

DRAFT

# Initial Study/ Negative Declaration

## City of Santee Safety and Environmental Justice Element

October 2024

Prepared for:



City of Santee  
10601 Magnolia Avenue  
Santee, California 92071  
Contact: Christina Rios, Senior Planner

Prepared by:



600 B Street, Suite 2000  
San Diego, California 92101  
(619) 236-1778  
Contact: Darin Neufeld, AICP, Director

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## ***Table of Contents***

---

<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Document Overview.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Section 1 Project Description .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Project Location .....	1
1.2 Project Overview .....	1
1.3 Project Background.....	3
1.4 Proposed Element.....	3
1.5 Regulatory Requirements, Permits, and Approvals .....	4
<b>Section 2 Initial Study Checklist.....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Project Information .....	7
2.2 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected .....	9
2.3 Lead Agency Determination .....	10
2.4 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts .....	11
2.4.1 Aesthetics .....	12
2.4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	16
2.4.3 Air Quality .....	19
2.4.4 Biological Resources .....	24
2.4.5 Cultural Resources.....	31
2.4.6 Energy .....	36
2.4.7 Geology and Soils .....	39
2.4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	46
2.4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	51
2.4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality .....	61
2.4.11 Land Use and Planning.....	72
2.4.12 Mineral Resources .....	74
2.4.13 Noise .....	76
2.4.14 Population and Housing.....	79
2.4.15 Public Services.....	83
2.4.16 Recreation .....	91
2.4.17 Transportation .....	94
2.4.18 Tribal Cultural Resources .....	101
2.4.19 Utilities and Service Systems.....	103
2.4.20 Wildfire.....	108
2.4.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	118

<b>Section 3</b>	<b>List of Preparers .....</b>	<b>122</b>
	3.1 Lead Agency .....	122
	3.2 Consultants .....	122
<b>Section 4</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>124</b>

**Figures**

Figure 1. Regional Location .....	5
-----------------------------------	---

**Tables**

Table 1. City of Santee EnviroStor Cleanup Sites .....	52
Table 2. City of Santee Population (2010–2020) .....	79

## ***Acronyms and Abbreviations***

---

AB	Assembly Bill
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission
ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
Attainment Plan	Attainment Plan for San Diego County
Basin Plan	Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin
BMP	best management practice
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CBC	California Building Code
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CH <sub>4</sub>	methane
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CO	carbon monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	carbon dioxide
CO <sub>2e</sub>	carbon dioxide equivalent
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EV	electric vehicle
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
GHG	greenhouse gas
GWP	global warming potential
HU	Hydrological Unit
I-	Interstate
IS	Initial Study
LID	Low Impact Development
Metropolitan	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
MSCP	Multiple Species Conservation Program
N <sub>2</sub> O	nitrous oxide
ND	Negative Declaration
NO <sub>2</sub>	nitrogen dioxide
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
O <sub>3</sub>	ozone
Padre Dam	Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Pb	lead
PM <sub>10</sub>	particulate matter measuring no more than 10 microns in diameter
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	fine particulate matter measuring no more than 2.5 microns in diameter
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan

RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
Safety-EJ Element	Safety and Environmental Justice Element
SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
SB	Senate Bill
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SDAB	San Diego Air Basin
SDAPCD	San Diego County Air Pollution Control District
SDMTS	San Diego Metropolitan Transit System
SF <sub>6</sub>	sulfur hexafluoride
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
SR-	State Route
SRA	State Responsibility Area
Sustainable Santee Plan	Sustainable Santee Plan: The City's Roadmap to Greenhouse Gas Reductions
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollutant Prevention Plan
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VHFHSZ	Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones

## ***Document Overview***

---

This Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) has been prepared in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines for the proposed Safety and Environmental Justice Element (Safety-EJ Element). The primary intent of this document is to (1) determine whether the Safety-EJ Element would result in potentially significant impacts to the environment, and (2) incorporate mitigation measures into the project design, as necessary, to eliminate or reduce the Safety-EJ Element's potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

In accordance with CEQA, projects that have the potential to result in either a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment must undergo analysis to disclose potential significant effects. The provisions of CEQA apply to California governmental agencies at all levels, including local agencies, regional agencies, state agencies, boards, commissions, and special districts. CEQA requires preparation of an IS for a discretionary project to determine the range of potential environmental impacts of that project and to define the scope of the environment review document. As specified in Section 15064(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, the lead agency (i.e., City of Santee) may prepare an ND if, in the course of the IS analysis, it is recognized that the project would not have a significant impact on the environment. As the lead agency for the Safety-EJ Element, the City has the principal responsibility for conducting the CEQA environmental review to analyze the potential environmental effects associated with the Safety-EJ Element. During the review process, it was determined that potential impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, an IS/ND has been prepared for the Safety-EJ Element.

The Safety-EJ Element has not been approved or denied. It is being reviewed for environmental impacts only.

