

County of San Diego

JACK MILLER DIRECTOR

SOLID WASTE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY 5500 OVERLAND AVE STE 170, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

858-694-2888, Fax; 858-495-5004 1-800-253-9933 www.sdcdeh.org

September 12, 2011

ELIZABETH POZZEBON ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)

1. Title:

East Otay Mesa Recycling Collection Center and Landfill (EOM RCCL)

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health 5500 Overland Avenue, Suite 170 San Diego, CA 92123

- 3. a. Contact: KariLyn Merlos, Supervising Environmental Health Specialist
 - b. Phone number: (858) 495-5799, Fax number: (858) 495-5004
 - c. E-mail: KariLyn.Merlos@sdcounty.ca.gov.
- 4. Project location:

The proposed project is located in the East Otay Mesa area in unincorporated south San Diego County. The proposed recycling collection center and class III solid waste landfill would occupy approximately 340 acres of the 450-acre site located approximately two miles east of the Siempre Viva Road exit off of Interstate 905, one quarter mile from Loop Road/Paseo De La Fuente, and east of the planned State Route 11. See enclosed vicinity map.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1352, Grid D-F1, D-F2

5. Project Applicant name and address:

East Otay Mesa Recycling and Landfill Facility, LLC. 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 4000 San Diego, CA 92121

6. General Plan Designation:

County General Plan: Public/Semi-public - Solid Waste Facility

Community Plan: East Otay Mesa

- 7. Zoning Use Regulation: SWF Solid Waste Facility
- 8. Description of project:

On June 8, 2010 the voters of San Diego County approved county-wide initiative Proposition A. Proposition A amended the County General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and other ordinances and policies of the County of San Diego to allow for the construction and operation of a recycling collection center and class III solid waste landfill on the project site. Proposition A also amended the Siting Element of the County-wide Integrated Waste Management Plan to list the project site as a recycling and disposal site and to conform the siting element text to provide for the proposed project.

The proposed recycling collection center and class III solid waste landfill would occupy approximately 340 acres of the 450-acre site. The remaining 110 acres would remain undeveloped. The East Otay Mesa Specific Plan established a 1,000-foot-wide buffer adjacent to the site to the west to minimize land use conflicts between the recycling collection center and landfill and nearby development. The proposed project would include a recycling collection center, lined landfill, scale area, borrow and stockpile area, leachate collection system, chipping and grinding area, storm water retention facilities, a new access route from Loop Road/Paseo De La Fuente, and a facilities and operation area. The facilities and operation area would include a visitors' center, office building, maintenance office, shop and yard, and landfill gas collection and recovery system.

The recycling and solid waste operations components of the proposed project would include the receipt, handling, processing, and/or disposal of solid waste or recyclable materials; cover operations; site grading and/or excavation, including blasting, rock crushing, and export of native material; and heavy equipment operation. Other site activities would include the operation of gas and leachate collection and treatment systems, remedial activities required by regulatory agencies, maintenance within the maintenance yard, and other activities that would support and are customarily associated with recycling and solid waste operations.

The landfill would utilize a state-of-the-art composite liner system and a leachate collection and recovery system, in accordance with State and Federal regulatory requirements, including California Code of Regulations Title 27 and subtitle D of Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (27 CCR 20340; SWRCB Resolution 93-62 IIIA; 40 CFR 258.40). The liner system would include from bottom to top: a low permeability barrier layer soil or geosynthetic alternative, a flexible impermeable geomembrane, a leachate collection layer, and a protective soil cover. All components of the liner system would be designed to provide protection of groundwater in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations.

The landfill would be developed utilizing a phased approach based on capacity needs, with individual phases or cells ranging in size from 5 to 20 acres, and following an engineered master development plan. Each phase would generally include excavation of native material which would either be used onsite, quarried for use as aggregate, or exported off-site. Estimated landfill capacity is approximately 180 million tons. Both the

Air Quality

capacity and the life of the landfill are subject to disposal rates and current landfill capacity in San Diego County. There is potential refuse capacity for 150 years or more.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

✓ Aesthetics

Lands surrounding the project site are used for institutional confinement and power generation. The project site and adjacent land is located at the foothills of the San Ysidro Mountains. The site is located within two miles of Highway 905.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Agricultural Resources

☑ <u>Biological Resources</u>		
☑Hazards & Haz. Materials		<u>Land Use & Planning</u>
	Noise Noise	☐Population & Housing
☑ Public Services	☑ Recreation	☑ Transportation/Traffic
☑ <u>Utilities & Service</u> Systems	✓ Mandatory Findin	gs of Significance
DETERMINATION:		
On the basis of this initial eva	luation:	
that the proposed prenvironment, and a NEO On the basis of this In that although the pro- environment, there will	oject COULD NOT GATIVE DECLARATION of the Department of the project could not be a significant ef made by or agreement.	tment of Environmental Health finds I have a significant effect on the fect in this case because revisions in ed to by the project proponent. A
	ect MAY have a signif	tment of Environmental Health finds ficant effect on the environment, and required.
Karisten a. Mas	la p	9-7-11
Signature /		Date
KariLyn Merlos		Supervising Env. Health Specialist

