accidental release of hazardous materials. Consequently, the proposed project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.8.6.2.)

Hazards to Schools. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to hazards to nearby schools is the City. Future development in the City may involve hazardous emissions or the handling of acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed primary or secondary school. Cumulative projects would be required to comply with regulations applicable to the use, disposal, and transportation of hazardous materials. Any potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with applicable regulations. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact would not occur with implementation of the proposed project.

The proposed project would comply with applicable hazardous materials and disclosure requirements for the handling, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials, Furthermore, the hazardous materials used on the project site would not be anticipated to occur in quantities significant enough to pose a risk to occupants of nearby schools or the school that may be developed within the boundaries of the project site. Therefore, proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts associated with hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed primary or secondary school would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.8.6.3.)

Hazardous Materials Sites. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regards to hazardous materials sites is the City. Cumulative projects in the region (see EIR Table 4-2) would have the potential to be located on or adjacent to existing contaminated sites. However, similar to the proposed project, discretionary projects would be reviewed for potential site contamination and appropriate measures to address risks to the public and environment would be required. For projects that do not require discretionary review, federal, state, and local regulations would require that any contamination that is encountered is reported to appropriate agencies and that appropriate precautions are taken to address risks to workers and the public. A significant cumulative impact would not occur with implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to hazardous materials sites would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.8.6.4.)

Airport Safety Hazards. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to airport safety hazards are the ALUCP boundaries for nearby airports. The cumulative projects are all located in the general vicinity (less than 2 miles) of MCAS Miramar and Gillespie Field. Potential risks associated with development in the vicinity of MCAS and Gillespie Field would be a factor in any decision to approve or deny future development proposals. Land uses that may be impacted by the airport are reviewed and regulated through the ALUCP, the City, and the San Diego Regional Airport Authority. As a result, cumulative project risks of future development located in proximity to MCAS Miramar and Gillespie Field would not result in a significant impact. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to safety hazards related to airports would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.8.6.5.)

Emergency Response Plans. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plan is the City. Construction and operation associated with cumulative development could result in activities that could interfere with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans, such a temporary construction barricades or other obstructions that could impede emergency access. Cumulative impacts from multiple projects within the Santee Fire Department's jurisdiction listed in EIR Table 4-2 can cause fire response service decline and impede emergency evacuation plans. These projects may include the GA Development subdivision, Carlton Oaks Country Club, Walker Trails, and others. Development of the proposed project, in combination with these cumulative projects, would potentially impact and conflict with adopted emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans.

A Fire Protection Plan, a Construction Fire Prevention Plan, and a Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan were prepared for the proposed project to ensure the community would be built to withstand significant fire, provide residents multiple evacuation routes, and offer the contingency option to emergency planners and responders of temporarily refuging persons on site, if considered safer than evacuating. The proposed project Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan was developed to meet City and County requirements and prevent any conflicts with current evacuation plans. Details of the emergency access routes are described in the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan prepared for the proposed project and were designed to comply with current and future population growth, roadway conditions, and access availability.

Furthermore, the only proposed through routes on the project site would loop between Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street on site and would not, in combination with other projects, affect emergency response and evacuation plans elsewhere in the City. The project street configuration and evacuation plan outlined in the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan provides evacuation routes to the north (once off site), south, east, and west depending on the nature of the emergency. The roadways and evacuation routes designed for the proposed project provides connections to major regional traffic corridors including indirectly to SR-52 to the south, southwest, and southeast; SR-67 to the east and northeast; I-125 to the south; and I-15 to the west to move residents out of the City thereby avoiding conflicts with emergency response or evacuation efforts in other areas of the City. Additionally, it is anticipated that future development projects would undergo CEQA review of potential impacts on adopted emergency response or evacuation plans,

and would be required to implement measures necessary to mitigate potential impacts. As a result, cumulative impacts related to interference with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.8.6.6.)

J. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Water Quality Standards. The geographic context for the cumulative impact analysis concerning hydrology and water quality is the San Diego HU, in the lower San Diego Hydrologic Area (907.10), and in the Santee Hydrologic Subarea (907.12) of the Basin Plan. Urban development from cumulative projects within the San Diego River HU would increase impervious areas and activities that generate pollutants, and consequently could result in additional water quality impacts from stormwater runoff to receiving waters in the HU. Existing water quality impairments or problems within receiving waters in the San Diego River HU include benthic community effects, cadmium, indicator bacteria, nitrogen, dissolved oxygen, phosphorus, total dissolved solids, and toxicity.

Most future development projects in the San Diego region would be subject to regulation during construction by the Construction General Permit and during design and operation by NPDES Phase I or II post-construction regulations, which would require that low-impact development measures be implemented and source control and nonpoint source BMPs be employed to control potential effects on water quality and that stormwater quality control devices be incorporated into stormwater collection systems to collect sediment and other pollutants. Further, there are several other regional and local initiatives that are being implemented to meet water quality objectives, reduce pollutant loads, address high-priority pollutants and improve surface water quality in impaired waters, such as the San Diego River WMA. The WQIP for the WMA identifies highest priority water quality conditions, strategies to address them, and monitoring plans. The goal of the WQIP is to further the CWA's objective to protect, preserve, enhance, and restore water quality of the San Diego River watershed. While these efforts are helping to remedy the problem, a significant cumulative water quality impact exists without implementation of the proposed project and is being addressed through existing regulations and programs.

Direct water quality impacts from the implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant because the proposed project is designed to comply with regulations protecting water quality and would not violate of any water quality standards or WDRs or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Further, other projects in the region are subject to similar regulatory requirements associated with stormwater runoff and there are several ongoing efforts to remedy water quality issues in receiving waters. Thus, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

Additionally, cumulative projects have the potential to degrade groundwater resources. However, similar to surface water quality, cumulative projects would have to comply with General Construction Stormwater Permit requirements, including the development and implementation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP must identify BMPs that the

discharger would use to protect stormwater runoff from pollutants and the placement of those BMPs. Because other projects in the region are subject to similar federal, state, and local requirements associated with stormwater runoff, cumulatively significant groundwater quality impacts would not occur. Thus, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with conflicts with the Basin Plan. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.9.6.1.)

Groundwater Supplies. The geographic context for the cumulative impact analysis concerning hydrology and water quality is the San Diego HU, in the lower San Diego Hydrologic Area (907.10), and in the Santee Hydrologic Subarea (907.12) of the Basin Plan. A significant cumulative impact related to groundwater supplies and recharge would occur if development within the Santee Hydrologic Subarea would increase the amount of impervious surface in the area, which would decrease the amount of recharge received by the groundwater table and decrease groundwater supplies. Therefore, increased impervious areas associated with construction of cumulative development projects would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact to groundwater supplies and recharge.

Implementation of the proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface of the project site. However, the proposed project would include pervious, landscaped areas, allowing groundwater recharge to continue to occur. Runoff from developed areas would drain into the proposed on-site basin system designed to slow peak flow and discharge to rates equal to or less than existing conditions. Hydromodification management would occur through storage of stormwater within proposed on-site basins, with outlets that regulate the flow rate and duration of stormwater released. Source control and low-impact development measures would be implemented to maximize the amount of Open Space, landscaping, and vegetated swales to slow and absorb runoff, allowing it to infiltrate the ground surface. Similar to the proposed project, cumulative projects would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations to minimize impacts to groundwater recharge. In addition, the City does not rely on groundwater for water supply. As such, development of the proposed project and other cumulative projects would not inhibit groundwater recharge. A significant cumulative impact related to groundwater recharge would not occur. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.9.6.2.)

Site Drainage and Hydrology. The geographic context for the cumulative impact analysis concerning hydrology and water quality is the San Diego HU, in the lower San Diego Hydrologic Area (907.10), and in the Santee Hydrologic Subarea (907.12) of the Basin Plan. Construction of cumulative projects would involve grading and other earthmoving activities that could result in temporary localized soil erosion. However, these site-specific impacts are not expected to combine with the effects of other regional activities because federal, state and local regulations, including the Construction General Permit and Regional MS4 Permit, govern project design and construction so that projects are designed to reduce stormwater runoff from project sites by promoting infiltration, minimizing impervious, requiring no net increase in flows, and controlling erosion and

construction-related contaminants at each construction site. Additionally, all future projects would be required to comply with Chapter 9.06 of the Santee Municipal Code, which requires the implementation of a pollution control plan (City of Santee 2020). In addition, all future projects would be required to comply with the Construction General Stormwater Permit, which requires preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP would include a series of specific BMPs to be implemented during construction to address erosion, accidental spills, and the quality of stormwater runoff and have been developed in part to reduce the potential adverse effects associated with site-specific construction activities. Construction-related impacts from cumulative projects would be temporary and short-term, and each project's construction activities would be localized. Therefore, a cumulatively considerable impact associated with site drainage and hydrology would not occur. During operation, the proposed project basins would help reduce flows by approximately 583 cubic feet per second compared to existing conditions. Thus, post-project flows would be released into Sycamore Canyon Creek at a lower rate than existing natural flows. Flows would be treated, detained, and then discharged to their respective discharge location. Future projects would be required to implement site- and project-specific design features that would also be required to regulate the flow rate and duration of stormwater released. In addition, the proposed project's direct impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.9.6.3.)

Activities in a Flood Hazard, Tsunami or Seiche Zone. The geographic context for the cumulative impact analysis concerning hydrology and water quality is the San Diego HU, in the lower San Diego Hydrologic Area (907.10), and in the Santee Hydrologic Subarea (907.12) of the Basin Plan. The geographic context for cumulative projects resulting in activities that would have a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche risk are projects within the City and general vicinity of the project site. Similar to the proposed project, cumulative projects within the City and vicinity of the project site would be located within the same proximity to the Pacific Ocean and would not be subject to a tsunami event. Additionally, due to topographical variations, including a valley located between the City and the San Vicente Reservoir, it is unlikely for cumulative projects to be inundated this reservoir. Further, cumulative projects located in a flood hazard area would have restrictions on development based on state and City regulations. Therefore, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact associated with activities in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche areas. The proposed project would have no impact with regard to flood hazards, tsunami, and seiche hazards. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.9.6.4.)

Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan. The geographic context for the cumulative impact analysis concerning hydrology and water quality is the San Diego HU, in the lower San Diego Hydrologic Area (907.10), and in the Santee Hydrologic Subarea (907.12) of the Basin Plan. Urban development associated with cumulative projects within the San Diego Hydrologic Unit would increase impervious areas and activities that generate pollutants, and consequently could result in additional impacts to receiving waters in the Hydrologic Unit. Most development projects in the San Diego region would be subject to NPDES regulations, which would require site design and source control BMPs to control potential effects on water quality, and the

incorporation of stormwater quality control devices into stormwater collection systems to collect sediment and other pollutants. These requirements are uniformly applicable throughout the San Diego region.

Additionally, the City does not rely on groundwater sources for its water supply. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact associated with obstruction of the Basin Plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan impact would not occur. The proposed project would not result in significant direct impacts associated with obstruction of the Basin Plan because it would comply with NPDES permit requirements and Chapter 9.06 of the Santee Municipal Code during construction and preparation of a SWPPP would be required. During operation, the proposed project would incorporate BMPs into project design as well as comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations to protect water quality and ensure project compliance with applicable water quality standards. Additionally, the project site falls outside of the boundaries of the San Diego River Valley Groundwater Basin and no sustainable groundwater management plan has been prepared for the project site. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.(EIR, § 4.9.6.5.)

K. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Physically Divide Established Community. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative land use impacts in the City. In addition to the cumulative projects identified in the EIR, smaller cumulative projects could have the effect of forming a barrier to access that would physically divide a community. Such impacts would generally be limited to an individual community and would not be cumulative in nature. Multiple projects in the same community could combine to result in a cumulative effect to the division of that community. However, all cumulative projects would be required to comply with the Santee General Plan and undergo development review prior to approval. This would ensure that a significant cumulative impact related to the physical division of an established community would not occur. Further, the proposed project does not propose any new land uses or infrastructure projects, including roadways that would divide established communities. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.10.6.1.)

Conflict with Land Use Plans. The proposed project would be consistent with the Santee General Plan and other relevant plans and policies. Furthermore, the cumulative projects identified in EIR Table 4-2 would be consistent with the existing adopted plans, or require mitigation measures or design review to ensure consistency, in order for project approvals to occur. In any case, land use factors associated with the development of the project site as proposed would not affect or be affected by approvals of reasonably expected future development elsewhere in the City or in other jurisdictions. Therefore, the proposed project, along with the identified cumulative projects, would not result in a cumulative land use impact. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.10.6.2.)

L. MINERAL RESOURCES

Loss of Known Mineral Resources. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts related to the potential loss of known mineral resources encompasses the County. For cumulative projects that include lands designated as MRZ areas and have the potential to impact mineral resources, consideration of economic, land use compatibility, and environmental protection factors would be considered when deciding on the appropriateness of mining in those particular areas. Cumulative projects identified in the City of Santee, the City of San Diego, and the County include the construction of residential, mixed-use, and civic properties that could contribute to the loss of availability of known mineral resources. New development northeast and southeast of the project site is within the County's jurisdiction. Currently, most properties south of the project site in the City of Santee are built out. No further development is anticipated to occur west of the project site on Marine Corps Air Station Miramar or within City of San Diego open space, or north of the project site in Sycamore Canyon. Although sand, gravel, and rock mining operations exist north and east of the proposed project in Slaughterhouse Canyon, the areas where the cumulative projects are located in the City are planned for residential, commercial, and municipal development and, therefore, would not be available for mineral extraction. Cumulative projects would not contribute to the loss of availability of mineral resources. Thus, a significant cumulative impact associated with the loss of availability of known mineral resources would not occur. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.11.6.1.)

Loss of Locally Important Mineral Resource Site. The geographic context for potential loss of locally important mineral resources delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan is projects within the City and adjacent communities. Cumulative projects in the City and the adjacent communities could contribute to the loss of mineral resources if they contain areas delineated as locally important mineral resources on a local general, specific, or land use plan. These areas would not be zoned for other types of development that would allow them to lose their availability as locally important mineral resource sites. In addition, these types of projects would require additional approvals by the City and other jurisdictions to permit as mineral resource sites. Cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact. The project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site in the Santee General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.11.6.2.)

M. NOISE

Exceedance of Noise Standards.

Construction. Construction noise impacts are localized in nature because they are limited to the construction site where construction equipment is operating. As discussed previously, noise levels from on-site construction would attenuate to 75 dBA approximately 375 feet from the active construction area, and noise from off-site construction would attenuate to 75 dBA approximately 160 feet from the construction area. Due to the length of the construction period for the proposed project, it is likely that construction of multiple cumulative projects would occur simultaneously with the proposed project.

