

### CITY OF ESCONDIDO

Planning Division 201 North Broadway Escondido, CA 92025-2798 (760) 839-4671 www.escondido.org

### **Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study Part II)**

- 1. Project title and case file number: ENV17-0006 (Via Hondita Subdivision Project)
- 2. Lead agency name and address: City of Escondido, 201 N. Broadway, Escondido, CA 92025
- 3. Lead agency contact person name, title, phone number and email: <u>Darren Parker, Associate Planner (760) 839-4553</u>, <u>Dparker@escondido.org</u>
- 4. Project location: Northern side of El Norte Parkway at Lincoln Avenue, east of La Honda Drive; end of Via Hondita) (APNs 225-042-26-27-28) in the City of Escondido, County of San Diego, CA
- 5. Project applicant's name, address, phone number and email: <u>James W. Price, 1879 Fox Bridge Court, Fallbrook,</u> CA 92028
- 6. General Plan designation: Suburban
- 7. Zoning: RE-20 (Residential Estate)
- 8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The proposed project involves a Tentative Subdivision Map (SUB 17-0030) for six single-family residential lots on approximately 3.39 acres of land within the City of Escondido, generally located on the northern side of El Norte Parkway at Lincoln Avenue, east of La Honda Drive at the end of Via Hondita (APNs 225-042- 26, -27, &-28). Proposed lot sizes range from approximately 20,108 SF to 20,757 SF. Single family homes range in size from 3,000 square feet (sq. ft.) to 3,044 sq. ft. The site is currently vacant. Project development includes grading and construction of single-family homes, along with improvements to Via Hondita and Ranridos Court, and the construction of new infrastructure such as electrical lines, waterlines, gas lines, and other utilities, including a sewer lateral connection from the project site to the adjacent offsite property (northwest section of the site). Cut and fill estimates are expected to be 6,500 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 5,600 cy of fill with 900 cy of export material. The project is not subject to a grading exemption since the maximum cut slope would be 20 feet. All the cut and fill slopes would be 2:1.

This environmental review is necessary because the parcels contain nonnative grasslands and southern willow scrub habitat totaling 1.00-acre that would be cleared for site development and to provide appropriate fire clearance areas. The entire project site is subject to the City's fuel modification requirements. Mitigation measures are necessary to offset the removal of the 1.00-acre of habitat at a 1:1 ratio.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (briefly describe the project's surroundings):

In general, the surrounding area is characterized as single-family residential, citrus orchards and other agricultural land uses. Single-family residential homes are located to the north, west and agricultural uses to the east and south. Dixon Reservoir and associated vegetated slopes are located further northeast. The General Plan land-use designation for the subject site is Suburban (up to 3.3 d.u. per acre) with an underlying zoning designation of RE-20 (Residential Estate). The topography of the site ranges from approximately 806 feet MSL at the northwest corner and 370 feet MSL at the intersection of Via Hondita and La Honda Road. The soil-types found onsite are mapped as Visalia Sandy Loam (VaA) and Vista Course Sandy Loam (VsD) on slopes between 0 and 15 percent.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

N/A

## **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

	environmental factors checked below potentially Significant Impact" as indicate				inv	olving at least one impact that is
	Aesthetics		Agricultural Resources			Air Quality
$\boxtimes$	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources			Geology and Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Mat	terials [		Hydrology/Water Quality
	Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources			Noise
$\boxtimes$	Paleontological Resources		Population/Housing			Public Services
	Recreation		Transportation/Traffic		$\boxtimes$	Tribal Cultural Resources
	Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance			
DET	ERMINATION: (To be completed by th	e Lea	ad Agency)			
On th	ne basis of this initial evaluation:					
	find that the proposed project COU DECLARATION shall be prepared.	LD N	NOT have a significant	effect on the	e e	nvironment, and a NEGATIVE
	find that, although the proposed projesting if the proposed project in this case because read MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION.	visio	ns in the project have bee			
t (	find that the proposed project might have City's General Plan Quality of Life Society's Environmental Quality Regulat ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORTS	Stand ions	ards, and the extent of the pursuant to Zoning Co	ne deficiency	ex	ceeds the levels identified in the
i t	find that the proposed project might hampact" on the environment, but at least o applicable legal standards, and b.) had be a standards on attached sheets. An ENVI effects that remain to be addressed.	one as b	effect: a.) has been adeq een addressed by mitiga	quately analyz ition measure	zed es b	in an earlier document pursuant passed on the earlier analysis as
i: <b>N</b> <del>C</del>	find that, although the proposed projects necessary because all potentially some personant to partie of NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to parlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARAT proposed project.	ignific appl	cant effects: (a) have b icable standards, and (b)	een analyze have been a	d a	dequately in an earlier EIR or ded or mitigated pursuant to that
S	ignature			ate		
				NI) /47 0000		
	arren Parker, Associate Planner rinted Name and Title		<u>E</u>	NV17-0006		