I. AESTHETICS Would the project:a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
charact vegetat the Sai utilize a landfill,	ially Significant Impact: The project terized by flat topography and low-gration become more varied within the project Ysidro Mountains and canyons street a phased approach to construction and a project-specific visual analysis to scenic vistas.	owing ect are tch in d ope	vegetation. The topography and ea and further north and east where land. The proposed project would eration of the class III solid waste
,	Substantially damage scenic resources, outcroppings, and historic buildings within		•
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
Californ Scenic the land scenic boundar	scenic highways refer to those highwania Department of Transportation (Cathighway Program). Generally, the aread adjacent to and visible from the vehighway is usually identified using a mary is selected when the view extends to rextends to the visual limits of the lands	Itrans) definicular notoris the d	as scenic (<u>Caltrans - California</u> ed within a State scenic highway is right-of-way. The dimension of a t's line of vision, but a reasonable istant horizon. The scenic highway
highway nearest west of viewshe	Than Significant Impact: There are ys nor County priority scenic routes to state scenic highway, SB-75 along Silvent the proposed project. The project site ed, therefore the proposed project would cenic highway.	ocated ver Streets ne	I within the Otay Mesa area. The rand Blvd., is located over 10 miles ot visible from the scenic highway
,	Substantially degrade the existing visua surroundings?	al cha	racter or quality of the site and its
\checkmark	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact

EAST OTAY MESA RECYCLING COLLECTION CENTER AND LANDFILL - 5 - September 12, 2011
Less Than Significant With Mitigation No Impact Incorporated
Discussion/Explanation:
Potentially Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. Features of the proposed project have the potential to cause a significant effect to the visual character of the site and surroundings. A project-specific visual analysis will be conducted to assess potential changes to the visual character due to the proposed project.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
 ✓ Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:
Potentially Significant Impact: Project design may require elements of lighting to support construction and operation of the proposed facility. Visual compatibility of lighting features will be analyzed in a project-specific visual analysis, and the potential to affect day or nighttime views in the area will be assessed.
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?
 ✓ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:
Potentially Significant Impact: Potential impacts to agricultural resources, and the conversion of agricultural resources to a non-agricultural use will be analyzed in a project-specific technical report.

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

Less than Significant Impact

✓ Potentially Significant Impact

EAST OTAY MESA RECYCLING COLLECTION CENTER AND LANDFILL - 7 -

September 12, 2011

	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
--	--	--	-----------

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. Because the construction of this landfill will be phased, construction-related air quality impacts are expected to be less severe at any single point in time, but the reduced impacts will occur periodically over a longer period of time than would occur in a single-phased project. Because operation of a landfill project involves ongoing vehicle movement on unpaved surfaces and the placement of soil cover materials, the operation of the landfill will have air quality impacts. Once solid waste has been placed in a landfill, landfill gas is generated by the decomposition of that trash, and must be managed to reduce emissions. Landfill gas consists primarily of methane, a recognized "greenhouse gas." Landfill gas generation is expected to continue after the landfill ceases active operation. However, air quality impacts are not expected to exceed the impacts that would occur if this facility were not operated at this location and its operations were diverted to an alternative location or locations where the necessary functions would be performed. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes construction and operation activities such as grading, chipping and grinding which have the potential to create pollutant emissions. A project-specific technical analysis will be conducted to determine conformance with the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP), and County's Interim Approach to Addressing Climate Change in CEQA Documents.

c)	which the project region is non-atta	ble net increase of any criteria pollutant for ainment under an applicable federal or state cluding releasing emissions which exceed ecursors)?
5	✓ Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

No Impact

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Potentially Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the construction and operation of EOM RCCL are likely to include emissions of PM_{10} , NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also as the result of increase of vehicular traffic, fugitive emissions of landfill gas including methane, and combustion-related emission from the burning or collected landfill gas. The proposed project will be regulated through a permit with the SDAPCD, and specific avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures will be enforced to the specifications of the permit. A project-specific technical analysis will be conducted to assess the potential for a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

d) I	Expose sensitive receptors to substantia	al pollu	utant concentrations?
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
Potentially Significant Impact: Pollutant emissions and the proximity to sensitive receptors will be analyzed in a project-specific air quality technical analysis for the proposed project.			
e) (Create objectionable odors affecting a s	ubstar	ntial number of people?
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		

Potentially Significant Impact: The potential for emissions of objectionable odors associated with the proposed facilities will be analyzed in a project-specific air quality technical analysis for the project.

	, , ,		
a) H	DLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the Have a substantial adverse effect, either on any species identified as a candidate local or regional plans, policies, or regulation of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife	r directe, se ations	ctly or through habitat modifications, nsitive, or special status species in s, or by the California Department of
\checkmark	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
center at 400 acreconna 2011). surveys (Viguied (Juncus the pot (Acanth variega during the Norther snake (approprincludin (Athene shrimp)	ially Significant Impact: Proposition A and class III solid waste landfill within cres of the 450-acre site were aissance, including general baseline is Several sensitive plant species have is, including: coast barrel cactus (Ferogra lacinata), San Diego marsh elder (Institute actus ssp leopoldii), and Tecate cylitential to support: Otay tarplant (Dientificated dudleya (Dudleya variegata). Focustive dudleya (Dudleya variegata). Focus the appropriate seasons to identify if the sensitive wildlife species were observed in harrier (Circus cyaneus), Golden Eag (Thamnophis hammondii). Focused wild riate seasons to identify if sensitive ving: Quino checkerspot butterfly (Eugle cunicularia), California gnatcatcher (Branchinecta sandiegonensis) and Ini). A raptor survey will also be conducted	the 4 asses survey been cactually a har press andra elery (see speed dulife swildlife shydry (Polici Rivers	50-acre project site. Approximately sed in a preliminary biologically and habitat assessments (REC identified onsite during preliminary is viridescens), San Diego viguiera (Supesiana), southwestern spiny rush (Cupressus forbesii). The site has conjugens), San Diego thornmint (Eryngium aristulatum var. parishii), are plant surveys will be conducted ecies occur onsite. Tring preliminary studies, including: quila chrysaetos), Two-striped garter urveys will be conducted during the especies are present at the site, was editha quino), burrowing owleptila californica), San Diego fairy
	al effects to species that are determined essed in a project-specific technical ana		present within the survey area will
r	Have a substantial adverse effect on natural community identified in local or the California Department of Fish and G	regior	nal plans, policies, regulations or by
$\overline{\checkmark}$	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation

Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site's biological value to the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species, including the use of wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites will be assessed in a project-specific technical analysis.

e)		Conflict with the provisions of any ado Communities Conservation Plan, other conservation plan or any other local pol resources?	appro	oved local, regional or state habitat
		Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Dis	cus	Incorporated sion/Explanation:	_	•
Coo MS Mir app cor	unty CP or <i>i</i> olica	pact: The proposed project site is located's Multiple Species Conservation Plant as amendment areas, including Major Amendment with Special Considerations able conservation plan, other appropriation plan, or any other local policies.	n (MS or Am s. The oved	SCP). The site is identified in the nendment, Minor Amendment, and project would not conflict with any local, regional or state habitat
V. a)		LTURAL RESOURCES Would the pro Cause a substantial adverse change in as defined in 15064.5?	•	significance of a historical resource
		Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Proposition A allows for a 340-acre recycling collection center and class III solid waste landfill within the 450-acre project site. Approximately 400 acres of the 450-acre site are being assessed in a cultural resource record search, literature review, and field survey by Statistical Research, Inc. Prehistoric and historic sites recorded in the project area will be studied to determine their significance. The project's potential to change the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5 will be assessed in a project-specific technical analysis.

b)		Cause a substantial adverse change ir resource pursuant to 15064.5?	n the	significance of an archaeological
		Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Dis	cus	sion/Explanation:		
and Res	l fie sear died an a	ially Significant Impact: A cultural really survey for 400 acres of the project rch, Inc. (2011). Prehistoric and historic to determine their significance. The proper that is a project specific technical analysis.	area sites ject's EQA (are being compiled by Statistical recorded in the project area will be potential to change the significance
c)	İ	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique ge	ologic	feature?
	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
		Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Dis	cus	sion/Explanation:		
sup	por	ially Significant Impact: Geologic ch t unique geologic features at the site al analysis.		
d)	j	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique pa	leonto	logical resource or site?
	V	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
		Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Dis	cus	sion/Explanation:		
and	l a s tain nnic	ially Significant Impact: The proposes site-specific review and technical report unique paleontological resources was report will analyze the potential to afficial report will be afficially analyze the potential to afficial report will be afficially analyze the potential to afficial report will be afficial report will be afficially analyze the potential to afficial report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially analyze the potential to a final report will be afficially and the analyze the potential report will be afficially analyze the analyz	of ge ill be	eological formations that potentially conducted for this project. This
e)		Disturb any human remains, includ cemeteries?	ing th	nose interred outside of formal
	$ \sqrt{} $	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact

	OTAY MESA RECYCLING CTION CENTER AND LANDFILL - 13 -		September 12, 2011
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
and field Researce encount notified coordinate with feet	ally Significant Impact: A cultural related survey for 400 acres of the project the characteristic and the County Coroner and Nation A Native American monitor was ation with applicable agencies, including deral, state, and local regulations and local to analyze and determine significant	t area ct site, ive Ar prese ng trib d stai	are being compiled by Statistical small pieces of human bone were nerican Heritage Commission were nt for all phases of work, and oal organizations, is in accordance adards. A technical report will be
a) E	OLOGY AND SOILS Would the proje expose people or structures to potential isk of loss, injury, or death involving:		antial adverse effects, including the
i.	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Z	oning. subst	as delineated on the most recent Map issued by the State Geologist antial evidence of a known fault? Special Publication 42.
	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	\checkmark	No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
by the 1997, F substan exposur	act: The proposed project is not locate Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zonin ault-Rupture Hazards Zones in Californatial evidence of a known fault. There of people or structures to adverse ear a result of this project.	ng Act nia, or efore,	, Special Publication 42, Revised located within any other area with there will be no impact from the
ii	i. Strong seismic ground shaking?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the

California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, in	cludin	g liquefaction?
Potentially Significant ImpactLess Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:		
No Impact: The proposed project site is no Area" as identified in the County Guidelines of Hazards. This indicates that the geologic susceptible to ground failure from seismic act by poor artificial fill or located within a floody from the exposure of people or structures susceptible to ground failure, including liqueface	for De envirc ivity. blain. to ad	termining Significance for Geologic onment of the project site is not In addition, the site is not underlain Therefore, there will be no impact
iv. Landslides?		
✓ Potentially Significant ImpactLess Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:		

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. However, a project-specific Geotechnical Report will be prepared to determine if the area shows evidence of either pre-existing or potential conditions that could become unstable and result in landslides.