This IS/ND is organized as follows:

- **Section 1: Project Description.** This section introduces the document and discusses the project description, including location, setting, and specifics of the lead agency and contacts.
- **Section 2: Initial Study Checklist.** This section discusses the CEQA environmental topics and checklist questions and identifies the potential for impacts.
- **Section 3: List of Preparers.** This section lists the organizations and individuals who were consulted and/or prepared this IS/ND.
- **Section 4: References.** This section presents a list of reference materials consulted during preparation of this IS/ND.

## **Public Review**

The IS/ND will be circulated for a 30-day public review period from October 25, 2024, to November 25, 2024.

Comments regarding this IS/ND must be made in writing and submitted to Christina Rios, 10601 Magnolia Avenue, Santee, California 92071, or by email to [crios@CityofSanteeCa.gov](mailto:crios@CityofSanteeCa.gov).

Comments should focus on the proposed finding that the Safety-EJ Element would not have a significant effect on the environment because revisions or mitigation measures have been made or agreed to by the City. If the commenter believes that the Safety-EJ Element may have a significant environmental effect, it would be helpful for the commenter to identify the specific effect and explain why the commenter believes the effect would occur and why it would be significant.

## Section 1 Project Description

---

### 1.1 Project Location

The City of Santee is a suburban city in eastern San Diego County. The City is part of the East County region and is approximately 18 miles from the Pacific Ocean. The City's regional location is shown on Figure 1, Regional Location. The City is connected to the coastline by State Route (SR-) 52, a six-lane freeway that runs from Interstate (I-) 5 in La Jolla to SR-67 in El Cajon. The City is intersected by the San Diego River, which is composed of a linear greenbelt that includes parks, trails, and more than 1,100 acres of natural riparian habitat.

### 1.2 Project Overview

The City proposes to update the City's existing General Plan Safety Element while incorporating a new Environmental Justice Element into one combined General Plan Element (hereafter referred to as the "Safety-EJ Element"). The Safety-EJ Element would be a component of the Santee General Plan that assesses the safety and environmental justice needs of all economic segments of the City; defines the goals, objectives, and policies that would guide the City's approach to resolving those needs; and recommends a set of programs that would implement these policies over the next 8 years.

The Safety-EJ Element, as part of the Santee General Plan, would establish safety- and environmental justice-related implementing programs to guide City decision-making related to emergency preparedness, emergency response, access to public facilities, and climate adaptation and resilience strategies, particularly for sensitive and vulnerable communities. The Safety-EJ Element would include strategies to establish action-oriented programs to increase the City's adaptive capacity to respond to climate change-related impacts to meet the current and future needs of people living and working in Santee. The Safety-EJ Element would require that the City implement a series of actions, referred to as the "implementation program" (Section 8 of the Safety-EJ Element), for compliance with state law.

Pursuant to California Government Code, Section 65302(g), a city's Safety Element is required to address the protection of its people from unreasonable risks associated with disasters, including earthquakes, floods, fires, landslides, and other hazards, identified by the local community. Specifically, the Safety Element must identify hazards and hazard abatement provisions to guide local decisions related to zoning, subdivisions, and entitlement permitting and should also integrate hazard and risk reduction strategies. In addition, the state recently adopted legislation that requires the Safety Element to provide additional information related to flooding, wildfires, emergency evacuation, and climate change, as well as several other requirements, including the following:

- An incorporation of, either by reference or through direct integration of content, the hazard profiles from the jurisdiction’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (Assembly Bill [AB] 2140)
- A Vulnerability Assessment that addresses the potential impact and the adaptive capacity of the jurisdiction to climate change-related events through a myriad of climate adaptation and resilience strategies (Senate Bill [SB] 379)
- An Emergency Evacuation Route Analysis that identifies evacuation routes and evaluates their capacity, safety, and viability under a range of emergency scenarios (AB 747) and evacuation route locations (AB 1409)

Pursuant to California Government Code, Section 65302(h), and SB 1000, a city’s Environmental Justice Element is required to identify disadvantaged communities in the area covered by the jurisdiction’s General Plan, if the jurisdiction has a disadvantaged community. The Environmental Justice Element is required to perform the following:

- Identify objectives and policies to reduce the unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities by means that include but are not limited to the reduction of pollution exposure, including the improvement of air quality, and the promotion of public facilities, food access, safe and sanitary homes, and physical activity
- Identify objectives and policies to promote civic engagement in the public decision-making process
- Identify objectives and policies that prioritize improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities

The Safety-EJ Element would consist of the following major components:

- Section 1, Executive Summary
- Section 2, Introduction
- Section 3, Statutory Requirements
- Section 4, Safety – Existing Conditions
- Section 5, Climate Adaptation and Resilience
- Section 6, Environmental Justice – Existing Conditions
- Section 7, Goals, Objectives, and Policies
- Section 8, Implementation
- Appendices
  - A, Vulnerability Assessment
  - B, Emergency Evacuation Route Analysis
  - C, Geotechnical/Seismic Hazard Study
  - D, Environmental Justice Existing Conditions Assessment
  - E, Environmental Justice Community Survey Results

### **1.3 Project Background**

The Safety-EJ Element would be adopted as a “joint element,” meaning that the Safety Element would be updated in conjunction with the Environmental Justice Element. The Safety-EJ Element would align with the City’s focus on providing “a more livable, equitable, and economically vibrant community,” especially considering the Element’s goal of creating a resilient, adaptable community in the face of climate change. The City would also be working toward its commitment to incorporate environmental responsibility into the management of its community and municipal operations through this Safety-EJ Element.