The nearest cumulative projects to the proposed area for on-site development are proposed at the existing northern terminus of the Summit Avenue public right-of-way, approximately 1,200 feet from the nearest on-site development area. Therefore, noise from construction of these projects is unlikely to combine with noise from construction of the proposed land uses.

In addition, a cumulative project (Santee View Estates) would potentially be within 160 feet of the proposed Cuyamaca Street extension. Similar to the proposed project, construction of this cumulative project would occur over a large area so that exposure of individual receptors to construction noise would vary depending on the location of construction activities during a certain day or phase. Construction of either project would only occur at the property line, within 160 feet of the other project, for a limited time. Due to the linear nature of the construction of the Cuyamaca Street extension, it is unlikely that the two projects' construction noise would combine simultaneously such that impacts from each project would affect the same receptors.

Additionally, cumulative projects and the proposed project would be subject to the construction limitations in the City's Noise Ordinance, which prohibits noise generated by construction activities between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. and on Sundays and holidays without approval from the Director of Development Services. Similar to the proposed project, cumulative projects would be required to implement noise control best management practices in order to comply with the ordinance, such as those listed in Mitigation Measure **NOI-4**. Distance between projects and compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would ensure that a significant cumulative construction noise impact would not occur.

Operation. Approved or planned projects within the City are considered in the cumulative analysis for the proposed project. This analysis incorporates the cumulative projects assumed in the traffic impact analysis for the proposed project. These approved or planned projects include multi-family and single-family residential development, commercial uses, light industrial use, and a church. Similar to the proposed project, residential land uses would generate nuisance noise that would not be considered a significant impact. However, some of the cumulative development projects would potentially include HVAC systems that would have the potential to result in significant impacts to NSLUs up to 275 feet from the source, as well as nuisance noise from parking lots and increased human activity. Industrial uses may result in localized impacts from equipment operation. The nearest cumulative projects to the proposed development area are proposed at the existing northern terminus of the Summit Avenue public right-of-way, approximately 1,200 feet from the nearest on-site development area. Therefore, noise from operation of the proposed project is unlikely to combine with noise from operation of cumulative projects. A cumulative impact would not occur related to operational noise.

Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels. A cumulative permanent ambient noise impact would occur if development associated with cumulative regional land use projects would result in an increase in ambient noise that would exceed the City's noise standards. Buildout of the proposed project, along with the cumulative projects and buildout of the Santee General Plan, would result in increases in traffic that would

cumulatively increase traffic noise. An individual project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact if the increase in noise attributable to the proposed project would cause a roadway to exceed the applicable noise standards or would be 3 dBA or higher on a roadway that would exceed the threshold without the proposed project. The potential noise impacts that would result from cumulative projects and regional growth are included in the Year 2035 scenario.

EIR Table 4.12-19 compares Year 2035 traffic noise levels to existing conditions. The proposed project's contribution to cumulative noise impacts is based on the increase in traffic noise attributable to the proposed project under the Year 2035 scenario. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable noise level increase on three impacted roadways of Fanita Parkway. Specifically, the proposed project's contribution to noise level at a new roadway is enough to push the noise level over the applicable threshold compared to conditions without the proposed project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative roadway noise impact.

Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measure **NOI-6** would reduce noise levels to receptors on the western side of Fanita Parkway to below the normally acceptable noise level for sensitive receptors (65 dBA Ldn). Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure **NOI-6**, the proposed project's contribution to a significant cumulative traffic noise impact would be reduced but not to below a cumulatively considerable level. This impact would be cumulatively considerable and unavoidable. (EIR, § 4.12.6.1.)

Vibration. Similar to noise effects, vibration is a localized phenomenon and is progressively reduced as the distance from the source increases. Therefore, the area of projects that would be considered for the vibration cumulative analysis would be only those projects close to the project site. Vibration levels from typical construction would attenuate to below 80 VdB approximately 75 feet from the active construction area, and blasting from vibration would attenuate to 80 VdB approximately 235 feet from the construction area. Due to the length of the construction period for the proposed project, it is likely that construction of multiple cumulative projects would occur simultaneously with the proposed project.

The nearest cumulative projects are proposed at the existing northern terminus of the Summit Avenue public right-of-way, approximately 1,200 feet from the nearest on-site development area. Therefore, vibration from on-site construction is unlikely to combine with vibration from construction of the proposed project. One cumulative project would potentially be within 235 feet of the proposed Cuyamaca Street extension: the Santee View Estates project proposed north of the existing terminus of Cuyamaca Street. Similar to the proposed project, construction of this cumulative project would occur over a large area so that exposure of individual receptors to construction vibration would vary depending on the location of construction activities during a certain day or phase. Construction would only occur within 235 feet of the proposed Cuyamaca Street extension for a limited time. Due to the linear nature of the construction of the Cuyamaca Street, it is unlikely that construction noise from the two projects would combine

simultaneously such that impacts from both projects would affect the same receptor. Distance between projects would reduce impacts to a less than significant cumulative impact. Once constructed, the proposed land use would not generate a significant source of vibration during normal operation. Therefore, a significant cumulative vibration impact would not occur. (EIR, § 4.12.6.2.)

Aircraft Noise. No additional aviation uses are planned to be introduced in the immediate vicinity of the project site. In addition, the proposed project does not propose any new or air traffic patterns. No NSLUs would be exposed to excessive noise levels from aviation as a result of the proposed project. Impacts related to nuisance noise within noise contour areas are site specific and are not cumulative in nature. Therefore, a cumulative impact related to aircraft noise would not occur. (EIR, § 4.12.6.3.)

N. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Inducement of Substantial Population Growth. The region's population growth is accounted for in SANDAG's population projections for the municipalities in the County and within the individual municipalities' general plans. A significant cumulative impact related to population growth would occur if the development of cumulative projects would induce a population increase not accommodated by SANDAG's projections for the City, which are based on the adopted Santee General Plan. The City has experienced a steady population growth trend since 2012 and is forecasted to continue to increase its population steadily through 2035. Of the 55 cumulative projects identified in EIR Table 4-2, more than half (28) propose residential development (e.g., single- and multi-family, condominiums, townhomes). Most of these projects would be consistent with the Santee General Plan and have been accounted for in regional growth forecasts. A few projects, such as Weston, would require annexation to the City or a General Plan Amendment to be consistent with the Santee General Plan. This growth would be consistent with the City's historical population growth trends. Therefore, cumulative projects would not have the potential to cause unplanned population growth, and a significant cumulative impact would not occur.

The project site has been historically designated for residential development ranging from 1,395 to 14,000 residential units. The state and the County recognize a prominent housing deficit, and the provision of new housing on the project site would be considered growth accommodating and would represent a regional benefit. In addition, the proposed project would satisfy the RHNA requirements for above moderate housing set forth in the Santee General Plan Housing Element. When considered in combination with other cumulative projects, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

With regard to cumulative indirect inducement of substantial population growth in an area, cumulative projects in the San Diego region could contribute to the indirect inducement of population growth through the extension of streets or other infrastructure as a result of unplanned development. However, cumulative projects would be required to comply with City or County requirements to provide new streets or utility improvements, as needed, to serve new populations. The construction of new streets or infrastructure

projects would be subject to environmental review documentation pursuant to CEQA, as well as analysis of those projects for consistency with the goals, policies, and recommendations of applicable planning documents. In general, compliance with federal, state, and local regulations would preclude indirect population growth impacts associated with new construction of, or improvements to, streets or infrastructure projects. A significant cumulative impact would not occur without implementation of the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in a significant indirect impact associated with substantial population growth. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.13.6.1.)

Displacement of People or Housing. With regard to displacement of housing and people, cumulative project development in the region is likely to result in the displacement of housing and people. However, due to the increase in density and need for housing in the region, cumulative projects resulting in displacement are likely to replace the lost housing with even more housing, such as the River Village and Prospect Fields residential development projects. However, the proposed project would not result in the displacement of housing or people and would not contribute incrementally to these potential impacts. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.13.6.2.)

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire Protection Services. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to fire protection services is the City near the project site, where facilities that may serve the project site are located. A significant cumulative impact would occur if growth associated with cumulative projects would outpace the SFD's ability to expand and serve new development, resulting in adverse effects from increased response times, physical deterioration of existing facilities, or lack of funding for the development of future facilities. Population increases in the City can be anticipated to continue, even without the proposed project. The City's population increased over 8 percent from 2010 through 2019 (DOF 2019). Continued population increases are anticipated from cumulative project development and could, over time, impact the SFD's capacity to provide response within the City's response time standard. As the City continues to grow, additional fire response resources would become necessary.

As additional development occurs in the City, increases in the demand for fire protection would likely require improvements to fire protection services. However, these and other cumulative projects would undergo discretionary review by local agencies and would be required to conform with applicable adopted land use plans, which are used as the basis to plan for adequate fire protection services. In addition, fire protection facilities would be provided for new development through property taxes, developer agreements, and other general fund revenue sources. Therefore, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact.

The proposed project would provide a fully staffed and equipped fire station on site to serve the proposed project and neighboring areas of the City. The proposed project

would not result in the need for additional fire protection facilities off site. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.14.6.1.)

Police Protection Services. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative demand for police protection services and facilities is the SDCSD service area, which includes facilities in the City that would serve project site. A significant cumulative impact related to adverse effects on existing police protection services would occur if the development of future cumulative projects were to result in adverse effects on the SDCSD from either increased response times, physical deterioration of existing facilities, or lack of funding for the development of future facilities. As additional development occurs in the County, increases in the demand for police protection services would most likely require improvements to police protection facilities. However, these and other cumulative projects would undergo discretionary review by local agencies and would be required to conform with applicable adopted land use plans, which are used as the basis to plan for adequate police protection services. In addition, police protection facilities would be provided for new development through property taxes, developer agreements, and other general fund revenue sources. Therefore, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact.

The ratio of officers to population in Santee is 2.5 full-time deputies per 1,000 residential units, which is higher than the County average, which requires the provision of one patrol position per 10,000 residents. Based on this ratio, the proposed project would be required to provide approximately 7.4 or 7.5 new sheriff's deputies, with the preferred land use plan with school or with the land use plan without school, respectively, to serve the proposed project. However, actual overall staff needed as a result of the proposed project would be discussed as a contractual commitment between both the City and SDCSD. The Village Center land use designation in Fanita Commons allows a law enforcement satellite office. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.14.6.2.)

School Facilities. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to schools is the SSD and GUHSD service area boundaries, which provide school services for school-age children in the City and the region. A significant cumulative impact related to adverse effects on school services would occur if future cumulative projects would generate an increase in population that would exceed the SSD and GUHSD educational standards and result in degraded school facilities and services. Increased housing generates increased demand for schools, which could result in the need for new or expanded schools. School projects would be subject to CEQA, which would require they mitigate significant impacts to the environment. In addition, future developments would be required to pay school impact mitigation fees in accordance with SB 50 for facility expansion and upgrades needed to serve new students. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact would not occur without implementation of the proposed project.

The School Overlay within Fanita Commons designates a site for a potential school or other educational uses. If pursued by the SSD, the site could accommodate a K–8 grade school with up to 700 students, including new students generated by development of the project site. If a school is not built, adequate school facilities would be provided at

existing schools through the payment of school fees. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.14.6.3.)

Libraries. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regards to library services is defined as the service area for the San Diego County Library (SDCL) system, which is the County. The County identifies more than half of the libraries, including the Santee branch library, as considered to be in a space deficit. Therefore, a potentially significant impact related to adverse effects on library services would occur if future cumulative projects were to result in adverse effects on the SDCL facilities from physical deterioration of existing facilities or lack of funding for the development of future facilities consistent with the County's library space goal. Cumulative projects identified in EIR Table 4-2, in combination with the proposed project would exacerbate the need for library facilities due to the SDCL already being in a space deficit. The County plans for expansion and growth of its library system based on the adopted planning documents of the jurisdictions that it serves, including the City. In addition, the SDCL system has created a Strategic Plan that identifies goals that involve financial management and fundraising strategies so that library facilities can be enhanced in the future. Therefore, cumulative projects would not result in a potentially significant cumulative impact.

The proposed project would contribute to the need for additional library space to serve the residents it would generate. The City has identified the need for an expanded library facility in its Five-Year Budget (Fiscal Years 2020 through 2024). Once a site is identified and plans are prepared, this facility would undergo its own separate environmental evaluation. Any identified significant impacts would be required to be mitigated to the extent feasible. In addition, the proposed project includes a Village Center land use designation that would allow for a mix of uses, including civic uses, which do not preclude a library. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.14.6.4.)

P. RECREATION

Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities. The geographic context for increased use of existing Neighborhood and Regional Parks or other recreational facilities is the City and adjacent communities. The cumulative projects in the City and adjacent communities, such as the 75-unit multi-family development (Prospect Fields) at Canyon Road and Halberns Boulevard or the 82-unit single-family residential unit (River Village) at Beck Drive and Cuyamaca Street, would increase the use of existing Neighborhood and Regional Parks or other recreational facilities. In general, cumulative projects in the region would result in a net increase in population using recreational facilities in the City and adjacent communities. However, as previously discussed, the City currently has a surplus of parks. In addition, all projects subject to Section 12.40 of the Santee Municipal Code are required to dedicate land or pay a fee in lieu of dedication, which would provide funding for additional parks and recreational facilities to satisfy demand from future population growth and funding for maintenance of those facilities. Both of these would be a condition of project approval, and the City would verify land dedication prior to the approval of the final map or payment of fees prior to the issuance of any building permits (Section 12.40 of the Santee Municipal Code). Thus, a significant cumulative impact

associated with the deterioration of parks and recreational facilities would not occur. In addition, the proposed project would develop additional parks and recreational facilities within the City to accommodate the proposed project's anticipated population growth. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (Draft Revised EIR, § 4.15.6.1.)

Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities. The geographic context for construction or expansion of new recreational facilities is the City and adjacent communities. Residential cumulative projects listed in EIR Table 4-2, such as Prospect Fields and River Village, would increase the number of people using recreational facilities and could result in the combined need for new or expanded recreational facilities. In addition to the parkland and trails proposed by the proposed project, Padre Dam Municipal Water District's future Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve Expansion Project and others would provide additional recreational area to the City and its growing residential population. The Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve Expansion Project is a part of Padre Dam Municipal Water District's Dynamic Vision Plan to expand parks and recreation opportunities in the district while generating revenue for the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve and showcasing the benefits of water recycling (PDMWD 2016). This expansion project remains in the design phase as of early 2020 and is planned for future development. Any new or expanded recreational facilities in the City and surrounding communities would require environmental review and potential mitigation as required under CEQA. It is reasonable to expect that these projects, like the proposed project, would comply with CEQA, and any project-specific impacts identified with the construction of these facilities would be mitigated to the extent feasible. Due to the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality, noise, and transportation, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities under the proposed project would contribute to the significant impacts identified for these environmental issues. Therefore, in combination with other cumulative projects, the proposed project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact related to the construction or expansion of new recreational facilities. The proposed project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.15.6.2.)