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

Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils onsite include Huerhuero loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes; Huerhuero loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes, eroded; Huerhuero loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes, eroded; San Miguel- Exchequer rocky silt loams, 9 to 70 percent slopes; and Terrace escarpments. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply with the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

	soils will not create substantial risks to lif		
,	Have soils incapable of adequately alternative wastewater disposal system disposal of wastewater?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
and se assess District Otay V Survey project Therefo	ewer for the disposal of wastewater. In the project ewer for the disposal of wastewater. In the proposed connection and service at any and determine the final wastewater displayed a connection is required for the San Diego Area, prepared by a site does include limitations for coore, the project site has the potential of the use of septic tanks or alternative	A provailate spossed. At the ontain	oject-specific technical analysis will bility as regulated by the Otay Water all method through coordination with ter conducting a review of the Soi US Department of Agriculture, the ing septic tank absorption fields ntain soils incapable of adequately
VII. H	AZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIA	<u>\LS</u>	· Would the project:
	Create a significant hazard to the publi transport, storage, use, or disposal of h reasonably foreseeable upset and acc hazardous materials into the environments.	azard ident	dous materials or wastes or through
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

b)

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to construct an approximately 340-acre recycling collection center and class III solid waste landfill which involves the routine use, storage, and/or generation of hazardous materials. The proposed project would include a recycling collection center, lined landfill, scale area, borrow and stockpile area, leachate collection system, chipping and grinding area, storm water retention facilities, and a facilities and operation area. The recycling and solid waste operations components of the proposed project would include the receipt, handling, processing, and/or disposal of solid waste or recyclable materials; cover operations; site grading and/or excavation, including blasting and rock crushing; and heavy equipment operation. Other site activities would include the operation of landfill gas and leachate collection and treatment systems, remedial activities required by regulatory agencies, maintenance within the maintenance yard, and other activities that would support recycling and solid waste operations.

The proposed project may involve the transport, storage, use or disposal of hazardous materials during construction and/or operation phases. A project-specific technical analysis will be conducted to determine potential impacts associated with hazardous materials.

Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials.

,	substances, or waste within one-quarter	mile	of an existing or proposed school?
\checkmark	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		
Potentially Significant Impact: There is no existing school within one-quarter mile of the project site. A project-specific analysis will be conducted to assess potential direct and/or indirect hazardous materials impacts to proposed schools, if any.			
Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			
\checkmark	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on a regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), and does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank (UST).

However, the project does propose structures for human occupancy (i.e., office building, maintenance office, shop and yard, and visitor center) that will be located onsite of the proposed recycling collection center and landfill. Also, the historic agricultural uses of the site would need to be reviewed to determine if the site presents a potential for contamination from any previous intensive agricultural historic uses. Therefore, further evaluation of the proposed design features for proposed structures and the site's historical uses will be required to determine if the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

,	For a project located within an airport I not been adopted, within two miles of a the project result in a safety hazard for area?	public	airport or public use airport, would
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), within a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface, or within two miles of a public airport, or 10,000 feet of any airport runway. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure that would conflict with applicable safety standards, and would not constitute a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Per Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 20270(b), affected airports (potentially including Brown Field) that are within a 5 mile radius of the proposed project will receive notification, as will the Federal Aviation Administration.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:	
•	pact: The proposed project is not within ject will not constitute a safety hazar area.	• •
,	mpair implementation of or physically esponse plan or emergency evacuation	, ,
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact No Impact

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

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating

Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

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

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

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

g)	Expose people or structures to a signifi wildland fires, including where wildlar where residences are intermixed with w	nds ar	e adjacent to urbanized areas or
	✓ Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. A project-specific technical analysis shall be conducted to assess the potential to expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Division 5, Chapter 3 and Appendix II-A of the Uniform Fire Code.

A Fire Service Availability Letter will be submitted to the San Diego Rural Fire Protection District to identify service conditions, expected travel time to the project site, and the maximum allowable travel time. Following the review of the project by the Fire District, a determination would be made on the anticipated exposure from hazardous wildland fires to people or structures as a result of the project.

September 12, 2011

h)	Propose a use that would substantial exposure to vectors, including mosquitransmitting significant public health dise	toes,	rats or flies, which are capable of
✓	, , ,		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discu	ssion/Explanation:		
Potentially Significant Impact: The project may include storm water retention facilities that have the potential to allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more. Also, the project involves the collection of solid waste that may potentially include the collection of organic and animal wastes. Therefore, the project may expose people to a vector risk. The project will be evaluated further for public exposure to substantial vectors and a Vector Management Plan may be required for the project to ensure the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies or create a cumulatively considerable impact. VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:			
a) √	Violate any waste discharge requiremer Potentially Significant Impact	II.3 :	Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discu	ssion/Explanation:		

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to construct an approximately 340-acre recycling collection center and class III solid waste landfill that would include a recycling collection center, lined landfill, scale area, borrow and stockpile area, leachate collection system, chipping and grinding area, storm water retention facilities, and a facilities and operation area. The proposed project will include development of a Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP). The SWMP will identify any special site design considerations, source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) or treatment control BMPs, under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R-9-2007-0001) as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