The City began coordinating development of its Safety-EJ Element with the update of its Housing Element, which was adopted in May 2022. The update of two or more General Plan Elements (Housing and Safety) triggers a state requirement to address environmental justice under the provisions of SB 1035 and SB 1000—the Planning for Healthy Communities Act (2016). SB 1000 requires cities and counties to address environmental justice in their General Plans. Therefore, the City is required to create new environmental justice policies to ensure compliance with state law and document the review.

### **1.4 Proposed Element**

The Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with existing and updated Santee General Plan goals, objectives, and policies and regulatory compliance with new California legislation. The Safety-EJ Element would assess existing conditions of potential hazards, health risks, and disproportionate environmental burdens faced by disadvantaged communities. The purpose of the Element is to identify goals, objectives, and policies that would perform the following:

- Mitigate existing and potential hazards in Santee
- Reduce the unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities
- Promote public engagement in the City’s decision-making process
- Prioritize improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities

Implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may encourage minor development and infrastructure projects for the enhancement of public safety and environmental justice in the City, such as the following:

- Utility and infrastructure improvements:
  - Improvement of drainage ways and flood control facilities to lessen recurrent flood problems;
  - Additional fire station construction or renovation;
  - Installation of sufficient security lighting around structures; and
  - Installation of solar equipment of electric vehicle charging stations.

- Transportation infrastructure:
  - Installation of traffic control devices such as signals, medians, and other street design measures along busy roadways;
  - Construction of additional transit stops;
  - Construction of alternative transit;
  - Development of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure (e.g., bike paths, sidewalks, crosswalks, etc.); and
  - Road improvements to ensure that multiple evacuation routes are available under a range of hazard scenarios.
- Recreational facilities, community facilities, and green infrastructure:
  - Development of vegetative barriers, tree canopy, and green infrastructure;
  - Development of parks, green space, recreation facilities, and natural environments;
  - Development of community gardens;
  - Development of community centers and community-building facilities; and
  - Development of greenways and tree trenches to increase resiliency to the impacts of extreme precipitation.
- Development of farmers markets, farm stands, ethnic markets, mobile health food markets, and convenience/corner stores that sell healthy foods
- New healthcare facilities, including mental health facilities
- Housing repairs

It should be noted that while the Safety-EJ Element encourages the types of projects listed above, this Element is a policy document that does not propose any specific development. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element would not directly result in the development of new infrastructure or facilities. Section 7, Goals, Objectives, and Policies, of the Safety-EJ Element provides the safety and environmental justice goals, objectives, and policies that are evaluated for environmental impacts in this Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND). Proposed Safety and EJ policies included in the Safety-EJ Element are listed in Section 2.4 as they relate to each of the resource areas evaluated (refer to Section 7, Goals, Objectives, and Policies, of the Safety-EJ Element for a full list of the proposed policies).

## **1.5 Regulatory Requirements, Permits, and Approvals**

The Safety-EJ Element would require an amendment to the Santee General Plan. In addition, the 2018 County of San Diego Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan would be incorporated into the Safety-EJ Element through resolution. If the 2023 County of San Diego Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is approved prior to adoption of the Safety-EJ Element and this IS/ND, then that update would also be incorporated by resolution. Adoption of the Safety-EJ Element requires adoption of this IS/ND. No other regulatory requirements, permits, and/or approvals are required.



*This page intentionally left blank.*

## Section 2 Initial Study Checklist

---

The following discussion of potential environmental effects was completed in accordance with Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines to determine if the proposed Safety-EJ Element may have a significant effect on the environment.

### 2.1 Project Information

1. **Project title:** City of Santee Safety and Environmental Justice Element
2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of Santee, Department of Development Services  
10601 Magnolia Avenue  
Santee, California 92071
3. **Contact person name, address, and phone number:** Christina Rios, Senior Planner  
10601 Magnolia Avenue  
Santee, California 92071  
(619) 258-4100 x157 [crios@CityofSanteeCa.gov](mailto:crios@CityofSanteeCa.gov)
4. **Project location:** City of Santee and sphere of influence
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** City of Santee, Department of Development Services  
10601 Magnolia Avenue  
Santee, California 92071
6. **General plan designation:** Citywide – varies
7. **Zoning:** Citywide – varies
8. **Description of project:** Refer to Section 1, Project Description, of this IS/ND.
9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** Refer to Section 1 of this IS/ND.