Q. TRANSPORTATION

Circulation System Performance. Some of the cumulative impacts associated with increases in traffic and exceedance of LOS standards are significant and unavoidable due to infeasibility of mitigation measures. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative LOS traffic impact after mitigation. (Draft Revised EIR, § 4.16.6.1.)

Vehicle Miles Traveled. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to inducing substantial VMT is the list of projects in EIR Table 4-2. All but two of these projects are located within the Santee General Plan and would be generally consistent with the goals and objectives of the policies within this plan. A majority of these projects are located in an urban area with access to multimodal pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks within the City. However, cumulative projects

would still exceed the Citywide VMT per capita. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact could occur.

The proposed project would result in substantial additional VMT that would exceed the Citywide average under all scenarios. A TDM Plan (Mitigation Measure **AIR-6**) would be implemented to reduce the number of single-rider vehicle trips generated by the proposed project; however, it would not reduce the project's impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, in combination with other cumulative projects, the proposed project would contribute to a significant VMT impact. The project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.16.6.2.)

Hazards Due to Design Features. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to transportation hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses consists of the projects listed in EIR Table 4-2. Each project would be required to comply with all design guidelines and street requirements set forth by either the City or its overseeing jurisdiction to minimize exposure to street hazards. If necessary, it is assumed that the cumulative projects would be required to implement a Traffic Calming Plan to reduce traffic-related hazards similar to the proposed project. The proposed project's Traffic Calming Plan would include various traffic calming and safety measures such as roundabouts, raised crosswalks, and designated wildlife crossings. In addition, the proposed project would improve two Mobility Element streets and add multimodal capabilities, which would further service other cumulative projects within the City. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact would not occur and the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.16.6.3.)

Emergency Access. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to inadequate emergency access is the City and list of projects provided in EIR Table 4-2. Cumulative projects would be required to undergo separate CEQA review to implement measures necessary to mitigate any potential impacts to emergency access. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact would not occur. In addition, the proposed project would provide adequate emergency access that meets the City's and County's requirements and standards. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.16.6.4.)

R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to TCRs is considered to be the County. Cumulative projects located in the County have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with the loss of TCRs through development activities that could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR. These sites may contain artifacts and resources associated with tribal cultural values and religious beliefs. Any cumulative projects that involve ground-disturbing activities have the potential to result in significant impacts on TCRs. In the event TCRs are discovered, each individual project would be required to comply with the applicable regulatory requirements and the consultation requirements of SB 18 and AB 52, as applicable, to determine and mitigate any potential impacts to TCRs. Therefore, the cumulative

destruction of significant TCRs from planned construction and development projects in the San Diego region would not result in a significant cumulative impact.

The proposed project has the potential to encounter sensitive TCRs. Mitigation Measure **CUL-11** would reduce impacts to TCRs to less than significant by providing proper treatment and disposition of TCRs. In addition, Mitigation Measures **CUL-1** through **CUL-10** would reduce any potential significant impacts to known sites and unknown TCRs by training construction workers on potential cultural material discovery, employing a cultural resources mitigation and monitoring program, and requiring an archaeological and Native American monitor of Kumeyaay descent be present during all ground-disturbing activities to minimize impacts to buried TCRs. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (Revised EIR, § 4.4.6.4.)

S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

New or Expanded Service Systems. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities is the individual service provider's service area in the County. A significant cumulative impact would result if combined cumulative projects would require the need for new or expanded utilities or service systems facilities that cause significant environmental effects. To support regional growth, including the cumulative projects listed in EIR Table 4-2, new water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities would be constructed in the City and elsewhere in the region. A majority of these new facilities would connect to existing systems. These new facilities could result in new significant physical impacts on the environment, mostly associated with construction activities and placement within sensitive resource areas. It is reasonable to expect that these projects, like the proposed project, would comply with CEQA, and any project-specific impacts identified with the construction of these facilities would be mitigated to the extent feasible. Due to the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality, noise, and transportation, the construction or expansion of utilities or service systems under the proposed project would contribute to the significant impacts identified for these environmental issues. Therefore, in combination with other cumulative projects, the proposed project would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact related to the construction or expansion of new utilities or service systems. The proposed project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. EIR, § 4.17.6.1.)

Water Supplies. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regards to water supply is the PDMWD water service area. A significant cumulative impact would occur if the combination of existing and future projects occurring in the PDMWD service area would result in insufficient water supplies, resulting in the need for new or expanded entitlements. PDMWD's 2015 UWMP evaluates the sufficiency of water supplies to accommodate future growth and ensure long-term reliability for the region, including the identification of alternative water supply sources to alleviate the risk of unforeseen water shortages. The 2015 UWMP takes into account regional population growth and future supplies, including supply development and conservation.

To address regional demand, PDMWD requires projects of a certain size to prepare WSAs, in accordance with SB 610, which takes into consideration new demands for potable water and whether those demands have been accounted for in the regional growth forecasts used to project demand in the 2015 UWMP. Projects that are not included in the regional growth forecasts are accounted for in the regional water supply plans through use of the AFG demand increment in the SDCWA's 2015 UWMP. The AFG component would account for a portion of SANDAG's estimated residential land use development that is currently projected to occur beyond the SDCWA's 2040 planning horizon but that has the potential to move forward on an accelerated schedule. The purpose of the AFG component of the demand forecast is to estimate, on a regional basis, additional demand associated with projects not yet included in local jurisdictions' general plans and to plan for additional sufficient regional supplies to reliably meet the water demand of those projects (such as the proposed project).

As documented in PDMWD's 2015 UWMP, the SDCWA is planning to meet future and existing demands, which include the demand increment associated with the AFG. Part of the SDCWA toolkit in these projections consists of WSAs prepared for applicable projects. The SDCWA would assist its member agencies in tracking the agency-provided certified EIRs that include WSAs, which use the AFG demand increment to demonstrate adequate supplies for the development. In addition, similar to the proposed project, prior to approval, all cumulative projects in the City would be required to demonstrate water and sewer availability by submitting water and sewer availability forms to the City that are signed by PDMWD. Therefore, in combination, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to water supply.

According to the WSA conducted for the proposed project, demand totals for the project site could exceed supplies available by PDMWD in single dry and multiple dry years. However, the additional project demands would be supplied by the SDCWA through the AFG component of the 2015 UWMP because the SDCWA has confirmed that it can meet the additional demand associated with the proposed project in normal, single dry, and multiple dry years, provided that the water shortage contingency planning measures identified in the PDMWD 2015 UWMP and SDCWA 2015 UWMP are implemented in dry years. In addition, PDMWD is developing the ECAWP Program. Phase 1 of the ECAWP Program would have the ability to provide up to 12,880 AFY to augment PDMWD supply. This additional supply could result in a decrease in needed SDCWA imported water supply beginning in 2025 or could be used to augment PDMWD supplies. However, this program is not necessary for PDMWD to meet the demand associated with the proposed project. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact would not occur and the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.17.6.2.)

Wastewater Treatment. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts related to wastewater treatment capacity is the PDMWD wastewater service area. A significant cumulative impact would occur if the combined cumulative projects identified in Chapter 4 of the EIR would result in inadequate wastewater treatment capacity. The Ray Stoyer WRF has the capacity to treat up to 2,240 AFY of wastewater generated within the region. Further, there are plans to expand the existing PDMWD

influent pump station and Ray Stoyer Water Treatment Facility through the ECAWP Program, described previously. If approved, this program would increase the capacity of the wastewater system to approximately 6,725 AFY by 2040.

Because PDMWD has the current capacity to treat up to 2,240 AFY and pass additional wastewater on to Point Loma Water Treatment Plant for treatment, and the planned ECAWP Program would increase the wastewater treatment system to 6,725 AFY by 2040, it is anticipated that there would be adequate capacity to receive and treat wastewater from future development occurring in the City, including the proposed project site and associated cumulative projects. Therefore, in combination, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to wastewater capacity. Since the proposed project's future demand of 662 AFY of wastewater treatment under the proposed project would be adequately served by PDMWD, the proposed project's contribution to regional wastewater treatment capabilities would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.17.6.3.)

Solid Waste Generation. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts related to solid waste is the County landfill system. Implementation of the proposed project, as well as other regional off-site development, would increase the amount of solid waste produced in the region. However, there are extensive regulations and waste management programs in place at the state and local levels focused on increasing diversion and conversion of waste into the future. Most cumulative projects would undergo CEQA review similar to the proposed project. This process would include verifying with Sycamore Landfill that there is adequate capacity to accept trash and recycling for the cumulative projects. Therefore, in combination, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to solid waste generation.

Based on a service letter provided by Waste Management, Inc., the service provider is capable of adequately serving the proposed project and would not need additional services or expanded facilities to do so. Additionally, based on existing capacity, remaining capacity, and disposal rates, Sycamore Landfill has available capacity to accept trash from the project site. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact would not occur and the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.17.6.4.)

Solid Waste Regulations. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts related to compliance with solid waste regulations is the San Diego region. Implementation of the proposed project, as well as other cumulative development, would increase the amount of solid waste produced in the region. However, there are extensive regulations and waste management programs in place at the state and local levels focused on increasing diversion and conversion of waste into the future. Waste and recycling, including construction waste and recycling, would comply with CALGreen and current regulations, such as SB 1374 designed to divert waste from landfills. Effective January 1, 2017, in all jurisdictions, the owners/builder of construction projects will be required to divert 65 percent of the construction waste materials. In addition, the operation of future projects would be required to comply with the mandates identified in AB 939 and AB 1826, which set requirements for waste diversion as well as solid waste and organic

waste programs. Cumulative projects would be required to comply with state and local solid waste regulations. Therefore, in combination, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact.

The proposed project would comply with the same state and local regulations as the cumulative projects. This includes the Santee Municipal Code, Section 9.04.080, which requires that any covered project submit a completed C&D debris management plan identifying waste materials expected to be generated as a result of the proposed project at the time of demolition or building permit application as well as AB 939. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with state and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. A significant cumulative impact would not occur and the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (EIR, § 4.17.6.5.)

T. WILDFIRE

Emergency Response Plan. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts regarding impairing an emergency response plan or evacuation plan is the areas in the City surrounding the project site, where these plans would apply. Cumulative impacts from multiple projects within the SFD's jurisdiction can cause fire response service decline and impede emergency evacuation plans. For example, several cumulative projects presented in Table 4-2, Cumulative Projects, in Chapter 4 of the Draft Revised EIR are projects within the SFD's jurisdiction that would have the potential to result in impacts to emergency response and evacuation plans. These projects include the GA Development subdivision, Carlton Oaks Country Club, Walker Trails, and others. Development of the proposed project, in combination with these cumulative projects, would result in a potentially significant cumulative impact if it is not consistent with the County's Emergency Operations Center emergency response plans and evacuation plans, including the City's EOP.

The project's FPP, CFPP, and Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan were prepared to ensure the community would be built to withstand significant fire, provide residents with at least two evacuation routes that lead to at least three major arteries, and offer the contingency option to emergency planners and responders of temporarily refuging persons on site if considered safer than evacuating (see Appendices P1 and P2 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). The project's Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan was developed to meet City and County requirements and prevent any conflicts with current evacuation plans. Details of the emergency access routes are described in the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan and were designed to comply with current and future population growth, roadway conditions, and access availability.

Furthermore, the only proposed through routes on the project site would loop between Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street and would not, in combination with other projects, affect emergency response and evacuation plans elsewhere in the City. The project streets configuration and evacuation plan described in the project's Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan provides evacuation routes to the north (once off site), south, east, and west depending on the nature of the emergency. The roadways and evacuation routes

designed for the proposed project would provide connections to major regional transportation corridors, including indirectly to SR-52 to the south, southwest, and southeast; SR-67 to the east and northeast; I-125 to the south; and I-15 to the west, to move residents out of the City, avoiding conflicts with emergency response or evacuation efforts in other areas of the City.

Additionally, it is anticipated that future development projects would undergo CEQA review of potential impacts on adopted emergency response or evacuation plans and be required to implement measures necessary to mitigate potential impacts. As a result, cumulative impacts related to interference with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with a conflict with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.6.1.)

Pollutant Concentrations. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to exacerbating wildfire risks and exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire is the project site and immediately surrounding area where the effects of potential pollutant exposure could occur. Cumulative impacts from multiple projects or large projects within the immediate area could exacerbate wildfire risk by exposing occupants to harmful pollutants, primarily during construction. For example, several cumulative projects presented in the Draft Revised EIR Table 4-2 are immediately adjacent to the project site that would have the potential to result in impacts to occupants from exposure to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire as a result of exacerbated fire risk. These projects include the GA Development subdivision, Santee View Estates, Calvary Chapel, and others. Similar to the proposed project, these cumulative projects would be required to comply with the latest ignition-resistant building codes found in Chapter 7A of the California Building Code, as adopted by City, and any additional restrictions or requirements adopted locally by the SFD.

The proposed project's FPP (Appendix P1 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) contemplated the slope and wind conditions of the project site and designed fire protection features that are site specific and focused on protecting the proposed project's buildings and residents while simultaneously minimizing the likelihood for on-site fire to burn off site into open space. The proposed project's fire protection features identified in the FPP would reduce potential impacts related to project occupant wildfire exposure due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors.

The proposed project would use pre-planning techniques and construction measures, including implementing the project's CFPP (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR), providing proper wildfire awareness, reporting, and suppression training to construction personnel, which would avoid any construction-related wildfire impacts. In addition, the proposed project would be designed to adhere to the most recent ignition-resistant building codes applicable to developments in VHFHSZs, including defensibility features, fire protection systems, and emergency access routes. Therefore, cumulative projects, including the proposed project, would be constructed and designed to minimize wildfire risk and would not exacerbate wildfire risk resulting in the

exposure of project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire. A significant cumulative impact would not occur, and the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.6.2.)

Installation of Association Infrastructure. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts from the project requiring the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment is the project site and immediately surrounding area. Cumulative impacts from multiple projects or large projects within the immediate area could exacerbate wildfire risk and expose occupants to environmental impacts from the infrastructure required to serve these projects. For example, several cumulative projects presented in the Draft Revised EIR Table 4-2 are projects located immediately adjacent to the project site that would have the potential to result in impacts from installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbated fire risk. These projects include the GA Development subdivision, Santee View Estates, Calvary Chapel, and others. Due to their proximity, an impact could occur if all of these projects were to install infrastructure that would exacerbate fire risk.