The project will require an NPDES wastewater discharge permit or a state Waste Discharge Requirements permit, either of which would be issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The RWQCB could choose to incorporate stormwater provisions into that permit. If stormwater matters are left to the County and to applicable general permits, the project will be required to conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulations and the RWQCB-

issued Municipal Stormwater Permit to address human health and water quality concerns. A project-specific technical analysis will be prepared to analyze potential waste discharge impacts and the project's compliance with State and County waste discharge and storm water management requirements.

b)	Is the project tributary to an already imp Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, cou pollutant for which the water body is alre	uld the	project result in an increase in any
\checkmark			Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discu	ssion/Explanation:		
Tijuan 2003, eutrop solids, eutrop Ocear in the metals	a River hydrologic unit. According to the portions of this watershed are impair phication, coliform bacteria, organic enrice, synthetic organics, trace elements, and to phication, coliform bacteria, lead, nickel, per at the Tijuana River mouth is impaired for Tijuana River watershed include: Freshes, pesticides, miscellaneous toxics, low delissolved solids, nitrates, petroleum, MTBE,	Clear red. T chmen rash; besticio colifo water issolve	n Water Act Section 303(d) list, July The Tijuana River is impaired for t/low dissolved oxygen, pesticides, Tijuana River Estuary is impaired for des, thallium, trash; and the Pacific rm bacteria. Constituents of concern coliform bacteria, nutrients, trace ed oxygen, and trash; Groundwater:
consti the po as list	proposed project has the potential to relead ruction and operation of the proposed fact otential to result in an increase in any pol and on the Clean Water Act Section 303(conducted to analyze potential impacts	cility. 7 lutant l) list.	Therefore, the proposed project has to an already impaired water body, A project-specific technical analysis
projection identif	rm Water Management Plan (SWMP) wo of which will address the potential for rele fy any special site design consideration ces (BMPs) or treatment control BMPs to	ase o	f pollutants during construction and source control Best Management
c)	Could the proposed project cause or consurface or groundwater receiving wat beneficial uses?		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
✓	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies primarily within the 911.12 hydrologic subarea, within the Tijuana River hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; freshwater replenishment; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; commercial and sport fishing; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; shellfish harvesting; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The proposed project has the potential to contribute potential sources of polluted runoff through construction and operation of the facility including transport and storage of waste materials. A project-specific technical analysis will be conducted to analyze potential impacts to surface and groundwater receiving water quality objectives and potential degradation of beneficial uses.

d)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with
	groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or
	a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-
	existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land
	uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
_	7 Detentially Cinnificant Impact

 , , ,	 Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The need for water services will be assessed. The evaluation will include groundwater availability and supplied water services. If applicable, service availability forms will be submitted to the Otay Water District to identify the availability of adequate water resources and entitlements to serve the requested water resources of the project. In addition, the project may involve diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway that may potentially impact rates of groundwater recharge. A project-specific technical analysis will be prepared to analyze the project's potential to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

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

\checkmark	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
operation operation order technic	ially Significant Impact: The proposed on of a 340-acre recycling collection ceed project site contains multiple existing reproposed facility all analysis will be prepared to analysis to accommodate the proposed facility all analysis will be prepared to analysis or siltation on- or off-site.	nter a draina and a	nd class III solid waste facility. The ages, which may need to be altered ancillary services. A project-specific
	Substantially alter the existing drainag through the alteration of the course of a the rate or amount of surface runoff in on- or off-site?	strea	m or river, or substantially increase
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
operation operation orde technic pattern	ially Significant Impact: The proposed on of a 340-acre recycling collection celed project site contains multiple existing reproposed facility all analysis will be prepared to analyze the and increase the rate or amount of surfling on- or off-site.	nter a draina and a he pro	nd class III solid waste landfill. The ages, which may need to be altered ancillary services. A project-specific bject's potential to alter the drainage
•	Create or contribute runoff water which planned storm water drainage systems?		I exceed the capacity of existing or
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		

Potentially Significant Impact: As the proposed project will result in installation of a 340-acre recycling collection center and class III solid waste landfill, the project would result in an increase in the amount of impervious surface. Drainage may need to be altered and conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage or

infiltration facilities. A project-specific technical analysis will be prepared to analyze the project's potential to create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

h)	F	Provide substantial additional sources of	fpollu	ted runoff?
		Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Dis	cuss	sion/Explanation:		
am cor pro cor will	ount nvey pose nstru be	ially Significant Impact: The propose to fimpervious surfaces due to the ped to either natural drainage channeed project has the potential to releast to and operation of the proposed factor prepared to analyze the project's post of polluted runoff.	lanne Is or e poll cility. <i>F</i>	d improvements. Drainage will be approved drainage facilities. The utants, including sediment, during project-specific technical analysis
i)	H	Place housing within a 100-year flood ha Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Ra map, including County Floodplain Maps?	ate Ma	• •
		Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Dis	cuss	sion/Explanation:		
ide hou	ntifie using	pact: No FEMA mapped floodplained within the project site. In addition, the g; therefore, the proposed project would azard area.	proje	
j)		Place within a 100-year flood hazard are redirect flood flows?	a stru	ctures which would impede or
		Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

No Impact: No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified within the project site. Therefore, there are no structures proposed that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area.