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:**

No other approvals are required.

**11. Have California Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

The City initiated and completed Native American consultation requirements consistent with Senate Bill 18 (SB18) and Assembly Bill 52 (AB52). The City contacted the tribal representatives which are traditionally and culturally affiliated within Santee and the tribal representatives recommended by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by certified mail. Two requests for consultation were received by the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians and the Campo Band of Mission Indians. Staff held a meeting with each tribal representative and explained that the project is an update to a planning-level document and future site-specific development would be subject to additional environmental review. The tribal representative from the Campo Band of Mission Indians requested a copy of the completed Negative Declaration for their records. No additional questions or requests were received by any of the tribes within the 30 and 90-day consultation period.

## 2.2 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the Safety-EJ Element, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils             | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality   | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning              | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing             | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None               |   |   |

## 2.3 Lead Agency Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed Safety-EJ Element COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed Safety-EJ Element could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Safety-EJ Element have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent, including implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed Safety-EJ Element MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed Safety-EJ Element MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed Safety-EJ Element could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Safety-EJ Element, nothing further is required.

---

Signature

Christina Rios, Senior Planner, City of Santee

---

Date

## 2.4 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

This section documents the screening process used to identify and focus on environmental impacts that could result from the Safety-EJ Element. The checklist portion of the IS begins below and includes explanations of each CEQA issue topic. CEQA requires that an explanation of all answers be provided along with this checklist, including a discussion of ways to mitigate any significant effects identified. The following terminology is used to describe the potential level of significance of impacts:

- **No Impact.** The analysis concludes that the Safety-EJ Element would not affect the particular resource in any way.
- **Less than Significant.** The analysis concludes that the Safety-EJ Element would not cause substantial adverse change to the environment without the incorporation of mitigation.
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The analysis concludes that it would not cause substantial adverse change to the environment with the inclusion of mitigation agreed upon by the project proponent.
- **Potentially Significant.** The analysis concludes that the Safety-EJ Element could result a substantial adverse effect or significant effect on the environment, even if mitigation is incorporated. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

### 2.4.1 Aesthetics

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Environmental Setting

The City is primarily composed of the flat San Diego River Valley and the gently sloping areas that transition to the steeply sloped hillsides associated with major ridgeline systems. The dramatic hillsides, ridgelines, and rock outcrops form a significant design resource (City of Santee 2003). The orientation of the San Diego River corridor creates impressive long views in Santee and to the surrounding ridgelines and mountains, such as El Capitan. The elevated western entry to the City along Mission Gorge Road also affords an opportunity for scenic views along the San Diego River corridor (City of Santee 2003). The numerous topographic features of the City and the surrounding vicinity provide distinctive views and vistas from the developed portions of the City.

### Impact Analysis

**a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Scenic vistas in Santee are identified in the Santee General Plan Community Enhancement Element, which describes several areas in and adjacent to the City that provide scenic relief and vistas and backdrops, including views of “scenic undisturbed hills and ridgelines” that surround the City, open space areas, and scenic views of the San Diego River corridor along Mission Gorge Road (City of Santee 2003). The Community Enhancement Element identifies Mission Gorge Road as a local scenic road and contains Mission Gorge Road Design Standards that establish specific design standards for properties along the Mission Gorge Road corridor. The design standards pertain to architectural theme of commercial buildings, signage,

access, and landscaping and are intended to improve the appearance and enhance the viability of commercial properties in the Mission Gorge Road corridor.

The Safety-EJ Element would not specifically propose development that would inhibit existing views in Santee of surrounding scenic areas. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could include transit and utilities infrastructure construction and repairs, healthcare facilities, and recreational space/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Due to the conceptual nature of future development, future development proposals would require project-specific CEQA review, including an assessment of potential impacts to scenic vistas in Santee. If necessary, mitigation would be required to reduce potential project-level impacts to a less than significant level. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to existing development standards in the Santee Municipal Code, such as the Mission Gorge Road Design Standards and other applicable standards. Compliance with these standards would ensure future development does not affect scenic views of the San Diego River corridor from Mission Gorge Road or other scenic vistas in Santee. The Santee General Plan Community Enhancement Element includes a goal to beautify the City to provide an aesthetically pleasing community: “To respect and integrate the natural and man-made environments of Santee to enhance the quality of life, revitalize older neighborhoods and community places, and sustain a beautiful, distinctive and well-organized community for our citizens” (City of Santee 2003). Therefore, compliance with applicable design standards and project-specific CEQA review would ensure that the Safety-EJ Element would result in less than significant impacts to scenic vistas.

**b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The entirety of SR-52 is identified as eligible for designation as a state scenic highway between I-5 and SR-67 but has not been officially designated. A portion of SR-52 is an officially designated state scenic highway due to the available scenic views toward Mission Trails Regional Park, which includes the Mission Trails Summit and Cowles Mountain.