New infrastructure associated with the proposed project and other cumulative projects would be required to comply with the necessary regulations to minimize fire risks. These regulations include the Santee Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 570, Chapter 11.18, California Fire Code) or the current fire and building codes at the time of Vesting Tentative Map approval; the 2019 California Building Code, Chapter 7A; 2019 California Fire Code, Chapter 49; 2019 California Referenced Standards Code Chapter 1-7A; and 2019 California Residential Code, Section R327, as adopted by the City. These regulations require projects to construct ignition-resistant structures and provide FMZs, fire apparatus access, water availability, and other requirements. In addition, the proposed project would exceed fire prevention regulations by providing a CFPP, code-exceeding FMZs, FMZ inspections, fire-resistant landscaping plan, and HOA wildfire education and outreach. Therefore, cumulative projects, including the proposed project, would not result in a significant cumulative impact associated with exacerbated fire risk from the installation or maintenance of infrastructure. The proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.6.3.)

Flooding or Landslides. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts that would 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, is the proposed project site and immediate surrounding area. Several cumulative projects in the Draft Revised EIR Table 4-2 are projects in the areas immediately surrounding the project site, such as the GA Development subdivision, Santee View Estates, Calvary Chapel, and others. Due to their proximity, a cumulative impact could occur if post-fire conditions, such as hillside instability on the project site or surrounding areas, caused a landslide or flooding to occur.

Construction of projects considered in the cumulative analysis would involve grading and other earthmoving activities that could result in temporary and short-term localized soil erosion or landslides. However, these site-specific impacts are not expected to combine with the effects of other surrounding project activities because cumulative projects would be required to comply with existing regulations, including adherence to stormwater management requirements, and associated BMPs. These required measures would control erosion and construction-related contaminants at each construction site.

After buildout, the irrigated and maintained landscaping in the proposed project would be ignition resistant and not expected to be burned or removed entirely should a fire occur on the proposed project site. Project development and associated design features would reduce the likelihood of flooding or landslides prior to or following a fire event because complete removal and exposure of erodible soils would be unlikely to occur. Considering these project site features and characteristics in combination with adherence to existing regulations, compliance with stormwater management requirements, and associated BMPs, post-fire conditions on the project site are not expected to combine with other cumulative projects and increase risks associated with runoff and erosion. Therefore, the proposed project impacts related to flooding or landslides as a result of fire would not be cumulatively considerable. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.6.4.)

Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plan is the City. Construction and operation associated with cumulative development could result in activities that could interfere with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans, such a temporary construction barricades or other obstructions that could impede emergency access. Cumulative impacts from multiple projects within the SFD's jurisdiction listed in Table 4-2, Cumulative Projects, in Chapter 4 of the Draft Revised EIR can cause fire response service decline and impede emergency evacuation plans. These projects may include the GA Development subdivision, Carlton Oaks Country Club, Walker Trails, and others. Development of the proposed project, in combination with these cumulative projects, would potentially impact and conflict with adopted emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans. The project's FPP, CFPP, and Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan were prepared to ensure the community would be built to withstand significant fire, provide residents multiple evacuation routes, and offer the contingency option to emergency planners and responders of temporarily refuging persons on site, if considered safer than evacuating (Appendices P1 and P2 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR). The project's Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan was developed to meet City and County requirements and prevent any conflicts with current evacuation plans. Details of the emergency access routes are described in Appendix P2 and were designed to comply with current and future population growth, roadway conditions, and access availability. Further, the only proposed through routes on the project site would loop between Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street on site and would not, in combination with other projects, affect emergency response and evacuation plans elsewhere in the City. The project street configuration and evacuation plan outlined in the project's Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (Appendix P2) provides evacuation routes to the north (once off site), south, east, and west depending on the nature of the

emergency. The roadways and evacuation routes designed for the proposed project provide connections to major regional traffic corridors including indirectly to SR-52 to the south, southwest, and southeast; SR-67 to the east and northeast; I-125 to the south; and I-15 to the west to move residents out of the City, thereby avoiding conflicts with emergency response or evacuation efforts in other areas of the City. Additionally, it is anticipated that future development projects would undergo CEQA review of potential impacts on adopted emergency response or evacuation plans and be required to implement measures necessary to mitigate potential impacts. As a result, cumulative impacts related to interference with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable under CEQA. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.6.5.)

Wildland Fires. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to wildland fire risk is the City near the project site. Throughout the City, projects are required to comply with the California Fire Code and the California Building Code. These regulations help reduce the spread of wildfires in the City by providing for ignition-resistant construction of new buildings. New structures incorporate ignition-resistant features and construction methods to minimize the possibility that they ignite. Further, new development projects result in the removal of available flammable fuels for wildfire to consume and break up fuel continuity. The fire protection features of new projects render them less vulnerable to wildfire damage and give fire suppression resources greater opportunity to contain and control a wildfire than older unprotected structures. Evacuation of cumulative projects within the City would occur consistent with City and County evacuation practices, including County EOP Annex Q, which coordinate evacuation response and provide for targeted evacuation to minimize vehicle congestion. The project has prepared an FPP (Appendix P1 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR) that addresses the project's specific risk for wildfire impacts. The FPP describes that the project incorporates numerous features to reduce wildfire impacts through extensive FMZs, design features, ignition-resistant building construction, ember protection, landscaping standards, and operational evacuation and temporary refuge procedures. Additionally, the project is required to adhere to California and City Fire Code standards for construction and land development. Based on the FPP (Appendix P1 of Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR), associated landscaping plans, and implementation FMZs, the project's contribution to a potential cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable under CEQA. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.6.6.)

Fire Protection Services. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to fire protection services is the City near the project site, where facilities that may serve the project site are located. A significant cumulative impact would occur if growth associated with cumulative projects would outpace the SFD's ability to expand and serve new development, resulting in adverse effects from increased response times, physical deterioration of existing facilities, or lack of funding for the development of future facilities. Population increases in the City can be anticipated to continue, even without the proposed project. The City's population increased over 8 percent from 2010 through 2019 (DOF 2019). Continued population increases are anticipated from cumulative project development and could, over time, impact the SFD's capacity to provide response within

the City's response time standard. As the City continues to grow, additional fire response resources would become necessary. As additional development occurs in the City, increases in the demand for fire protection would likely require improvements to fire protection services. However, these and other cumulative projects would undergo discretionary review by local agencies and would be required to conform with applicable adopted land use plans, which are used as the basis to plan for adequate fire protection services. In addition, fire protection facilities would be provided for new development through property taxes, developer agreements, and other general fund revenue sources. Therefore, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact. The project would provide a fully staffed and equipped fire station on site to serve the proposed project and neighboring areas of the City. The project would not result in the need for additional fire protection facilities off site. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable under CEQA. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.6.7.)

Inadequate Emergency Access. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regard to inadequate emergency access is the City and list of projects provided in Table 4-2, Cumulative Projects, in Chapter 4 of the Draft Revised EIR. This impact is adequately addressed in Section 4.18.6.5 of the Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR. Cumulative projects would be required to undergo separate CEQA review to implement measures necessary to mitigate any potential impacts to emergency access. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact would not occur. In addition, the proposed project would provide adequate emergency access that meets the City's and County's requirements and standards. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable under CEQA. (Recirculated Sections of Final Revised EIR, § 4.18.6.8.)

SECTION VI: FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, require that an EIR address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur should the project be implemented. Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if any of the following would occur:

- The project would involve a large commitment of non-renewable resources;
- The primary and secondary impacts of the project would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents; or
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified.

Development of the proposed project would result in the commitment of the project site to residential and community serving uses. Restoration of the project site to pre-

developed conditions would not be feasible given the degree of disturbance, the urbanization of the area, and the level of capital investment that would result from implementation of the proposed project. In general, conversion of a portion of the project site from undeveloped land to urbanized uses (paved roadways and graded lots with structures and landscaping) would represent a permanent, irreversible change to the project site. Project construction and maintenance of the buildings and infrastructure proposed would require the commitment of energy, natural resources, and building materials. Nonrenewable and limited resources that would be consumed with project development would include oil, natural gas, gasoline, lumber, sand and gravel, asphalt, aggregate, water, steel, and similar materials. Nonrenewable fuels would be used by construction equipment, haul trucks, and worker vehicles. Nonrenewable energy also would be expended during the harvesting and on-site reuse of natural resources such as wood and aggregate and during the subsequent manufacturing of construction materials such as wood framing and concrete. This commitment of resources and energy would be commensurate with that of other projects of similar size but would nevertheless be irretrievable. Post-construction consumption of nonrenewable resources would include the use of electricity, natural gas, and water by project residents, employees, and visitors. This energy use would be a long-term commitment and irretrievable but not wasteful given the many sustainable features of the proposed project.

SECTION VII: GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to discuss the ways the Project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e), a Project would be considered to have a growth-inducing effect if it would:

- Directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing in the surrounding environment;
- Remove obstacles to population growth (e.g., construction of an infrastructure expansion to allow for more construction in service areas);
- Tax existing community service facilities, requiring the construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects; or
- Encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.

In addition, CEQA Guidelines state that growth inducement must not be assumed.

The proposed project would develop a new residential community consisting of approximately 2,949 housing units under the preferred land use plan with school or 3,008 units under the land use plan without school and up to 80,000 square feet of commercial uses, parks, open space, and agriculture uses. This would result in a population increase of approximately 7,974 persons under the preferred land use plan with school or 8,145 persons under the land use plan without school, increasing the City's 2019 population of

58,408 to 66,382 or 66,553, respectively, at project buildout. The San Diego Association of Governments' population projections for the City are based on the adopted Santee General Plan. The current designation of the project site as Planned Development (PD) in the Santee General Plan Land Use Element and the identification of the site to provide 1,395 units in the Santee General Plan Housing Element demonstrate that the site has been planned for residential growth by the City (City of Santee 2013). Using the 2.9 persons per household multiplier, a development project of 1,395 units could result in a population increase of approximately 4,045 residents. The difference between the planned and proposed land uses, when translated to persons per household, is approximately 3,929 and 4,100 persons under the preferred land use plan with school and the land use plan without school, respectively.

However, the project site has been subject to land use planning for the past 40 years, indicating that this site was planned for development even before it was part of the City. In 1980, the project site was designated in the County of San Diego (County) General Plan for development of approximately 14,000 residential units. When the City adopted its first General Plan (1984), the project site was designated for a maximum of 8,100 residential units. The number of residential units proposed on the project site has continued to vary over the years, with many proposals greater than the 2,949 residential units currently proposed, indicating the project site has been intended for population growth by the City and the County for many decades. Further, the production of housing in California would need to be approximately 100,000 additional residential units annually to meet projected housing demand (HCD 2018). In the County, the San Diego Association of Governments projected that housing production at the regional level will not be able to keep pace with population growth in the coming years. Because new development in the County is constrained to the north by Camp Pendleton, to the west by the Pacific Ocean, and to the south by Mexico, the proposed project would be beneficial to County residents because it would contribute to the overall County housing stock. Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to begin in 2021 with a buildout of approximately 10 to 15 years. Thus, based on a conservative estimate and averaged over 10 years, the 7,974 to 8,145-person population increase would equate to approximately 797 to 815 new residents per year, which would be consistent with the City's historical population increases. In the context of the housing shortage currently experienced by the state and the San Diego region, the provision of new housing on the project site would be considered growth accommodating and would represent a regional benefit.

In addition, the San Diego Association of Governments' 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment has identified housing needs based on income level for the City. The Santee General Plan Housing Element lists the project site as the only source for above moderate income residential units (City of Santee 2013). Other sites are identified to meet Regional Housing Needs Assessment requirements for the other income levels. The proposed project would satisfy the Regional Housing Needs Assessment requirements for above moderate residential units and provide additional residential units to meet the anticipated future deficiencies in the City.

Further, the widening of State Route 52 from Cuyamaca Street to State Route 67 has contributed to the loss of housing in the City. This project resulted in the loss of

approximately 199 residential units as of 2006, which the proposed project would replace (Poucel 2006). Therefore, the preferred land use plan with school and land use plan without school would not contribute to unplanned population growth.

In addition to direct growth, additional indirect growth could occur as new businesses are established or existing businesses expand, thus creating new sources of employment. Increased industrial, commercial, and residential development typically generates a secondary or indirect demand for other services, such as groceries, entertainment, and medical services, that would stimulate economic activity. The proposed project involves private residential development, commercial, and recreational development and would generate jobs and economic activity. Based on a factor of 2.9 persons per household and 1.6 persons per Active Adult unit, the proposed project would be expected to generate approximately 7,974 to 8,145 persons within the expected 10- to 15-year buildout time frame of the proposed project. The additional population would increase activity in nearby retail establishments and generate demand for such services as child care, landscaping, gardening, pest control, home cleaning, and other maintenance services. The proposed project also proposes to develop approximately 80,000 square feet of commercial space and employment opportunities, which is expected to generate approximately 450 jobs under the preferred land use plan with school and approximately 200 jobs under the land use plan without school. In addition to the commercial facilities available on the project site, project residents are anticipated to frequent existing retail and commercial services already available in the City.

The Santee General Plan Update Market Analysis was performed concurrently with the development of the Santee General Plan EIR. The analysis found that the development of the project site would be a potential generator of sales tax for the City. It also concluded that developing the site is critical to the City's financial future because it would generate (in 2003 dollars) an estimated $39 million in retail sales, with an estimated $30 million staying in the City, and would provide a significant stock of housing, which would benefit the City's efforts to attract higher-end firms and employers (City of Santee 2003). Because this economic activity generated by the proposed project is the expected result of planning for the ultimate development of the City through the Santee General Plan, it would not result in a significant adverse impact. The proposed project is expected to result in increased economic activity in the City and the region.

In addition, the Planned Development (PD) land use designation in the Santee General Plan for the project site allows for a variety of mixed-use development types, including commercial uses. The Planned Development (PD) land use designation also allows for innovative and high-quality development and does not limit the extent or mix of development to occur, which allows greater flexibility to provide a variety of land uses. Thus, development of commercial uses on the project site resulting in economic growth is an expected and planned outcome of development of the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to unplanned economic growth inducement in the City.

The elimination of either physical or regulatory obstacles to growth is considered a growth-inducing impact. A physical obstacle to growth typically involves the lack of public service infrastructure. The proposed project would trigger growth if it would result

in infrastructure with excess capacity or if it would remove an obstacle to growth in an area, such as providing infrastructure that was previously not available. Infrastructure elements such as sewer and water lines, streets, and drainage facilities would connect the project site with existing development. The proposed extensions of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue are included in the Santee General Plan Mobility Element and would facilitate residential development contemplated in the Santee General Plan Land Use Element. Therefore, the planned extension of these streets would be growth accommodating because this growth is already planned for in the Santee General Plan.