,	Expose people or structures to a signific flooding?	ant ris	sk of loss, injury or death involving
	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	$\overline{\checkmark}$	No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
Therefo	pact: The project site lies outside a ore, the project will not expose people to flooding.	-	•
•	Expose people or structures to a signific flooding as a result of the failure of a lev		
	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	$\overline{\checkmark}$	No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
dam/re immedi Therefo	pact: The project site lies outside a new servoir within San Diego County. I iately downstream of a minor dam the project will not expose people to the group of the project will not expose people to the group of the project will not expose people to the group of the project will not expose people to the group of the project will not expose people to the group of the project will not expose people to the project site lies outside a manufacture of the project site lies outside a manufacture of the project within the project will not expose people the project within the project will not expose people t	In adnat	dition, the project is not located ould potentially flood the property
m)	Inundation by seiche or tsunami?		
	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	$\overline{\checkmark}$	No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
i. :	SEICHE		

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir;

ii. TSUNAMI

therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, the site would not be inundated. n) Inundation by mudflow? i. MUDFLOW ✓ Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation No Impact Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact: Mudflow is a type of landslide. The site is located within a landslide susceptibility area as the site contains slopes greater than 25%. A project-specific Geotechnical Report will be prepared to determine if the area shows evidence of either pre-existing or potential conditions that could become unstable and result in landslides. **IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project: Physically divide an established community? Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation \square No Impact Incorporated Discussion/Explanation: No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of urbanized areas and would not alter land use in the community. The site is undeveloped and located in a largely undeveloped area of East Otay Mesa and would not divide an established community. b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation No Impact Incorporated

No Impact: The County of San Diego was authorized by the voters of San Diego County and directed to amend elements of the General Plan, sub-regional plans, community plans, Zoning Ordinance, Waste Management Plan and other ordinances and any other legislative acts affected by the approved initiative to ensure consistency between the initiative and other elements of the County's General Plan, sub-regional

and community plans, Zoning Ordinance and other County ordinances and policies. The land use element of the County General Plan and all sub-regional and community plans which apply to the project site and any related maps as well as the zoning ordinance have been amended to designate the project site Public/Semi-public lands with a Solid Waste Facility Designator.

The proposed project site is located within the regional planning area of the County's Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP). The site is identified in the MSCP as amendment areas, including Major Amendment, Minor Amendment, and Minor Amendment with Special Considerations. The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, including those adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES	Would the proje	ct:
----------------------	-----------------	-----

X. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the proje		
 Result in the loss of availability of a kr value to the region and the residents of t 		
✓ Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:		
Potentially Significant Impact: The project so Department of Conservation — Division of Mine Classification: Aggregate Materials in the West Region, 1997) as an area of "Potential Mine project-specific technical analysis of impacts to determine if a potentially significant loss of avoidable to the region and the residents of the statement.	es and tern S eral R o mine ailabil	d Geology (Update of Mineral Land San Diego Production-Consumption Resource Significance" (MRZ-3). A eral resources would be required to lity of a known mineral resource of
 Result in the loss of availability of a local site delineated on a local general plan, s 		
☐ Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	$\overline{\checkmark}$	No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:		

No Impact: The project site is zoned Solid Waste Facility, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). The County of San Diego was authorized by the voters of San Diego County and directed to amend elements of the General Plan, sub-regional plans, community

September 12, 2011

plans, Zoning Ordinance, Waste Management Plan and other ordinances and any other legislative acts affected by the approved initiative to ensure consistency between the initiative and other elements of the County's General Plan, sub-regional and community plans, Zoning Ordinance and other County ordinances and policies.

a)	DISE Would the project result in: Exposure of persons to or generation established in the local general plan or of other agencies?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
operati project waste is a po operati materia propos conduct County constru	tially Significant Impact: The propion of a 340-acre recycling collection ce would add vehicle and truck trips to materials would be associated with the otential that traffic noise could increase ion of the facility would include such als, rock crushing, use of heavy equed maintenance yard. Therefore, a cted to assess the potential noise effects of General Plan – Noise Element and the action of the proposed project has the packed standards of the County of San Division of S	the some contents of the some	and class III solid waste facility. The surrounding roadways as import of ation of the facility. Therefore, there is the proposed project. In addition wities as chipping and grinding of ant, and ongoing activities at the ct-specific noise analysis will be ese activities in accordance with the linty Noise Ordinance. Furthermore all to generate noise emissions that
	Exposure of persons to or generation groundborne noise levels?	of e	xcessive groundborne vibration of
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project may result in impacts recurring periodically over a long period of time due to operation of heavy equipment in the project area. As the proposed class III solid waste landfill would be in-filled (not stockpiled), the project has the potential to result in exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The duration and schedule of these activities will be further evaluated in a project-specific technical analysis.

c)	A substantial permanent increase in aml above levels existing without the project		noise levels in the project vicinity
\checkmark	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		
trips to the op increa such a heavy project	tially Significant Impact: The propose of the surrounding roadways as import of peration of the facility. Therefore, there is edue to the proposed project. In additinativities as chipping and grinding of material equipment, and ongoing activities at the t-specific noise analysis will be conducted activities in accordance with ambient noise	waste e is a on, op terials, propo ed to a	materials would be associated with potential that traffic noise could eration of the facility would include blasting and rock crushing, use of sed maintenance yard Therefore, a ssess the potential noise effects of
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increvicinity above levels existing without the		• •
\checkmark	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		
has the of Saltempool levels asses	tially Significant Impact: Construction e potential to generate noise emissions on Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-brary or periodic increase in ambient newsisting without the project. A project-sp of the potential increase in ambient noise of without the project.	that m 410), oise le ecific	ay exceed standards of the County which may result in a substantial evels in the project vicinity above noise analysis will be conducted to
e)	For a project located within an airport I not been adopted, within two miles of a the project expose people residing or noise levels?	public	airport or public use airport, would
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The proposed project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels. Therefore, no impact will result due to implementation of the proposed project.