The Safety-EJ Element would not specifically propose new development that would adversely affect (directly or indirectly) scenic resources in Santee. As described under Section 2.4.1(a), future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to existing development standards in the Santee Municipal Code, such as the Mission Gorge Road Design Standards and other applicable standards. Due to the conceptual nature of future development, future development proposals would require project-specific CEQA review, including an assessment of potential impacts to scenic resources in Santee. If necessary, mitigation would be required to reduce potential project-level impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element would result in less than significant impacts to scenic resources.

- c. Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Santee General Plan Community Enhancement Element includes the objective of strengthening the gateways into the City (Objective 10.0) and maintaining and enhancing scenic views (Objective 15.0). The objectives are supported by policies to preserve the high-quality scenic viewshed visible from the western entry along Mission Gorge Road and SR-52 (Policy 10.1) and provide for the maintenance of view opportunities to surrounding hillsides by ensuring proposed structures do not significantly impact existing community-level viewsheds (Policy 15.2).

The Safety-EJ Element would not specifically propose the development of infrastructure that would degrade the visual character of the City. Due to the conceptual nature of future development, future development proposals would require project-specific CEQA review, including an assessment of potential impacts to visual character and scenic quality of the City. If necessary, mitigation would be required to reduce potential project-level impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the Santee General Plan Land Use Element includes the objective to ensure that development in Santee is consistent with the overall community character and contributes positively toward the City's image (Objective 11.0). The objective is supported by policies to ensure that all requirements set forth within the Community Enhancement Element are implemented during the development review process (Policy 11.1) and to maintain and update, as needed, the design standards for landscaping and site planning to provide guidelines for future developments (Policy 11.2). Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to comply with these policies, and project-specific CEQA review would ensure that future development would not conflict with applicable zoning or regulations that have been designed to protect scenic quality. Therefore, impacts to visual character and scenic quality of the City would be less than significant.

- d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element would not specifically propose the development of infrastructure that would create a new source of light or glare or that adversely affect day or nighttime views in Santee. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to existing development standards in the Santee Municipal Code. For example, light spillover and glare are regulated by Section 13.30.030(B) of the Santee Municipal Code, which states that all lighting shall be designed and adjusted to reflect light away from any road or street and away from any adjoining premises. New sources of light or glare would be consistent with the ambient light levels from nearby sources.

Future development proposals would require project-specific CEQA review, including an assessment of potential impacts related to light and glare. If necessary, mitigation would be required to reduce potential project-level impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element would result in less than significant impacts to light or glare that could affect day or nighttime views in Santee.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

<p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and <b>Fire Protection regarding the state's</b> inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided. Would the project:</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program designates the majority of the City as Urban Land (not Important Farmland) (DOC 2016). No Farmlands of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmlands, or Farmlands of Local Importance occur in Santee. Further, according to the Santee General Plan Land Use Element, no agricultural land uses occur in Santee.

## Impact Analysis

- a. **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development, but may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as transportation and utility improvements and recreational spaces/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be in areas that have been defined by the California Department of Conservation as Urban Land. The proposed Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with the existing Santee General Plan and would not identify any new land that is subject to urbanization or rezoning from agricultural use to commercial and/or residential use. As described above, no Farmlands of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmlands, or Farmlands of Local Importance exist in Santee. Therefore, future development would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Grazing to non-agricultural use, and no impact would occur.

- b. **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

**No Impact.** The Santee General Plan Land Use Map shows no agricultural land uses in Santee. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** No state forests or lands currently used for timber production or management are in Santee. Additionally, no zoning designation for timberland or forest resources exists in Santee. Therefore, future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- d. **Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

**No Impact.** As described in Section 2.4.2(c), no zoning designation for timberland or forest resources exists in Santee. Nevertheless, along the San Diego River is dedicated open space heavily vegetated with trees. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with current zoning and land use regulations and would

not include development projects in designated open space areas of the City. As such, the proposed Safety-EJ Element would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- e. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

**No Impact.** As described in Section 2.4.1(b), the Santee General Plan Land Use Map shows no agricultural land uses in Santee. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element would not result in a zoning change for existing agricultural properties and would not restrict agricultural uses on these properties. Implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

### 2.4.3 Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Southern California is characterized as a semiarid climate, although it contains three distinct zones of rainfall that coincide with the coast, mountain, and desert. The City is within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The SDAB is a coastal plain with connecting broad valleys and low hills bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and high mountain ranges to the east. The topography in the SDAB region varies greatly, from beaches to the west, to mountains, and then desert to the east.

Regional climate and local meteorological conditions influence ambient air quality. The climate in the SDAB is largely dominated by the strength and position of the semi-permanent high-pressure system over the Pacific Ocean, known as the Pacific High. This high-pressure ridge over the West Coast often creates a pattern of late night and early morning low clouds, hazy afternoon sunshine, daytime onshore breezes, and little temperature variation year-round.