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1. This section evaluates the potential environmental effects of the proposed project, generally using the environmental checklist from the State CEQA Guidelines as amended and the City of Escondido Environmental Quality Regulations (Zoning Code Article 47). A brief explanation in the Environmental Checklist Supplemental Comments is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including off-site, on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts and mitigation measures. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact might occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. The definitions of the response column headings include the following:
  - A. "Potentially Significant Impact" applies if there is substantial evidence that an effect might be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries once the determination is made, an EIR shall be required.
  - B. "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 2 below, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced). Measures incorporated as part of the Project Description that reduce impacts to a "Less than Significant" level shall be considered mitigation.
  - C. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project creates no significant impacts, only less than significant impacts.
  - D. "No Impact" applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. "No Impact" answers do not require an explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency which show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2. Earlier Analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - A. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where it is available for review.
  - B. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of an adequately analyzed earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - C. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 3. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 4. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 5. The explanation of each issue should identify the significance of criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, as well as the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

ISSUES:

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
l.	<u>AE</u>	STHETICS Would the project:				
	a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				$\boxtimes$
	b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
	C.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				$\boxtimes$
	d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
II.	agr may Ass Cor	RICULTURAL RESOURCES In determining whether impacts to icultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies y refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site tessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of inservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on iculture and farmland. Would the project:				
	a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency or (for annexations only) as defined by the adopted policies of the Local Agency Formation Commission, to non-agricultural use?				
	b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
	C.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
	d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				$\boxtimes$
	e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
III.	the	<b>QUALITY</b> Where applicable, the significance criteria established by applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
	a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
	C.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
	d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
	e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			$\boxtimes$	
IV.	BIG	OLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
	a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
	b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
	C.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
	d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			$\boxtimes$	
	e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
	f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				$\boxtimes$

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
٧.	<u>cu</u>	ILTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
	a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				
	b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				
	C.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
VI.	<u>TR</u>	BAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
	a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in §21074?				
VII.	GE	OLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:				
	a.	Expose people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
		<ol> <li>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</li> </ol>				
		ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				
		iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
		iv. Landslides?				
	b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
	C.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
	e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				
VIII.	GR	REENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project:				
	a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.				
	b.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?				
IX.	HA	ZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:				
	a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
	b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
	C.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
	d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
	e.	For a project located within an airport land-use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
	f.	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
	g.	Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
	h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				
Χ.	<u>HY</u>	DROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
	a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
	b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
	C.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner which would result in substantial/increased erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
	d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
	e.	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
	f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			$\boxtimes$	
	g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
	h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				$\boxtimes$

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
	j.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				
XI.	<u>LA</u>	ND USE PLANNING Would the project:				
	a.	Physically 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?				
XII.	MII	NERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
	b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land-use plan?				
XIII.	<u>NC</u>	DISE Would the project result in:				
	a.	Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.				
	b.	Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
	C.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
	d.	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	e.	For a project located within an airport land-use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
	f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
XIV.	<u>PA</u>	LEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
	a.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
XV.	<u>PO</u>	PULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:				
	a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
	b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
	C.	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
XVI.	<u>PU</u>	BLIC SERVICES Would the project:				
	a.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services.				
		i. Fire protection?				
		ii. Police protection?				$\boxtimes$
		iii. Schools?				
		iv. Parks?				
		v. Other public facilities?				$\boxtimes$

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	RE	CREATION Would the project:				
	a.	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
	b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
XVIII.	<u>TR</u>	ANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:				
	a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit.				
	b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
	C.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
	d.	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
	e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?				
	f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX.	<u>UT</u>	TILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:				
	a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
	b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
	C.	Require, or result in, the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
	d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
	e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves, or may serve, the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
	f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
	g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				
XX.	<u>M</u> .	ANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
	a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number, or restrict the range, of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
	b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
C.	Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				
d.	Where deficiencies exist relative to the City's General Plan Quality of Life Standards, does the project result in deficiencies that exceed the levels identified in the Environmental Quality Regulations (City of Escondido Zoning Code Article 47 Section 33-924(a))?				