•	For a project within the vicinity of a poeople residing or working in the project		
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
airstrip;	pact: The proposed project is not locat therefore, the project will not expose excessive airport-related noise levels.		•
a) I	DPULATION AND HOUSING Would the Induce substantial population growth in proposing new homes and businesses extension of roads or other infrastructure.	an ar es) or	ea, either directly (for example, by
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
alter la collection growth	pact: The proposed project is located on use or induce growth in the area. on center and landfill project to directly in the area and the 1,000 foot buffer with the project site.	Ther or indi	e is no potential for the recycling rectly induce substantial population
•	Displace substantial numbers of existing of replacement housing elsewhere?	hous	ing, necessitating the construction
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

No Impact: The project is proposed on a vacant site in an undeveloped area and would not require the removal of existing housing, and therefore would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

C)		cement housing elsewhere?	nece	ssitating the construction of
	Less	entially Significant Impact s Than Significant With Mitigation orporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	ssion/E	Explanation:		
not di	splace			in an undeveloped area and would nerefore would not necessitate the
XIII. F	PUBLIC	C SERVICES		
a)	the pr physic signifi respo	covision of new or physically altered cally altered governmental facilities cant environmental impacts, in ord	d gove s, the der to service	te physical impacts associated with ernmental facilities, need for new or construction of which could cause maintain acceptable service ratios ce ratios, response times or other ervices:
	i. ii. iii. iv. v.	Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities?		
	Less	entially Significant Impact s Than Significant With Mitigation prporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The need for public service improvements to incorporate response services the site will be assessed. Service availability forms will be submitted to all applicable public service agencies to determine the need for significantly altered services or additional facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, or objectives for any public services. The evaluation on public services will include the assessment of fire protection, groundwater availability, police protection, and emergency response. Particular attention will be given to construction and operational activities. The project is

anticipated to require a blasting permit from the San Diego County Sheriff's Office. The project would not impact or require public services from schools or parks.

a)	Would the project increase the use of e or other recreational facilities such that facility would occur or be accelerated?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
undeve existin	Than Significant Impact: The proposed eloped area and does not involve a reside good neighborhood and regional parks or obtained have a less than significant impacts.	dential ther r	use that would increase the use of ecreational facilities. Therefore, the
,	Does the project include recreational expansion of recreational facilities, which on the environment?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
and do	pact: The proposed project is located ones not include recreational facilities or tional facilities. Therefore, the project uction or expansion of recreational facilities.	requir t wou	e the construction or expansion of
a)	RANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would to Cause an increase in traffic which is sure load and capacity of the street system either the number of vehicle trips, the congestion at intersections)?	ıbstan (i.e.,	tial in relation to the existing traffic result in a substantial increase in
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project would add vehicle and truck trips to the surrounding roadways as import of waste materials would be associated with the operation of the facility. A project-specific traffic analysis will be conducted to assess potential impacts to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

0)	Exceed, either individually or cumulestablished by the County congestion by the County of San Diego Transportations or highways?	mana	gement agency and/or as identified
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Disc	ussion/Explanation:		
	ntially Significant Impact: A project-spe ss impacts to applicable level of service s		•
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patter levels or a change in location that result		<u> </u>
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Disc	ussion/Explanation:		
not l	mpact: The proposed project is located of cated within two miles of a public or pure esult in a change in air traffic patterns.		•
,	ubstantially increase hazards due to a angerous intersections) or incompatible us		
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: A project-specific traffic analysis will be conducted to assess impacts to roadways and if required, all road improvements will be constructed according to applicable Public and Private Road Standards. The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or impede adequate site distance on a road.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access	s?	
Potentially Significant ImpactLess Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:		
Less Than Significant Impact: The proposemergency access. All roads used will be requand Private Road standards and in conformant Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County.	uired to	be consistent with applicable Public
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?		
Potentially Significant ImpactLess Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:		
Less Than Significant Impact: A project-speto determine the requirement for parking capa Zoning Ordinance Section 6766 Parking Schespaces, and the proposed project will be constrequirements; therefore, the proposed project project capacity.	city as dule re sistent	ssociated with the proposed project. equires provision for on-site parking with the Ordinance for total parking
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plan transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycl		
Potentially Significant ImpactLess Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:		

Less Than Significant Impact: A project-specific traffic analysis will be conducted, and if required, all road improvements will be constructed according to applicable Public and Private Road Standards and will be consistent with applicable policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation.

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

a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requiremed Quality Control Board?	ents of	the applicable Regional Water
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		
confor the Ca	tially Significant Impact: Wastewater of the RWQCB'S applicable standard alifornia Water Code. The method of was ect-specific technical analysis.	s, incl	uding the Regional Basin Plan and
b)	Require or result in the construction facilities or expansion of existing facilities significant environmental effects?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		
manag enviro	tially Significant Impact: The prop gement will be assessed in a project-s nmental impacts associated with the water treatment facilities will be assessed	specific const	c technical analysis. If applicable,
c)	Require or result in the construction of expansion of existing facilities, the consenvironmental effects?		<u> </u>
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project's method of storm water management will be assessed in a project-specific technical analysis. If applicable, environmental impacts associated with the construction or expansion of storm water facilities will be assessed.