The favorable climate of the SDAB also works to create air pollution problems. Sinking or subsiding air from the Pacific High Pressure Zone creates a temperature inversion, known as a “subsidence inversion,” which acts as a lid to vertical dispersion of pollutants. Weak summertime pressure gradients further limit horizontal dispersion of pollutants in the mixed layer below the subsidence inversion. The combination of poorly dispersed anthropogenic emissions and strong sunshine leads to photochemical reactions, which results in the creation of ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) at this surface layer.

Air quality is defined by ambient air concentrations of six specific pollutants identified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to be of concern with respect to health and welfare of the public (known as criterial pollutants). The criteria pollutants include O<sub>3</sub>, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen

dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), 10-micrometer or less particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and 2.5-micrometer or less particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and lead (Pb).

Air quality in the SDAB is regulated by the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). The SDAPCD is the government agency that regulates sources of air pollution in San Diego County. Currently, the SDAB has a “non-attainment” status for criteria pollutants O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The SDAPCD has prepared an Attainment Plan for San Diego County (Attainment Plan), the applicable air quality plan, to provide control measures to achieve attainment status for these criteria pollutants. The Attainment Plan relies on information from the California Air Resources Board and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), including mobile and area source emissions and information regarding projecting growth in San Diego County, to project future emissions and then determine strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. The California Air Resources Board mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population and vehicle trends and land use plans developed by the cities and San Diego County. Projects that propose development that are consistent with the growth anticipated by the Santee General Plan are therefore consistent with the Attainment Plan.

### **Proposed Policies**

The following EJ policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to air quality:

**Policy 1.4:** Continue to protect the air, water, soil, and biotic resources from damage by exposure to hazardous materials.

**Policy 2.1:** Continue to maintain or improve the current air quality level within the City of Santee’s jurisdiction.

**Policy 2.2:** Remove particulate matter from mobile source emissions through implementation of the Sustainable Santee Plan’s public transit, active transportation, and electrification strategies.

**Policy 2.3:** Seek to partner with the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District and the California Department of Transportation to establish a mitigation program, such as a roadside vegetation barrier program, to reduce the impacts of pollution, notably for homes in the disadvantaged communities bounded by Magnolia Avenue, Prospect Avenue, Cuyamaca Street, and Mission Gorge Road.

**Policy 2.4:** Explore creating a program to provide education on how to improve air quality for City residents impacted by air pollutants, especially those living within proximity to Gillespie Field.

**Policy 2.5:** Seek to partner with the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District to (1) establish a mitigation program to reduce the impact of air pollution on disadvantaged communities and (2)

create targeted permit inspection programs in disadvantaged communities to help ensure enforcement of air quality permits.

**Policy 2.6:** Create land use patterns that encourage people to bicycle, walk, or use public transit to reduce emissions from mobile sources, such as plans that (1) require vegetative barriers to be included in industrial developments near residential areas in Santee and/or (2) improve tree canopy and promote green infrastructure development in disadvantaged communities, particularly the neighborhoods that do not already have access to green space.

**Policy 2.7:** Encourage stronger pollution controls at facilities in/near disadvantaged communities, especially the neighborhoods around Magnolia Avenue, Prospect Avenue, Cuyamaca Street, and Mission Gorge Road.

## Impact Analysis

### a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development that could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Attainment Plan. Instead, the Safety-EJ Element would identify policies that could be implemented to mitigate the current levels of air pollution in Santee. For example, the proposed Safety-EJ Element would incorporate the following new policies, which would improve air quality in Santee:

**Policy 2.2:** Remove particulate matter from mobile source emissions through implementation of the Sustainable Santee Plan’s public transit, active transportation, and electrification strategies.

**Policy 5.3:** Encourage ridesharing and the use of transit and other transportation systems management programs to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and traffic congestion.

**Policy 5.4:** Preclude through-city truck traffic on local roadways and limit truck routes through Santee to principal and major arterial roadways.

**Policy 11.2:** Continue expedited review of building permits for solar equipment and electric vehicle charging stations.

While the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development, it may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as transportation and utility improvements, healthcare facilities, and recreational spaces/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). For specific future development projects, consistency with the Attainment Plan would be assessed during project-specific CEQA review at the time the individual projects are proposed, and mitigation measures would be applied as necessary in conformance with CEQA. Therefore,

the Safety-EJ Element would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans, and impacts would be less than significant.

**b. Would the project 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)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development that could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which San Diego County is non-attainment. Instead, the Safety-EJ Element would identify policies that could be implemented to mitigate the current levels of air pollution in Santee. Construction and operational emissions of future development projects would be estimated during projects-specific CEQA review and compared against the SDAPCD's screening-level thresholds. Mitigation measures would be applied as necessary in conformance with CEQA. Further, implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element would include several new policies that would improve air quality in Santee (e.g., Policies 5.3, 5.4, and 11.2 listed above). Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element would not result in a cumulatively net increase of any criteria pollutant, and impacts would be less than significant.