# Source of Information/Material Used in Preparation of this Analysis

ATC Design Group. 2019. Preliminary Drainage Analysis for Via Hondita, April.

Atkins. 2012. City of Escondido Greenhouse Gas Emissions CEQA Thresholds and Screening Tables. Prepared for the City of Escondido. August 22.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), 2015a, Envirostor Online Database. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/: Website accessed in May 2018.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), 2015b, Information Required from the Department of Toxic Substances Control Under Government Code Section 65962.5(a). http://www.calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/SectionA.htm. Website accessed in June 2018.

City of Escondido General Plan Update. 2012.

https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Planning/GPUpdate/GeneralPlanChapterVII\_pdf; website accessed May-June 2018.

City of Escondido. General Plan Final EIR. 2012. Website: <a href="https://www.escondido.org/Volume-l-Draft-EIR.aspx">https://www.escondido.org/Volume-l-Draft-EIR.aspx</a>; website accessed July 19, 2019.

City of Escondido. Escondido Drainage Master Plan. 1995. Website: <a href="https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Engineering/DrainageMasterPlan.pdf">https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Engineering/DrainageMasterPlan.pdf</a>; website accessed July 19, 2019.

City of Escondido. Draft MHCP maps (Multiple Habitat Conservation Program). 2001. Website: <a href="https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/pdfs/Planning/MHCP/Section0.pdf">https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/pdfs/Planning/MHCP/Section0.pdf</a>; website accessed July 19, 2019.

City of Escondido. Escondido Wastewater Collection System Master Plan Update (Nov. 2005) and Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Facilities Capacity Study, Dec 2006.

City of Escondido. Adopted Climate Action Plan. 2013. Website: <a href="https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Planning/ClimateActionPlan/AdoptedClimateActionPlan.pdf">https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Planning/ClimateActionPlan/AdoptedClimateActionPlan.pdf</a>; website accessed July 19, 2019.

City of Escondido. 2008. Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan. <a href="https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/pdfs/Utilities/SUSMP.pdf">https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/pdfs/Utilities/SUSMP.pdf</a>; website accessed May 2018.

City of Escondido. 2015. Article 47 Environmental Quality, Section 33-924. Website: <a href="http://qcode.us/codes/escondido/view.php?topic=33-47-1">http://qcode.us/codes/escondido/view.php?topic=33-47-1</a> 33\_924&frames=on. Website accessed July 12, 2019.

CalRecycle. 2018. California's 2017 Per Capita Disposal Rate Estimate. Website: <a href="https://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/goalmeasure/disposalrate/mostrecent">https://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/goalmeasure/disposalrate/mostrecent</a>; website accessed July 12, 2019.

City of Escondido. 2016. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Website: <a href="https://www.escondido.org/urban-water-management-plans.aspx">https://www.escondido.org/urban-water-management-plans.aspx</a>. Accessed on July 12, 2019.

City of Escondido. 2019. HARRF. Website: <a href="https://www.escondido.org/harrf.aspx">https://www.escondido.org/harrf.aspx</a>. Accessed on July 11, 2019.

California Department of Conservation (CDC). 2008 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP)

The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). Guide to addressing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from projects subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) 2008.

FIRM maps (Flood Insurance Maps). Website: <a href="https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor">https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor</a>; website accessed March 2018.

Fire Protection Plan. Fire wise 2000

Federal Highway Administration. 2008. (Roadway Construction Noise Model and Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment.

Kennedy, M.P., Tan, S.S., Bovard, K.R., Alvarez, R.M., Watson, M.J., and Gutierrez, C.I. 2007. <u>Geologic map of the Oceanside 30x60-minute quadrangle, California</u>: California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Map No. 2, scale 1:100,000

SANDAG. 2002. SANDAG's (Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region. Website:

https://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid\_1140\_5044.pdf; website accessed July 19, 2019.

Scheidt, Vincent. 2018. Biological Resources Survey Report for the Via Hondita Subdivision Project. June 2017; revised December 2018.

State of California Department of Conservation. Land Conservation Act Map; <a href="http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca">http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca</a>; website accessed September 2017.