Further, most adjacent undeveloped land is already constrained and protected from development; these areas include the Padre Dam Municipal Water District Ray Stoyer Water Recycling Facility, Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve, Goodan Ranch/Sycamore Canyon County Preserve, and Marine Corps Air Station Miramar. All of the proposed project's off-site utility and street connections would be south and west in developed areas of the City. Development of new infrastructure on the project site would not result in expansion to these areas. The proposed project would not eliminate any regulatory obstacles to growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in growth inducement due to the elimination of physical or regulatory obstacles to growth.

SECTION VIII: ALTERNATIVES

A. BACKGROUND

The EIR analyzed five alternatives to the Project as proposed and evaluated these alternatives for their ability to avoid or reduce the Project's significant environmental effects while also meeting the majority of the Project's objectives. The City finds that it has considered and rejected as infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR and described below. This section sets forth the potential alternatives to the Project analyzed in the EIR and evaluates them in light of the Project objectives, as required by CEQA.

Where significant impacts are identified, section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to consider and discuss alternatives to the proposed actions. Subsection (a) states:

> (a) An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting

> those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.

Subsection 15126.6(b) states the purpose of the alternatives analysis:

> (b) Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.

In subsection 15126.6(c), the State CEQA Guidelines describe the selection process for a range of reasonable alternatives:

> (c) The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the Project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

The range of alternatives required is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. Alternatives are limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project.

However, when a project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, the lead agency has no obligation to consider the feasibility of alternatives to lessen or avoid environmental impacts, even if the alternative would reduce the impact to a greater degree than the proposed project. (Pub. Res. Code § 21002; *Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521; *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 730-731; *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403.)

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following objectives have been established for the Project (EIR, § 6):

1. Create a new community with clustered development that provides residential, commercial, mixed-use, agricultural, and recreation land uses while preserving large blocks of significant natural open space areas as a habitat preserve dedicated to the City of Santee's Draft Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan for permanent preservation and management.

2. Provide a complementary and supportive array of land uses that would enable development of a community with a variety of housing types to address the state's current housing crisis.

3. Organize the development into villages with high-architectural-quality, mixed-use Village Centers focused on an agrarian and sustainability theme to create a unique identity and sense of community for each village.

4. Provide a range of recreational opportunities, including passive and active parks and recreational facilities, that promote an active and healthy lifestyle, are accessible to residents of the community and surrounding areas, and satisfy the City of Santee's park dedication requirements.

5. Provide an extensive system of pedestrian, bicycle, and hiking trails as a key community amenity that accommodates a variety of users, facilitates the enjoyment of the outdoor environment, and provides connections to local and regional parks and trails.

6. Incorporate a working farm and related agricultural uses into the community to provide community access to fresh, locally grown foods to promote wellness and a sustainable lifestyle.

7. Develop a sustainable community that incorporates current conservation technologies and strategies to achieve local, state, and federal goals to address global climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, including various modes of transportation and alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel.

8. Create a fire-safe community through a series of fire protection measures that incorporate fuel modification zones, fire-resistant landscape design, ignition-resistant building materials, fire alarm and sprinkler systems, and adequate ingress-egress points for emergency personnel and residents.

9. Implement major transportation components of the Santee General Plan Mobility Element by extending Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue to the planned development.

C. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS

The CEQA Guidelines state that an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Among factors used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in the EIR is the failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, infeasibility, or inability to avoid significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[c]). This section describes alternative concepts that were considered as alternatives to the proposed project but were rejected from further analysis, and the reason(s) underlying their rejection.

1. Consolidated Density Alternative

The Consolidated Density Alternative would include decreasing the development footprint while increasing the number of units on site. The three villages would still be constructed but would decrease individual lot sizes and eliminate many of the proposed project amenities. This would result in mid- to high-rise buildings on the project site as well as decreased commercial uses, parks, and open space within the village development area. This alternative was rejected from further analysis because the density would be out of character with the project site and its surroundings, it would increase significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, noise, recreation, transportation, and utilities and service systems and it would fail to meet a majority of the project objectives (1, 2, 3, 4, and 6). For example, increasing density on the project site would result in a higher project population, which would increase vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and associated air quality and GHG emissions. In addition, this alternative would not satisfy the project objectives associated with a variety of land uses, array of amenities, recreational opportunities, and agricultural uses because a condensed development footprint with additional housing would eliminate space for these uses. (EIR, § 6.1.1.)

2. Alternate Location

The Alternate Location Alternative would include building the proposed project in a different location from the current project site. Consideration would be given to various locations within the City of Santee (City) and County of San Diego (County). This alternative was ultimately rejected from further analysis because it would be considered infeasible as there is no site of similar size available in the City on which to locate the proposed project. In addition, this would require the applicant to gain ownership of additional property which is subject to market availability. The acquisition of land outside of the City limits would not be consistent with the Santee General Plan land use designation for the project site as Planned Development because the site would remain undeveloped under this alternative. (EIR, § 6.1.2.)

Finding: The City Council rejects both the Consolidated Density Alternative and the Alternate Location Alternative, on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the alternatives fail to meet the majority of the Project objectives; (2) the alternatives would likely not eliminate or further reduce any of the proposed project's significant impacts; and (3) the alternative sites are technically, financially, and legally infeasible given that the Project Applicant does not own other land that would accommodate the proposed Project and consolidating density on the Project site is out of character with the Project site and its surroundings. Therefore, the Consolidated Density Alternative and the Alternate Location Alternative are eliminated from further consideration.

D. ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

The alternatives selected for further detailed review within the EIR focus on alternatives that could lessen the Project's significant environmental impacts, while still meeting most of the basic Project objectives. Those alternatives include:

- No Project/No Build Alternative
- No Project/General Plan Consistency Alternative
- Modified Development Footprint Alternative
- No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative
- No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative

1. No Project/No Build Alternative

Description: Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, the proposed project would not be built nor would any other project be built on the project site. The 2,638-acre project site would remain in its existing undeveloped condition without management. This alternative would eliminate all of the significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed project. (EIR, § 6.2.1.)

Impacts: As the project site would remain in an undeveloped condition without management, Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative would result in less impacts as compared to the project in the following areas: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation (with the exception of emergency access), and utilities and service systems. Regarding hazards and hazardous materials, Alternative 1 would have no impacts regarding transport of hazardous materials, schools, hazardous material sites, airport safety, and potentially

significant but mitigable impact on hazardous releases. However, this alternative would have potentially greater impacts than the proposed project on emergency response and evacuation plans because improvements to Santee General Plan Mobility Element roadways and additional emergency access to the site would not occur. Under land use and planning, Alternative 1 would conflict with the Santee General Plan and the City's Zoning Ordinance because it would not implement the Planned Development (PD) designation and zone for the project site. The Santee General Plan currently allows up to 1,395 residential units on the project site and identifies 16 Guiding Principles for its development. Under this alternative, the planned development of the site would not occur. Therefore, the No Project/No Build Alternative would result in potentially greater impacts related to inconsistency with the Santee General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. As to wildfire impacts, under the No Project/No Build Alternative, impacts related to emergency response and evacuation plans would be greater because the proposed Mobility Element circulation system improvements to Fanita Parkway and off-site Cuyamaca Street and Magnolia Avenue would not be constructed, which would provide enhanced emergency response to existing community areas. However, this alternative would not have a need for evacuation from the project site in case of emergency because there would be no residents on the project site. This alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire and the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure because no people would occupy the site, eliminating the need for new infrastructure. In addition, this alternative would have less intensive but still less than significant impacts compared to the proposed project related to exposing people or structures to significant risks involving flooding or landslides due to post-fire slope stability or drainage changes because no alteration of the site would occur as opposed to the proposed project. However, because the project site would remain undeveloped, there would be no fire protection plan, fuel management zones, or managing entity maintaining the fuels on site. In addition, the new emergency access points at select dead-end streets under the proposed project would not be provided under this alternative. Therefore, the potential to expose existing residences to wildfires would be potentially greater under this alternative than the proposed project. (EIR, § 6.2.1.1 and Table 6-2.)

Project Objectives: The No Project/No Build Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives because no development of the project site would occur. Because clustered village development and other land uses would not be constructed, the proposed project would not extend the three

major Mobility Element streets planned for in the Santee General Plan. The project site would remain in its undeveloped state and would not be legally open to the public. Therefore, the proposed project would not provide a system of pedestrian, biking, and hiking trails for public use. Additionally, the proposed project would not benefit from large blocks of open space actively managed as Habitat Preserve because the site would remain unmanaged and continue to be susceptible to degradation over time. (EIR, § 6.2.1.2.)

Finding: The City Council rejects Alternative 1: No Project, on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the alternative fails to meet any of the project objectives; (2) the alternative would result in greater land use impacts, as well as emergency service impacts than the project; and (3) the alternative is infeasible as it would not implement the current Planned Development (PD) designation and zone for the project site consistent with the City's General Plan.

2. No Project/General Plan Consistency Alternative

Description: Under the No Project/General Plan Consistency Alternative, the project site would be developed consistent with the previously approved project in 2007 (i.e., the Barratt American Development Plan) consisting of four villages spread throughout the project site. The footprint would consist of three villages in the northern area of the site and one village in the southern area of the site, adjacent to existing development. It would include approximately 1,380 residential units with 15 live-work units, consistent with the Santee General Plan, which allows 1,395 residential units on the project site. A 46-acre Community Park in the northwestern area of the site would include a pedestrian-oriented Village Center and community-serving recreational resources. These resources would include a lake, a park, community centers, sports fields, and preserve areas. The land use plan would include 4.1 acres for a fire station but would not include Medium Density Residential, Active Adult, Village Center, School Overlay, or Agriculture Overlay land use designations or overlays. Approximately 1,465 acres of the site would be designated as Habitat Preserve to be protected and conserved consistent with the City's Draft MSCP Subarea Plan. Access to the site under this alternative would be through the northerly extensions of Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street. Fanita Parkway would be reconstructed from Mast Boulevard to the southerly project site boundary at the existing San Diego Gas & Electric transmission line.

This alternative was selected because it would reduce or eliminate the following significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed project: (1) air quality (consistency with the applicable air

quality plan, cumulative increase in criteria pollutant emissions), (2) noise (exceedance of noise standards), (3) recreation (construction or expansion of recreational facilities), (4) transportation (circulation system performance, VMT), and (5) utilities and service systems (new or expanded utilities or service systems). (EIR, § 6.2.2.)

Impacts: Alternative 2 would result in reduced impacts associated with air quality, energy, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, and utilities and service systems. The No Project/General Plan Consistency Alternative would have potentially greater impacts regarding aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, soils, paleontological resources, hydrology and water quality, and wildfire.

Regarding aesthetics, because development is proposed in the southern half of the project site near existing residential development, this alternative would result in more intensive but still less than significant visual impacts related to the change in character of the site and more intensive but still less than significant impacts to scenic vistas. In addition, potentially greater impacts than the proposed project on light and glare would occur due to new sources of light in the southern half of the site including exterior building illumination, residential lighting, parking lots, new landscaped areas, and new roadway lighting. This is a new impact that may require mitigation measures.

Regarding biological resources, this alternative would designate approximately 185 acres less for Habitat Preserve than the proposed project, increase edge effects, and decrease wildlife connectivity across the site. Therefore, impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status plant and wildlife species would be expected to be greater under this alternative. This alternative would also include development in the southern area of the site where high-quality coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*) habitat, previously occupied suitable habitat for Hermes copper butterfly (*Lycaena hermes*), and suitable habitat for Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*) occur. Because the footprint of this alternative would be larger than the proposed project, the alternative would have a greater impact on wildlife corridors. Due to the more spread-out configuration of the different villages under this alternative, it would provide limited opportunity for movement through the preserve area and limit regional connections.

Similarly, due to the approximately 185 acres larger project disturbance area, there would be potentially greater significant impacts to archeological resources, human remains, and tribal

cultural resources. The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) eligible known cultural sites CA-SDI-8243 and CA-SDI-8345 would be directly impacted under this alternative because development would be proposed on these sites. Due to the larger footprint and location of proposed development under this alternative, greater potentially significant but mitigable impacts would occur related to soil erosion and topsoil loss, geologic stability, and expansive soils. In addition, potentially greater significant impacts would occur regarding geologic stability due to the southern area of the site consisting of extensive landslide deposits where the southern village would be developed. Therefore, additional enhanced mitigation measures would be required to mitigate landslide impacts from the development of the southern village under this alternative. This alternative would include an additional village in the southern area of the site that would be located in an area with high paleontological sensitivity near existing residential development. Therefore, potentially greater impacts to paleontological resources would occur under this alternative.

Though it would include fewer residential units and commercial uses than the proposed project, development would be more spread out potentially causing greater disruption to the natural hydrology of the site. Construction and operation of this alternative would generate pollutants that could potentially degrade the surface water quality of downstream receiving waters. Therefore, this alternative could cause greater impacts on water quality standards and site drainage and hydrology and require new mitigation measures. In addition, this alternative could result in activities inundated by potential mudflows from landslide deposits in the southern portion of project site. Therefore, impacts related to mudflows would be greater than the proposed project and require new mitigation measures. In addition, potentially greater impacts would occur related to flooding or landslides as a result of post-fire stability or drainage changes due to the southern area of the project site containing extensive landslide deposits and being prone to slope failure. Under this alternative, this area would be extensively developed with a residential village. Numerous debris avalanches and debris slides of varying ages are present on these slopes. It is expected that such conditions could be exacerbated in a post-fire landscape where surface vegetation has been removed or burned and erosion potential increases. New mitigation measures would be required to address the increased potential for impacts in the southern area of the site and best management practices for erosion control in a post-fire landscape. (EIR, § 6.2.2.1 and Table 6-2.)

Project Objectives: The No Project/General Plan Consistency Alternative would

accomplish four of the nine project objectives (Project Objectives 4, 5, 7, and 8). This alternative would meet Project Objective 4 because it would provide community-serving recreational opportunities including a lake, a large central park, and sports fields and satisfy the City's park dedication requirements. This alternative would meet Project Objective 5 because it would provide a system of pedestrian, biking, and hiking trails that would connect with the regional system. Project Objective 7 would be met by this alternative because it would provide various sustainable features including energy-efficient buildings, water efficient systems, and electric-vehicle charging stations and outlets. This alternative would satisfy Project Objective 8 and create a fire-safe community through various fire protection measures including managed FMZs, fire-resistive landscaping, fire alarm and sprinkler systems, and active management of the Habitat Preserve. However, this alternative would not fulfill Project Objective 1 because it would not cluster development in one area of the project site or include agricultural land uses that promote access to local food sources. This alternative would only partially satisfy Project Objective 2 because it would not provide the Active Adult or Medium Density Residential land use, thus limiting the array of land uses that would enable development of a community with a variety of housing types. It would also provide approximately 1,554 fewer residential units to address the state's housing crisis. In addition, this alternative would not fulfill Project Objective 3 as it would not create villages that include high-architectural-quality mixed-use Village Centers, and no agrarian theme is anticipated. This alternative would not meet Project Objective 6 because it would not include a working farm and related agricultural uses for the community. Project Objective 9 would not be fulfilled because this alternative would not extend Magnolia Avenue, a major transportation component of the Santee General Plan Mobility Element. (EIR, § 6.2.2.2.)