**c. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element would not identify or approve specific development projects that could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. However, future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in short-term construction emissions, such as dust (i.e., particulate matter) generated by clearing and grading activities, exhaust from gas- and diesel-powered construction equipment, and vehicular emissions associated with construction worker commutes. All future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require project-specific CEQA review, including an assessment of criteria pollutant emissions associated with construction and operation of the individual development project. Potential air quality-related impacts would be location-specific and cannot be assessed in a meaningful way until the nature of the individual project and location of the project site are known. The individual development project would be subject to SDAPCD rules and regulations, and any impacts identified with the development project would be addressed through mitigation measures specific to the impact. Short-term construction and long-term operational air emissions would be subject to the screening-level thresholds set forth in the San Diego County's CEQA Guidelines. In addition, the Safety-EJ Element would contain policies that would maintain or improve air quality through reducing vehicle traffic congestion (Policy 5.3), reducing particulate matter (Policy 2.2), and encouraging EV use (Policy 11.2). Therefore, impacts related to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant.

**d. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Odors are one of the most obvious forms of air pollution to the public. The California Air Resources Board’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook includes a list of the most common sources of odor complaints received by local air districts. Although offensive odors seldom cause physical harm, they can be a nuisance. Typical sources of odor complaints include facilities such as sewage treatment plants, landfills, recycling facilities, petroleum refineries, and livestock operations.

The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development projects. However, construction associated with future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could result in, for example, minor amounts of odor compounds associated with diesel heavy equipment exhaust. Construction would not take place all at once and would occur at various locations throughout the City. Any operations near existing receptors would be temporary; therefore, impacts associated with odors during construction and operation of new development would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.4 Biological Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any applicable policies protecting biological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other applicable habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

According to the Santee General Plan Conservation Element, the regionally important biological resources that occur in Santee include the coastal sage scrub- and chaparral-covered hills north and south of the City and the riparian corridor along the San Diego River (City of Santee 2003).

The City contains numerous wildlife species that are defined as “sensitive” species, meaning listed as rare, endangered, threatened, of “special concern,” or otherwise noteworthy by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Native Plant Society, or other conservation agencies, organizations, or local botanists (City of Santee 2003).

Chaparral and coastal sage scrub communities occur throughout the City on undeveloped hillside areas in the North Magnolia area, Rattlesnake Mountain, and in the southwestern quadrant of the City, south of Prospect Avenue and Rancho Fanita Drive. These communities also provide

valuable wildlife habitat for a diverse group of species, including protected species like the California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica*) and the San Diego banded gecko (*Coleonyx variegatus abbotti*) (City of Santee 2003).

Sensitive plants in the region include the San Diego County viguiera (*Viguiera laciniata*), San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*), San Diego thorn mint (*Acanthomintha ilicifolia*), San Diego sagewort (*Artemisia palmeri*), Orcutt's brodiaea (*Brodiaea orcuttii*), long-spined spineflower (*Chorizanthe polygonoides* var. *longispina*), Palmer's grapplinghook (*Harpagonella palmeri*), and others. Sensitive animals in the region include the San Diego coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei*), coastal western whiptail (*Cnemidophorus tigris multiscutatus*), desert woodrat (*Neotoma lepida*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*), and several other wide-ranging species, including various native bats (City of Santee 2003).

The City participates in the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) under the Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program and has prepared a MSCP Subarea Plan (City of Santee 2006). The MSCP is a multi-jurisdictional program that provides a regional conservation solution to species and habitat issues that have historically presented roadblocks to land and infrastructure development. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan represents its contribution to the MSCP and to the regional Natural Communities Conservation Planning (California Natural Community Conservation Planning) conservation goals. The implementation of the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan also contributes to the recovery of listed species due in part to the coordination of key biological areas, including biological cores and habitat linkages and to the proactive habitat management actions. The Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan addresses the need for broad-based planning to accommodate the conflicting demands for wildlife conservation and urban development while contributing to the recovery of a species and their habitat.

### **Proposed Policies**

The following Safety policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to biological resources:

**Policy 13.1:** Continue to encourage the implementation of low-impact development (e.g., rain gardens, rainwater harvesting, green roofs) to reduce flooding.

**Policy 13.2:** Continue to promote the application of nature-based solutions (e.g., greenways, tree trenches) to improve resilience and preserve biodiversity.

**Policy 13.3:** Continue to encourage the use of climate-smart landscaped surfaces (e.g., permeable pavement, stormwater parks, green streets) in new and existing development.

The following EJ policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to biological resources:

**Policy 1.1:** Continue to protect natural resources from pollution, such as trash and debris in creeks, rivers, and storm drainage areas, especially in areas where transient populations are prevalent.

**Policy 1.2:** Increase maintenance of public spaces, such as parks and trails, to protect natural resources from pollution.

**Policy 1.3:** Continue to reduce the potential danger related to the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials to an acceptable level of risk.