The project will comply with all requirements of the RWQCB to ensure the protection of surface water quality. The project will secure a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination

System Permit, Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and a Water Appropriation Permit. The project will involve landform modification and will implement Best Management Practices for storm water run-off.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existence entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
 ✓ Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:
Potentially Significant Impact: The need for water services will be assessed. evaluation will include groundwater availability and supplied water services applicable, service availability forms will be submitted to the Otay Water Distriction of adequate water resources and entitlements to serve requested water resources of the project.
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serve may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
 ✓ Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact Incorporated Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:
Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project's method of wastew management will be assessed in a project-specific technical analysis. If applicable capacity of the wastewater treatment provider to serve the project's projected demawill be assessed. The evaluation will include assessing the provider's exist commitments and the impacts of additional demands resulting from the projected demands.
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
 □ Potentially Significant Impact □ Less than Significant Impact □ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

September 12, 2011

No Impact: The project is the construction of a new landfill, recycling collection center, and associated facilities. Any solid waste generated from the project will be disposed of on-site and would not place any burden on existing permitted capacity of other landfills or transfer stations within San Diego County.

g)	Comply with federal, state, and local sta waste?	tutes	and regulations related to solid
	Potentially Significant Impact	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		
recycli the ex County All soli In Sa Enforc Califor author Regula	than Significant Impact: The projecting collection center, and associated factisting permitted capacity of any landity. Solid waste generated by the project id waste facilities, including landfills required in Diego County, the County Department Agency issues solid waste factinia Department of Resources Recyclinity of the Public Resources Code (Sectionations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, the will comply with Federal, State, and locations.	cilities iill or would iire so tment iility p g and ons 44 , Chap	, and will not place any burden on transfer station within San Diego I be disposed of at the project site. Iid waste facility permits to operate of Environmental Health, Local ermits with concurrence from the Recovery (CalRecycle) under the 1001-44018) and California Code of oter 4 (Section 21440 et seq.). The
XVII. N	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICA	ANCE	:
a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a wildlife population to drop below self-splant or animal community, substantially of a rare or endangered plant or animal major periods of California history or present the project of t	fish o sustair y redu al or e	r wildlife species, cause a fish or ning levels, threaten to eliminate a ce the number or restrict the range liminate important examples of the
$\overline{\checkmark}$	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		

Potentially Significant Impact: Project-specific technical analyses for potential impacts to biological and cultural resources will be conducted for the proposed project. The analysis will consider the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or

September 12, 2011

endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

	Does the project have impacts that a considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable a project are considerable when viewe projects, the effects of other current propects)?	ble" m	eans that the incremental effects of connection with the effects of past
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
conside	cially Significant Impact: A list of parened and evaluated for potential adverse impacts, the proposed project will be that are cumulatively considerable.	cumu	llative effects. In addition to project
,	Does the project have environmenta adverse effects on human beings, either		
	Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		

Potentially Significant Impact: Project-specific technical analyses for potential direct and indirect impacts to human beings will be conducted for the proposed project.

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

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulations refer to http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/. For State regulations refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ((www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative

EAST OTAY MESA RECYCLING COLLECTION CENTER AND LANDFILL - 40 -

September 12, 2011

- Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)
- Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).
- Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt)
- Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm)
- International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)
- US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm)
- US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)
- US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.
- US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
 (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/nhsdatoc.html)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

- California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (<u>www.qp.gov.bc.ca</u>)
- County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

- County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

- CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.agmd.gov)
- County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.
- County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.
- Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.
- Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.
- R.E.C., Summary Report Biological Preliminary Draft Report for the East Otay Mesa Recycling Collection Center and Landfill. April 2011.
- Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program

EAST OTAY MESA RECYCLING COLLECTION CENTER AND LANDFILL - 41 -

September 12, 2011

- Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (http://www.wes.army.mil/)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.qov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (<u>www.leginfo.ca.gov</u>)
- County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.
- Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.
- U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine

Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.
- California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)
- California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

- California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/, www.oes.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)
- Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.
- Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)
- Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 &13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

- American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government
- California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)
- California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

- California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov, http://www.amlegal.com/,)
- County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)
- County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.
- Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.
- National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)
- National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (<u>www.fema.gov</u>)
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)
- San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997.
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

- California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)
- California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

September 12, 2011

- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to August 3, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.
- Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.
- Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

- National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)
- U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.
- U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

- California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)
- Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (http://www.access.gpo.gov/)
- Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html)
- International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway
 Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise
 and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis
 and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C.,
 June 1995. (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www.usen.com.org/www.cornell.edu)

- National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)
- US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (http://www.census.gov/)

RECREATION

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.
- California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)
- California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf)
- County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permitsforms/manuals.html)
- Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html)
- Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.
- San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)
- San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)
- US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

EAST OTAY MESA RECYCLING COLLECTION CENTER AND LANDFILL - 44 -

September 12, 2011

- California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.
- US Census Bureau, Census 2000.
- US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.
- US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
- US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

East Otay Mesa Recycling Collection Center and Landfill

Proposed Project Vicinity Map