Finding: The City Council rejects Alternative 2: No Project/General Plan Consistency Alternative, on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the alternative fails to meet the project objectives to the same extent as the project and is infeasible; and (2) the alternative would result in increased impacts relating to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, geology, soils and paleontological resources, hydrology and water quality, and wildfire.

3. Modified Development Footprint Alternative

Description: Under the Modified Development Footprint Alternative, the proposed project would consist of development exclusively in the southern half of the project site, extending no farther north than the PDMWD Ray

Stoyer Water Reclamation Facility. See Figure 6-2, Modified Development Footprint Alternative, for an illustration of the development footprint associated with this alternative. It would include approximately 2,947 low- and medium-density residential units, 36 acres of visitor commercial uses, 47.1 acres of parks, 196.2 acres of open space (includes FMZs), a fire station, a school site, and the Special Use area on approximately 785 acres. The remaining 1,853 acres would be dedicated as Habitat Preserve and would not be developed. Access to the site under this alternative would be from Fanita Parkway and the extension of Carlton Hills Boulevard. The proposed development would connect with several existing neighborhood dead-end streets in the City.

This alternative was selected because it would reduce or eliminate significant transportation impacts to some street segments and intersections of Cuyamaca Street that have been identified for the proposed project. It would also reduce impacts to biological and cultural resources compared to the proposed project.(EIR, § 6.2.3.)

Impacts: Compared to the proposed project, the Modified Development Footprint Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated with biological resources, cultural resources, hydrology and water quality, and mineral resources. The Modified Development Footprint Alternative would have potentially greater impacts regarding aesthetics, air quality, geology, soils, and paleontological resources, GHG emissions, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, utilities and service systems, and wildfire.

The Modified Development Footprint Alternative would include development located exclusively in the southern half of the project site. Because development is proposed only in the southern half of the project site adjacent to existing City development, this alternative would result in greater visual impacts to public views in this area compared to the proposed project. Potentially greater impacts than the proposed project to scenic vistas and visual character or quality of public views of the site would occur because proposed development would be clearly visible from existing City public streets and residences immediately adjacent to the east, south, and west of the project site. Due to the location and proximity of proposed development, it is likely that this alternative would partially block views of scenic vistas of the project site from public streets and rights-of-way. In addition, potentially greater impacts than the proposed project on light and glare would occur due to potential new sources of light in the southern half of the site including exterior building illumination, residential lighting, parking lots, new landscaped areas, and new roadway lighting. This would be a new impact requiring mitigation to reduce it to a less than significant level.

The Modified Development Alternative would result in similar potentially significant and unavoidable impacts as the proposed project related to consistency with the applicable air quality plan because it would exceed the number of residential units identified for the project site in the Santee General Plan Housing Element. Thus, this alternative would exceed the SANDAG growth assumptions assumed for the project site and would be inconsistent with the emissions projections in the RAQS and the SIP. Impacts associated with criteria air pollutant emissions during construction would be potentially significant, similar to the proposed project, due to similar construction activities occurring on site resulting in similar maximum daily emissions. Operational emissions associated with stationary sources (e.g., architectural coatings, consumer products, landscape equipment, and energy use) would be similar to the proposed project due to a similar number of residential units (2,947) on the project site. However, operational air quality emissions associated with mobile emissions (vehicle trips) would be greater under this alternative due to a greater on-site population. As a result, carbon monoxide hotspots on sensitive receptors would be greater because of the increase in vehicle trips. In addition, similar potentially significant impacts from toxic air contaminants and operational health impacts on sensitive receptors would occur under this alternative due to similar construction activities and operational land uses. Mitigation Measures similar to AIR-1 through AIR-10, and GHG-4, All-Electric Homes, would be required to reduce impacts on the applicable air quality plans and cumulative increases in criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operation, though not to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Though the alternative development footprint is a smaller area, potentially significant impacts would still occur regarding soil erosion, topsoil loss, and expansive soils due to the magnitude of excavation and grading proposed for on-site development and off-site improvement areas. The geotechnical recommendations set forth in Mitigation Measure GEO-1 and compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations as required by the proposed project would be required under this alternative to reduce potentially significant geological impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, potentially greater significant impacts would occur with regard to geologic stability due to the southern area of the site, including the Special Use area, containing known extensive landslide deposits. Therefore, additional mitigation measures would be required to mitigate landslide impacts under this alternative.

The Modified Development Footprint Alternative would result in similar potentially significant construction GHG emissions as the

proposed project due to similar construction equipment and worker and vendor vehicle trips. However, long-term operational GHG emissions from mobile source emissions under this alternative would be greater than the proposed project due to a greater on-site population. In addition, area source and stationary source emissions from activities associated with landscaping, heating, and electricity demand would be similar to the proposed project due to a similar unit count. Therefore, this alternative would result in emissions above the per capita threshold of 1.77 MT CO_2e developed consistent with the Santee Sustainable Plan. Mitigation measures similar to Mitigation Measures AIR-5 through AIR-8, AIR-10, and GHG-1 through GHG-6 would be required to reduce operational and amortized construction GHG emissions under this alternative through the application of solar panels, recycling and composting services, water conservation, electric homes, on-site tree planting, and private electric vehicles to a less than significant level.

The Modified Development Footprint Alternative would result in greater potentially significant construction noise impacts than the proposed project due to the proximity of construction activities, including equipment and vehicle traffic, to adjacent NSLUs. Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-4, in addition to new mitigation measures to mitigate noise on nearby existing residences and Sycamore Canyon Elementary School, would be required to reduce excessive noise levels as a result of construction activities. Due to the proximity of the alternative development footprint to adjacent NSLU, it would expand the number of receptors that would be exposed to construction noise impacts. Therefore, this alternative would have the potential to result in more intensive potentially significant construction noise impacts. In addition, this alternative would result in potentially greater operational impacts than the proposed project due to the entire alternative development being concentrated in the southern portion of the site immediately adjacent to existing NSLUs. Operational noise impacts that would be mitigated by distance under the proposed project would be potentially significant as a result of such proximity to existing NSLUs. Nighttime nuisance noise impacts from the Special Use area would be potentially significant under this alternative, similar to the proposed project, and Mitigation Measure NOI-5 would still be required. Operational traffic would be routed through several existing streets including Birchcrest Boulevard, Halberns Boulevard, Carlton Hills Boulevard, and Cecilwood Drive directly south and west of the alternative footprint that would not provide project access under the proposed project. This would result in new noise impacts on the adjacent NSLUs compared to the proposed project. Therefore, Mitigation Measures NOI-6 and NOI-7, as well as additional new mitigation measures, would be required to reduce impacts, though

not to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, operational noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, temporary potentially significant groundborne vibration impacts from construction equipment and blasting would occur under this alternative. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-8 and NOI-9, in addition to Mitigation Measures NOI-3 and NOI-4, would minimize temporary groundborne vibration impacts from construction and blasting activities at nearby receptors. However, due to the proximity of construction activities under this alternative, impacts from groundborne vibration would be potentially greater than under the proposed project and may require additional mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant.

Unlike the proposed project, this alternative does not propose an Active Adult community, which includes a lower 1.6 persons per household residential population compared to the 2.9 persons per household for low- and medium-density residential units. Using these population generation factors, this alternative would generate approximately 8,546 residents, and the proposed project would generate approximately 7,974 residents under the preferred land use plan with school or approximately 8,145 residents under the land use plan without school. Therefore, greater population growth would result from this alternative.

The Modified Development Footprint Alternative would result in more intensive but still less than significant impacts on fire protection facilities, police protection facilities, public school facilities, and libraries compared to the proposed project due to a greater on-site residential population. However, similar to the proposed project, this alternative includes a site for a future fire station and for a school, which would allow this alternative to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives, and reduce demand for fire protection and public school service. Police protection and library facilities would be accommodated off-site by existing uses and would not result in physical impacts associated with the proposed project. Physical impacts as a result of construction of the new fire protection and school facilities would be reduced through mitigation measures put forth in other resource topics as part of the overall project environmental evaluation. Therefore, this alternative would have more intensive but still less than significant impacts on public services compared to the proposed project.

The Modified Development Footprint Alternative would result in an increased demand for recreational facilities due to a greater on-site population than the proposed project. This alternative would include

approximately 47.1 acres of parks. Using the City's minimum parkland requirement of 10 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents, along with the Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 12.40, provision of 5 acres per 1,000 residents of parkland dedication plus 5 acres per 1,000 persons of in-lieu fee, this alternative would be required to provide approximately 85.5 acres of parks (total project population divided by 1,000 and multiplied by 10). Since this alternative would only provide 47.1 acres, it would not provide sufficient acreage of parks, trails, and recreational facilities to satisfy the parkland dedication requirements and would not comply with the Santee General Plan. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would mitigate any impacts associated with new on-site park development as part of the proposed project's environmental evaluation and identify applicable mitigation measures as needed. However, because this alternative would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality, noise, and transportation, construction of the recreational facilities associated with the alternative would contribute to these impacts. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to new or expanded recreational facilities on site would be significant and unavoidable for air quality, noise, and transportation, while the remaining impacts would be less than significant or reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation. The lack of proposed park acreage would result in increased demand on existing park and recreation facilities in the City causing substantial deterioration of those facilities. Therefore, this alternative would result in a new potentially significant impact compared to the proposed project and would require new mitigation measures, such as the payment of fees, to meet these parkland requirements.

This alternative would result in greater potentially significant operational transportation impacts than the proposed project due to a greater on-site population because this alternative would not propose Active Adult units. Using the trip rates for low-density, medium-density, and visitor commercial land uses from the Transportation Impact Analysis, this alternative would result in approximately 986 additional residential average daily trips compared to the proposed project. This could result in greater traffic impacts than have been identified for the proposed project. However, because the development would be concentrated in the southern portion of the project site, potentially significant impacts on certain segments and intersections of Cuyamaca Street would be avoided because this alternative would not access the project site from Cuyamaca Street. Traffic under this alternative would be rerouted through other existing City streets to the south and west including Sycamore Canyon Road, Birchcrest Boulevard, Halberns Boulevard, Carlton Hills Boulevard, Dragoye Drive, Cambury Drive, and Cecilwood Drive, potentially resulting in new significant impacts on

these roadways, which would require new mitigation measures.

In addition, this alternative would result in less intensive but still potentially significant impacts on VMT because it would be located entirely in the southern portion of the site adjacent to existing City development resulting in approximately 1 to 3 fewer VMT per capita to and from various existing and proposed land uses. However, without the Active Adult community under this alternative, the VMT per capita would increase. Due to the number of units that would be developed under this alternative, Mitigation Measure AIR-6 would still be required to implement a Transportation Demand Management Plan to reduce potentially significant impacts on VMT, though not to less than significant. Similar to the proposed project, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of this alternative would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

The Modified Development Footprint Alternative would result in slightly greater demand for water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities than the proposed project because it would generate a greater population. Therefore, potentially increased significant impacts would occur because this alternative would require the construction of new and expanded utilities and service systems to serve the proposed residential and commercial uses. Similar to the proposed project, applicable mitigation measures from other resource topics would be required to reduce physical environmental impacts of these new facilities to a less than significant. However, because this alternative would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality, noise, and transportation, construction of utilities and service systems associated with the alternative could contribute to these impacts. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to new or expanded utilities and service systems would be significant and unavoidable for air quality, noise, and transportation, while the remaining impacts would be less than significant or reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation.

Potentially greater impacts would occur related to flooding or landslides as a result of post-fire stability or drainage changes due to the southern area of the project site containing extensive landslide deposits and being prone to slope failure. This alternative would concentrate development in the southern area, potentially resulting in a new significant impact requiring mitigation. Numerous debris avalanches and debris slides of varying ages are present on these slopes. It is expected that such conditions could be exacerbated in a

post-fire landscape where surface vegetation has been removed or burned and erosion potential increases. In addition, the Special Use area proposed under this alternative was deemed unsuitable for park or substantial facility development by a focused geotechnical study due to geological constraints including landslides. This alternative proposes residential development in proximity to the Special Use area. Therefore, the alternative would result in greater impacts related to post-fire instability and new mitigation measures would be required to mitigate flooding or landslide impacts under this alternative. (EIR, § 6.2.3.1 and Table 6-2.)

Project Objectives: The Modified Development Footprint Alternative would accomplish five of the nine project objectives (Project Objectives 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8). This alternative would satisfy Project Objective 2 because it would provide an array of land uses that would enable development of a community with a variety of housing types to address the state's housing crisis. This alternative would meet Project Objective 4 because it would provide community-serving recreational opportunities including two large parks. This alternative would meet Project Objective 5 because it would provide a system of pedestrian, biking, and hiking trails that would connect with the regional system. Project Objective 7 would be met by this alternative because it would provide various sustainable features including energy-efficient residences, drought-tolerant landscaping, and close connections to existing City development to offset single-occupancy vehicle travel. In addition, this alternative would satisfy Project Objective 8 and create a fire-safe community through various fire protection measures including managed FMZs, fire-resistive landscaping, fire alarm and sprinkler systems, and active management of the Habitat Preserve. This alternative would only partially satisfy Project Objective 1 because, although it would create a clustered development with a mix of land uses concentrated in the southern area of the site and dedicate a large block of open space as Habitat Preserve to the City's Draft MSCP Subarea Plan, it would not include agricultural land uses that promote access to local food sources. However, this alternative would not fulfill Project Objective 3 because it would not create multiple villages that include mixed-use Village Centers, and no agrarian theme is anticipated. This alternative would not meet Project Objective 6 because it would not include a working farm and related agricultural uses for the community. Project Objective 9 would be partially fulfilled because while this alternative would improve Fanita Parkway it would not extend or improve Cuyamaca Street or Magnolia Avenue, which are major transportation components of the Santee General Plan Mobility Element. (EIR, § 6.2.3.2.)

Finding: The City Council rejects Alternative 3: Modified Development

Footprint Alternative, on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the alternative fails to meet the project objectives to the same extent as the project and is infeasible; (2) the alternative fails to avoid or reduce any potentially significant impacts of the project regarding air quality, noise, recreation, transportation and utilities and service systems; and (3) the alternative would result in increased impacts relating to aesthetics, geology, soils, and paleontological resources, GHG emissions, population and housing, public services, and wildfire.

4. No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative

Description: Under the No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative, the project footprint would be the same as the proposed project except Fanita Commons (the northwestern village) would not be constructed. See Figure 6-3, No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative, for an illustration of the development footprint for this alternative. Development would occur on approximately 692 acres with the remaining 1,946 acres being dedicated as Habitat Preserve. This alternative would include approximately 2,392 low- and medium-density residential units, 8.7 acres of visitor commercial uses, 38.5 acres of parks, a fire station, a school site, and the Special Use area. Without Fanita Commons, the alternative would eliminate a majority of the commercial uses and Active Adult neighborhood. The proposed school would be moved to the Farm site, eliminating the Farm. A fire station would be located next to the school site to the north. The Community Park would be located in Vineyard Village under this alternative. Street "V" and Street "W" would be constructed to connect Orchard Village with Vineyard Village. Access to and from the site would be through the extensions of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue.

This alternative was selected because it would reduce or eliminate some of the significant and unavoidable transportation impacts to street segments and intersections identified for the proposed project (circulation system performance). It would also have reduced significant and unavoidable impacts associated with: (1) air quality (consistency with the applicable air quality plan, cumulative increase in criteria pollutant emissions), (2) noise (exceedance of noise standards), (3) recreation (construction or expansion of recreational facilities), (4) transportation (VMT), and (5) utilities and service systems (new or expanded utilities or service systems). (EIR, § 6.2.4.)

Impacts: Compared to the proposed project, the No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts

associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology, soils and paleontological resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation, utilities and service systems, and wildfire. The No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative would have potentially greater impacts on recreation because this alternative would not meet the City park acreage requirements.

The No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative would result in reduced demand for existing recreational facilities because it would construct one less village and generate less population growth (approximately 1,037 fewer people). However, with the elimination of Fanita Commons, proposed project recreation amenities including the Community Park, two Neighborhood Parks, two Mini-Parks, and the Farm would also be eliminated. This alternative would provide approximately 38.5 acres of parks. Using the City's minimum parkland requirement of 10 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents, along with the Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 12.40, provision of 5 acres per 1,000 residents of parkland dedication plus 5 acres per 1,000 persons of in-lieu fee, this alternative would be required to provide approximately 69.4 acres of parks (total project population divided by 1,000 and multiplied by 10). Since this alternative would only provide 38.5 acres, it would not provide sufficient acreage of parks, trails, and recreational facilities to satisfy the parkland dedication requirements and would not comply with the Santee General Plan. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would mitigate any impacts associated with new on-site park development as part of the proposed project's environmental evaluation and identify applicable mitigation measures, as needed, to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, because this alternative would result in some significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality, noise, and transportation, construction of the recreational facilities associated with the alternative could contribute to these impacts. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to new or expanded recreational facilities on site would be significant and unavoidable for air quality, noise, and transportation, while the remaining impacts would be less than significant or reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would have lessened impacts because it would contribute to fewer significant and unmitigated transportation impacts from the construction of on-site recreational resources. However, the lack of adequate park facilities on the project site to meet the City's requirements would mean that project residents would more frequently use existing recreational facilities in the community than they would if adequate facilities were provided on site. This could result in a new significant impact related to the

degradation of existing recreational facilities compared to the proposed project and require this alternative to mitigate through the payment of parkland fees to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. (EIR, § 6.2.4.1 and Table 6-2.)

Project Objectives: The No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative would accomplish four of the nine project objectives (Project Objectives 5, 7, 8, and 9). This alternative would meet Project Objective 5 because it would provide a system of pedestrian, biking, and hiking trails that would connect with the regional system and existing City development. Project Objective 7 would be met by this alternative because it would provide various sustainable features, including energy-efficient residences, drought-tolerant landscaping, and connections to existing City development to offset single-occupancy vehicle travel. In addition, this alternative would satisfy Project Objective 8 and create a fire-safe community through various fire protection measures including managed FMZs, fire-resistive landscaping, fire alarm and sprinkler systems, and active management of the Habitat Preserve. Project Objective 9 would be fulfilled by this alternative because it would extend and improve Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, or Magnolia Avenue, three major transportation components of the Santee General Plan Mobility Element. This alternative would only partially satisfy Project Objective 1 because, although it would create a new community with clustered development and a mix of land uses and dedicate large blocks of open space as Habitat Preserve to the City's Draft MSCP Subarea Plan, it would not provide recreational land uses to meet the City's park dedication requirements or provide the Farm that would promote access to local food sources. This alternative would only partially meet Project Objective 2 because it would not provide the Active Adult land use, limiting the array of land uses with a variety of housing types and would provide approximately 557 fewer residential units to address the state's housing crisis. However, this alternative would only partially meet Project Objective 3 because there would not be an agrarian theme throughout the development and no Farm would be proposed. In addition, this alternative would only provide two villages, eliminating Fanita Commons, which would be the main commercial center for the proposed project. This alternative would not meet Project Objective 4 because this alternative would not provide enough passive and active parks to satisfy the City's park dedication requirements. Finally, this alternative would not meet Project Objective 6 because it would not include a working farm, thereby not providing fresh, locally grown produce for the community. (EIR, § 6.2.4.2.)

Finding: The City Council rejects Alternative 4: No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative, on the following grounds, each of which

individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the alternative fails to meet the project objectives to the same extent as the project and is infeasible; (2) the alternative fails to avoid or reduce the potentially significant impacts of the project related to recreation; and (3) the alternative would result in increased impacts relating to recreation.

5. No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative

Description: Under the No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative, the project footprint would be similar to the proposed project except Vineyard Village (the eastern village) would not be constructed. Under this alternative, residential units would be reduced to approximately 1,904 units. Development would occur on approximately 462 acres with the remaining 2,176 acres to be dedicated as Habitat Preserve. It would include 27.8 acres of visitor commercial uses, the Farm, 30 acres of parks (including the Community Park), a fire station site, and the Special Use area. However, no school site would be designated under this alternative. This alternative would not require the construction of internal streets "V" and "W." Access to and from the site would be through the extensions of Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue.

This alternative was selected because it would reduce or eliminate the following significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed project: (1) air quality (consistency with the applicable air quality plan, cumulative increase in criteria pollutant emissions), (2) noise (exceedance of noise standards), (3) recreation (construction or expansion of recreational facilities), (4) transportation (circulation system performance, VMT), and (5) utilities and service systems (new or expanded utilities or service systems). (EIR, § 6.2.5.)

Impacts: Compared to the proposed project, the No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology, soils and paleontological resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation, utilities and service systems, and wildfire. The No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative would have potentially greater impacts on recreation because this alternative would not meet the City park acreage requirements. This alternative would fulfill six of the nine project objectives.

The No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative would result in reduced overall demand for recreational facilities compared to the

proposed project because it would construct one less village (1,045 fewer residential units) and generate less population growth. However, with the elimination of Vineyard Village, proposed project recreation amenities including 4 Neighborhood Parks, 10 Mini-Parks, and various trail connections would also be eliminated. This alternative would provide approximately 30 acres of parks. Using the City's minimum parkland requirement of 10 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents, along with the Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 12.40, provision of 5 acres per 1,000 residents of parkland dedication plus 5 acres per 1,000 persons of in-lieu fee, this alternative would be required to provide approximately 55.2 acres of parks (total project population divided by 1,000 and multiplied by 10). Since this alternative would only provide 30 acres, it would not provide sufficient acreage of parks, trails, and recreational facilities to satisfy the parkland dedication requirements and would not comply with the Santee General Plan. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would mitigate any impacts associated with new on-site park development as part of the proposed project's environmental evaluation and identify applicable mitigation measures, as needed, to reduce impacts to less than significant. However, because this alternative would result in some significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality and transportation, construction of the recreational facilities associated with the alternative could contribute to these impacts. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to new or expanded recreational facilities on site would be significant and unavoidable for air quality and transportation, while the remaining impacts would be less than significant or reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would have lessened impacts because it would contribute to fewer significant and unmitigated noise and transportation impacts from the construction of on-site recreational resources.

The lack of adequate park facilities on the project site under this alternative to meet the City's requirements would mean that project residents would more frequently use existing recreational facilities in the community than they would if adequate facilities were provided on site. This could result in a new significant impact related to the degradation of existing recreational facilities compared to the proposed project and require this alternative to mitigate this impact through the payment of fees to meet satisfy the parkland requirements to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. (EIR, § 6.2.5.1 and Table 6-2.)

Project Objectives: The No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative would accomplish six of the nine project objectives (Project Objectives 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9). This alternative would meet Project Objective 3

because it would create villages that include high-architectural-quality, mixed-use Village Centers with an agrarian theme. This alternative would meet Project Objective 5 because it would provide a system of pedestrian, biking, and hiking trails that would connect with the regional system and existing City development. This alternative would meet Project Objective 6 because it would include a working farm that would provide fresh, locally grown produce for the community. Project Objective 7 would be met by this alternative because it would provide various sustainable features including energy-efficient residences, drought-tolerant landscaping, and connections to existing City development to offset single-occupancy vehicle travel. In addition, this alternative would satisfy Project Objective 8 and create a fire-safe community through various fire protection measures including managed FMZs, fire-resistive landscaping, fire alarm and sprinkler systems, and active management of the Habitat Preserve. Project Objective 9 would be fulfilled by this alternative because it would extend and improve Fanita Parkway, Cuyamaca Street, or Magnolia Avenue, three major transportation components of the Santee General Plan Mobility Element. This alternative would only partially satisfy Project Objective 1 because it would create a new community with clustered development and a mix of land uses and dedicate large blocks of open space as Habitat Preserve to the City's Draft MSCP Subarea Plan, but it would not provide enough recreation land uses to the City's parkland dedication requirements. This alternative would only partially meet Project Objective 2 because, although it would provide an array of land uses with a variety of housing types, it would provide approximately 1,045 fewer residential units to address the state's housing crisis. However, this alternative would not meet Project Objective 4 because this alternative would not provide enough passive and active parks to satisfy the City's park dedication requirements.(EIR, § 6.2.5.2.)

Finding: The City Council rejects Alternative 5: No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative, on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the alternative fails to meet the project objectives to the same extent as the project and is infeasible; (2) the alternative fails to avoid or reduce the potentially significant impacts of the project related to recreation; and (3) the alternative would result in increased impacts relating to recreation.

E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

According to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative, which is the alternative having the

potential for the fewest significant environmental impacts, from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated in an EIR.

The level of environmental impacts associated with the No Project/No Build Alternative is overall less than the proposed project. It would avoid all of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project. This alternative would have greater land use impacts than the proposed project as it would conflict with the Santee General Plan and zoning ordinance. It would also not accomplish any of the proposed project objectives. Nonetheless, the No Project/No Build Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative. According to Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, if the No Project Alternative is selected as the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall also identify am environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives.

Compared to the proposed project, the No Project/General Plan Consistency Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated with air quality, energy, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, and utilities and service systems. The No Project/General Plan Consistency Alternative would have potentially greater impacts regarding aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, soils, paleontological resources, hydrology and water quality, and wildfire. This alternative would fulfill four of the nine project objectives.

Compared to the proposed project, the Modified Development Footprint Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated with biological resources, cultural resources, hydrology and water quality, and mineral resources. The Modified Development Footprint Alternative would have potentially greater impacts regarding aesthetics, air quality, geology, soils, and paleontological resources, GHG emissions, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, utilities and service systems, and wildfire. This alternative would fulfill five of the nine project objectives.

Compared to the proposed project, the No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology, soils and paleontological resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation, utilities and service systems, and wildfire. The No Fanita Commons Reduced Project Alternative would have potentially greater impacts on recreation because this alternative would not meet the City park acreage requirements. This alternative would fulfill four of the nine project objectives.

Compared to the proposed project, the No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology, soils and paleontological resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation,

utilities and service systems, and wildfire. The No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative would have potentially greater impacts on recreation because this alternative would not meet the City park acreage requirements. This alternative would fulfill six of the nine project objectives.

The No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative overall has less environmental impacts than the other alternatives, but more environmental impacts than the No Project/No Build Alternative. In addition to having reduced impacts to the environmental issues listed above, this alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with noise (exceed noise standards) and transportation (certain street segments and intersections) identified for the proposed project. This alternative would not fulfill three of the nine project objectives. It would not fulfill Project Objective 4, because this alternative would not provide enough passive and active parks to satisfy the City's park dedication requirements. This alternative would only partially satisfy Project Objective 1 because it would create a new community with clustered development and a mix of land uses and dedicate large blocks of open space as Habitat Preserve to the City's Draft MSCP Subarea Plan, but it would not provide enough recreation land uses. This alternative would only partially meet Project Objective 2 because, although it would provide an array of land uses with a variety of housing types, it would provide approximately 1,045 fewer residential units to address the state's housing crisis. Therefore, of the alternatives analyzed, the No Vineyard Village Reduced Project Alternative would result in the greatest reduction in environmental impacts compared to the proposed project and would be considered the environmentally superior alternative. (EIR, § 6.3.)

SECTION IX: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a), the City Council must balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the proposed project. If the specific benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those environmental effects may be considered acceptable.

Having reduced the adverse significant environmental effects of the proposed project to the extent feasible by adopting the mitigation measures, and having considered the entire administrative record on the proposed project, the City Council has weighed the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable adverse impacts after mitigation in regards to air quality, noise, recreation, transportation, and utilities. While recognizing that the unavoidable adverse impacts are significant under the applicable CEQA thresholds, the City Council nonetheless finds that the unavoidable adverse impacts that will result from the proposed project are acceptable and outweighed by specific social, economic and other benefits of the proposed project.

In making this determination, the factors and public benefits specified below were considered. Any one of these reasons is sufficient to justify approval of the proposed

project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the City Council would be able to stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this section, and in the documents found in the record of proceedings.

The City Council therefore finds that for each of the significant impacts that are subject to a finding under CEQA Section 21081(a)(3), that each of the following social, economic, and environmental benefits of the Project, independent of the other benefits, outweigh the potential significant unavoidable adverse impacts and render acceptable each and every one of these unavoidable adverse environmental impacts:

1. **Provide Essential Housing:** The proposed project would help combat the declared state and City housing supply crisis maximizing housing production and providing between 2,949 and 3,008 homes consistent with the City's Essential Housing Program, Urgency Ordinance No. 592. In addition, the proposed project would provide 150 workforce housing units and would pay $2.6 million to be used by the City to fund the construction of affordable housing. Meeting the stringent criteria of the City's Essential Housing Program ensures proposed project meets the City's immediate housing needs, promotes environmental excellence, and furthers General Plan objectives and policies.

2. **Provide a Mixed-Use, Livable Community:** The proposed project would create a new community within the City consisting of approximately 2,949 housing units under the preferred land use plan with school, or 3,008 units under the land use plan without school, and up to 80,000 square feet of commercial uses in addition to parks, open space, and agriculture uses.

3. **Create a Sense of Identity Within the Community:** The proposed project would cluster development, organizing the development into three villages with high-architectural-quality, mixed-use Village Centers focused on an agrarian and sustainability theme to create a unique identity and sense of community for each village. Each village would be defined by its location, physical characteristics, and mix of housing types and uses.

4. **Preserve Wildlife Corridors:** The proposed project's clustered development would preserve natural open space areas, drainages, and key wildlife corridors.

5. **Conserve Habitat:** The proposed project footprint has been reduced from the previous development hardline footprint identified in the approved 1998 MSCP Plan. The development bubbles included in the Multi-Habitat Planning Area ("MHPA") that is part of the 1998 MSCP Plan impacted approximately 1,224 acres, including 1,140 acres of habitat. By removing a large development bubble in the southern portion site from the 1998 project design, the proposed project impacts approximately 988.77 acres of on- and off-site sensitive habitats, thereby increasing the size of the current Habitat Preserve by more than 200 acres.

Accordingly, the proposed project would preserve large blocks of significant natural open space areas totaling 1,650.4 acres (approximately 63 percent of the project site) as a habitat preserve dedicated to the City of Santee's Draft Multiple Species Conservation Program ("MSCP") Subarea Plan for permanent preservation and management. As a hardline Covered Project under the Draft MSCP Subarea Plan, impacts to covered narrow endemic species require 100 percent conservation within open space (i.e., hardline preserve) and 80 percent conservation through translocation within permanent impact (i.e., take-authorized) areas. The proposed project will include such open space dedications, and at no cost to the City, will identify a funding source, in perpetuity, for the management of the MSCP preserve areas. This habitat preservation would also enable the City to fulfill its commitment to participate in the San Diego MSCP.

6. **Develop a Special-Use Area on a Constrained Site:** The proposed project would develop a Special-Use area in the southwestern corner of the project site that would include a limited range of uses such as a solar farm, recreational vehicle storage for use by all Santee citizens, and other similar uses. The project would allow for beneficial use of this area, which was previously graded for a park and is not suitable for habitat preservation, cannot be irrigated and is limited to minimal grading because of geological conditions on the site.

7. **Provide a Range of Housing Opportunities:** The proposed project would provide a complementary and supportive array of land uses that would enable development of a community with a variety of housing types to address the state's current housing crisis. The range of housing types and lot sizes, include higher density residential in the Village Center, medium density residential, low density residential, and active adult housing to provide homes for a variety of income levels that will enhance homeownership and rental opportunities within the City. Specifically, the project would provide 866 medium density residential units, 1,203 low density residential units, 445 active adult residential units, as well as 435 residential units in the Village Center.

8. **Encourage Alternative Modes of Transportation:** The proposed project would allow for shared parking to reduce the need for large parking lots and pavement areas in the Village Center land use designation. Additionally, a bicycle station would be provided with bicycle parking, access to air and water, and a bike share facility. Each Village Center (one in each of the three Villages) would also provide electric vehicle (EV) charging stations and preferred parking per CALGreen requirements. The location of parking for medium density residential and active adult residential land uses would consider proximity to the Village Centers and parks, and seek to promote walkability or alternative modes of transportation by providing a neighborhood electric vehicle network, bicycle facilities and trails to offset single-occupancy vehicle use.

9. **Provide Increased Recreational Opportunities:** The proposed project would provide a range of recreational opportunities. An approximately 31.2-acre

Community Park, 8 Neighborhood Parks, and 31 Mini-Parks would be distributed throughout the development to provide active and passive recreational opportunities for use by all Santee citizens and gathering spaces within walking distance of all residences. Some of the Mini-Park designated areas would also provide trail access and serve as the primary access point to the trail system in the Habitat Preserve and Open Space land use designation areas. These recreational opportunities promote an active and healthy lifestyle, are accessible to residents of the community and surrounding areas, and satisfy the City of Santee's park dedication requirements.

10. **Promote Dedicated Trail Use:** The proposed project would provide over 35 miles of an extensive system of pedestrian, bicycle, and hiking trails as a key community amenity that accommodates a variety of users, facilitates the enjoyment of the outdoor environment, and provides connections to local and regional parks and trails. Trail locations throughout the project site would be coordinated to minimize conflicts with sensitive habitat areas by using existing trails and dirt roads and providing signage, well-defined trail markers, fencing, and community education to protect habitat areas and minimize indirect impacts sensitive species.

11. **Promote Wellness and Sustainability:** The proposed project would incorporate a working farm and related agricultural uses into the community to provide community access to fresh, locally grown foods to promote wellness and a sustainable lifestyle. The Farm in Fanita Commons, located on approximately 27.3 acres, would be the centerpiece of the proposed project. The Farm and the additional 10.9 acres of vineyards and orchards would honor the City's long tradition of agriculture.

12. **Provide a Sustainable Community:** The proposed project would incorporate current conservation technologies and strategies to achieve local, state, and federal goals to address global climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, including various modes of transportation and alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel.

13. **Promote General Plan Mobility Element Policies:** The proposed project would implement major transportation components of the Santee General Plan Mobility Element by extending Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street to the planned development and extending Magnolia Avenue from the existing terminus of Princess Joann Road to Cuyamaca Street.

14. **Provide Improved Circulation:** Streets on the project site would be established in the Fanita Ranch Development Plan and would be designed as a system of complete streets that supports multiple user types, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders. Additionally, a Traffic Calming Plan would be implemented throughout the site to improve the quality of life for residents and lower the vehicle speeds on neighborhood streets without restricting access.

Traffic calming measures would promote pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle safety by controlling the speed and distribution of vehicles traveling through the project site.

15. **Create a Fire-Safe Community:** The proposed project would implement a series of fire protection measures that incorporate fuel management zones ("FMZ"), fire-resistant landscape design, ignition-resistant building materials, fire alarm and sprinkler systems, and adequate ingress-egress points for emergency personnel and residents. The proposed project's Fire Protection Plan provides for roadside FMZs throughout the project area and along both sides of access roads up to 50 feet and provides 100 feet of FMZ along existing residential areas as additional protection from wildland fire. In addition, the proposed project would include a fire station fully staffed with trained firefighters that would be able to respond quickly to reported fires. The on-site fire station increases fire safety and reduces fire risk, as well as respond to medical emergencies throughout the proposed project and surrounding neighborhoods.

16. **Improve Fire Safety for Project Site and Surrounding Areas**: The proposed project would be fire adapted with a strong resident outreach program that raises fire awareness among its residents and a heightened early wildfire detection network for the City and surrounding areas. The proposed project would convert nearly 988 acres of ignitable fuels to lower flammability landscape and hardscape, include better access throughout the site, provide managed and maintained landscapes, and place more fire aware individuals on the ground that would reduce the likelihood of arson, off-road vehicles, shooting, or other non-authorized recreational-based activities that cause fires, some of which is currently occurring on the undeveloped project site. Motorized activities on the trails would be prohibited and enforced. If a hiker or mountain biker were to start a fire, detection and response would be anticipated on a fast timeline due to the residents living in the proposed community who would have the ability to detect fires throughout the property. The quick detection and call to 911 would result in a fast response from the on-site fire station. If a fire is detected and cannot be accessed by a responding fire engine, it would be sized up, and additional aerial and other support would be requested quickly. Thus, the project would enable faster fire size up (determining the needed firefighting resources) and requests for additional resources, including aerial support, compared to current conditions at the project site. Further, fires originating off site would not have continuous fuels across the development footprint and would therefore be expected to burn into the provided Fuel Management Zones with reduced intensity until starved of fuels, well away from the project site's structures.

17. **Improve Emergency Access:** The proposed project would include at least two ingress/egress points leading to three main arteries and adequately sized streets that would allow traffic circulation and emergency response access. All interior residential streets would be designed to accommodate a minimum of a 77,000 pound fire truck. Fire department engine access points would be provided at dead end streets on the southerly, easterly, and westerly sides of existing, neighboring

developments where they do not currently exist. Both Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street would include bike lanes with buffers that would serve as emergency lanes for first responders. The project would include a Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan which provides an evacuation route map and various family evacuation preparation tools that would result in faster evacuations and a population that understands the potential wildfire threat and actions they may be directed to take. The proposed project would implement a community outreach and education program to ensure that residents and visitors would be fire aware, have regular reminders of fire safety practices, and be encouraged to sign up for Reverse 911 and prepare their own personal action plan following the "Ready, Set, Go!" evacuation model. This would benefit project residents as well as existing residences, which will have better improved emergency preparedness.

18. **Promote the Sustainable Santee Plan:** The proposed project is consistent with the Sustainable Santee Plan. The entire residential portion of the proposed project (minimum 2,949 residential units) would require the use of high-efficiency equipment and fixtures that exceed 2016 California Green Building Standards Code and 2019 Title 24 standards by 14 percent. Additionally, the proposed project increases the energy efficiency of commercial buildings by an additional 14 percent. The proposed project would include parks, trails, and a Habitat Preserve that would contribute to reducing urban heat island effect and encourage the use of light-colored, semi-reflective, or cool-roof technology for all roofing within the proposed project, including at least 60,000 square feet of commercial rooftops. The proposed project would implement a master tree planting plan, requiring at least 26,705 trees and at least 237.4 acres of bushes on hedges on site. The proposed project will also provide 100 electric vehicles to project residents. Further, in accordance with the Sustainable Santee Plan, the proposed project will institute recycling and composting services to divert at least 90 percent of the proposed project's operational waste, consistent with the City's performance metric. The proposed project would also recycle or reuse at least 70 percent of the construction waste, soil, and debris by 2030 and 80 percent starting in 2030.

19. **Encourage Use and Reuse of On-Site Natural Resources**. The proposed project contemplates the use and reuse of on-site rock materials, such as large boulders, rock cobble, decomposed granite, and processed rock. There are large quantities of rock cobble existing on site. Rock cobble would be collected and used in the construction of water quality and landscape features. The proposed project involves setting up an aggregate plant on site during construction. The aggregate plant would produce roadway sub-base and other aggregate materials for use on site. In addition to rock materials, there are large deposits of decomposed granite on site, which would be reused for trails and other landscape-related purposes. Use of on-site materials would responsibly use mineral resources, eliminate the need for importing rough or finished materials, and reduce construction-related vehicle emissions in support of the approved Sustainable Santee Plan.

20. **Facilitate School Development:** The proposed project reserves a school site for a potential K–8th grade public school or other educational uses on approximately 15 acres in Fanita Commons. If acquired by the Santee School District, the site would accommodate up to 700 students, including existing and new students, assisting the Santee School District in maintaining adequate capacity at its school facilities. Other uses, such as private school, charter school, child care center, nature center, and cultural and farm education facilities, would be permitted with approval of a conditional use permit if the Santee School District does not pursue the site for a public school.

21. **Provide Community Amenities:** The proposed project would provide a number of community amenities, including but not limited to the 31.2 acre Community Park at the center of Fanita Commons, as well as The Farm. The Community Park would include two multi-purpose lighted ballfields, lighted sport courts, restrooms, tot lots, open play areas, and passive picnic areas. Additionally, it may include an aquatic element, a community gathering plaza, and a dog park. The Farm would allow for a range of community activities including farm-to-table events, community harvests, weddings, and other celebrations and festivals. Farm-based education would be provided as tours, volunteer opportunities, camps, and workshops related to gardening and farmer training, nutrition, cooking, herbal medicines, and home preservation of food. The Village Center and the Village Green would allow the Farm's activities, such as farmers markets and festivals, to expand into the Village Center. This would provide a service to residents of the Project, the City and surrounding community, as well as generate revenue for the City.

22. **Generate Employment.** The proposed project would create new construction-related and permanent jobs in the project area. In addition to construction jobs, the non-residential components of the proposed project, including commercial uses (retail, service, and office) in the Village Centers, the Farm, and the proposed school, would result in the creation of approximately 450 jobs (411 full-time and 39 part-time positions). Approximately 250 jobs would be associated with the school.

23. **Increase tax revenue:** As provided in the Santee General Plan Update Market Analysis, development of the project site would be a potential generator of sales tax for the City. Developing the site is critical to the City's financial future because it would generate (in 2003 dollars) an estimated $39 million in retail sales, with an estimated $30 million staying in the City, and would provide a significant stock of housing, which would benefit the City's efforts to attract higher-end firms and employers. Overall, the proposed project would generate a surplus of $3.06 million (in 2020 dollars) to the City's General Fund annually at completion and stabilization.

24. **Improve SR-52:** Approximately $5 million has already been expended to fund feasibility studies and other efforts related to improvements for State Route 52, in conjunction with the proposed project. The proposed project would expend an additional approximately $5 million to fund these improvements pursuant to an agreement with Caltrans. The improvements to SR-52 are of critical importance to

the City's residents, and the future residents of Fanita Ranch. Therefore, the Project applicant will also provide additional support to facilitate the funding and construction of future phases of improvements to State Route 52.

25. **Assist in Meeting Regional Housing Needs:** The proposed project would assist the City to provide housing to meet is Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation by providing at least including 435 Moderate and 2,514 Above-Moderate units, and up to 3,008 units if developed without a school. The proposed project would satisfy the City's Moderate and Above-Moderate housing needs for 2021-2029. Providing adequate housing in the City and San Diego County has economic, social, and environmental benefits by reducing commutes to homes out of county, reducing disruptions to family life, reducing air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, reducing health problems, and increasing money spent in the local economy.

26. **Funding Affordable Housing:** The proposed project would pay $2.6 million to be used by the City to fund the construction of affordable housing. The City will use these funds to construct or support affordable housing consistent with the City's Housing Element and state law.

27. **Providing Workforce Housing:** The proposed project will further assist the City towards achieving the required provision of housing set forth in the RHNA allocation as identified in the General Plan Housing Element by entering into an affordable housing agreement for the provision of 150 low and moderate income Workforce Housing units. Workforce Housing shall be acquired or constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the 1,000th dwelling unit.

28. **Funding Infrastructure Improvement Project:** The proposed project would pay to the City the sum of Two Million Six Hundred Thousand Dollars ($2,600,000.00) to be used by the City to fund an off-site infrastructure improvement project identified in the City Capital Improvement Program. The Applicant shall make this payment not later than the date on which the City issues the first grading permit for the Project.

29. **Funding MSCP Subarea Plan:** The City's costs incurred in connection with the processing of the environmental documents required for the adoption and implementation of the City's MSCP Subarea Plan, of which the proposed project is a portion, are being funded by the proposed project.

30. **Fiber Optics.** The proposed project includes a fiber optics interconnect system that includes a minimum of 3-inch conduit, pull boxes and pull rope. The alignment of the conduit shall follow the utility joint trench or street light conduit routing for the project. The conduit shall be provided to serve the new Fire Station, Community Park and Neighborhood Park # 8. As part of the proposed project, all new traffic signals be connected with this fiber optic interconnect system at the closest existing connection point.