**Policy 1.4:** Continue to protect the air, water, soil, and biotic resources from damage by exposure to hazardous materials.

**Policy 8.1:** Consider creating an environmental education program that will include the following to encourage the appreciation of Santee’s natural resources:

- Development of trails, interpretive signs, and overlooks at public parks adjacent to sensitive environments
- Encouragement of private environmental organizations to sponsor wetlands enhancement programs and to provide docents for wetlands tours
- Coordination with school districts to use specified areas as outdoor learning laboratories

**Policy 8.2:** Consider developing and implementing a Green Infrastructure Plan, including a combination of stormwater features, habitat, trees, and other greenery.

**Policy 8.3:** Identify strategies for grassroots implementation of green infrastructure and restoration by Santee residents, such as through the promotion of eco-literacy with a focus on urban gardening.

**Policy 14.8:** Implement green infrastructure projects, including tree planting in disadvantaged communities, through implementation of a Green Infrastructure Plan through implementation of the Sustainable Santee Plan, Urban Forestry Plan, and private development proposals.

**Policy 14.9:** Integrate the natural and human-made landscapes of Santee to enhance the quality of life, revitalize older neighborhoods and community places, and sustain a beautiful, distinctive, and well-organized community for Santee residents.

## **Impact Analysis**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Santee General Plan Conservation Element includes policies designed to promote the preservation of natural communities that support rare, threatened, and/or endangered species. Specifically, Conservation Element Policy 10.1 addresses the importance of preserving significant natural resources (e.g., biological resources) in Santee: “The City should

encourage the conservation of rare or unique plants and wildlife by identifying such resources through the environmental review process and by using open space preservation, where appropriate, to preserve the resources as a condition of a project approval, consistent with the City’s future Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan” (City of Santee 2003).

Implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects that could directly and indirectly affect sensitive and special-status plant and wildlife species, such as drainage and flood control improvements and development of parks and recreational facilities (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Given the programmatic nature of the Safety-EJ Element, specific development projects are unknown at this time. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to sensitive species. However, the Safety-EJ Element is a policy document that includes goals, objectives, and policies for the enhancement of public safety and environmental justice in the City and does not propose any specific development projects. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element would not directly result in the development of new infrastructure or facilities.

The City, through its CEQA compliance program, requires that new development projects in undeveloped areas prepare an assessment of biological habitat and potential impacts to sensitive species. Future projects would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations in place to protect special-status species. With implementation of project-specific CEQA review and compliance with federal, state, and local regulations protecting special-status species, impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species would be less than significant.

**b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Santee General Plan Conservation Element includes policies designed to promote the preservation of natural communities. Conservation Element Policy 2.1 intends to protect “the San Diego River Corridor and all other City water corridors to reduce flood hazards, protect significant biological resources and scenic values, and to provide for appropriate recreational uses” (City of Santee 2003).

Implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects that could directly and indirectly affect riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as identified by state and federal agencies, such as drainage and flood control improvements and development of parks and recreational facilities (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Currently, specific development projects are unknown. The Safety-EJ Element is a

policy document that includes goals, objectives, and policies for the enhancement of public safety and environmental justice in the City and does not propose any specific development projects. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element would not directly result in the development of new infrastructure or facilities.

Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to sensitive species. Further, the City, through its CEQA compliance program, requires that new development projects in undeveloped areas prepare an assessment of biological habitat, including riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. Future projects would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations in place to protect riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities. With implementation of project-specific CEQA review and compliance with federal, state, and local regulations, impacts to riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities would be less than significant.

**c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Isolated wetlands that may be under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which regulates compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), are supported in Santee. Construction associated with future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may directly or indirectly affect such wetlands. Given the programmatic nature of the Safety-EJ Element, specific development projects are unknown at this time. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to federally protected wetlands. Any potential impacts to these resources from future projects would require consultation with and permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Therefore, impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources would be less than significant.

EJ Policy 8.1 encourages an environmental education program that includes wetlands enhancement programs with guided wetland tours. Additionally, Safety Policies 1.1 through 1.9 discourage development within the floodplain, which may include some wetlands areas.

**d. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as drainage and flood control improvements and development of parks and recreational facilities, that may adversely affect the ability of wildlife to

move through the City and cause habitat fragmentation (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). The Santee General Plan Conservation Element addresses the need to ensure that individual projects comply with federal and state laws protecting sensitive plant and wildlife species: “The City shall require that all development proposals provide appropriate mitigation for identified significant biological resources including selective preservation, sensitive site planning techniques and in-kind mitigation for identified impact” (Policy 7.2) (City of Santee 2003).

Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to wildlife movement. In areas so designated by the regulatory agencies, appropriate surveys shall be conducted at the times of year necessary to detect sensitive species for which potentially suitable habitat exists on a given site, and appropriate mitigation shall be applied. Future projects would be required to comply with these goals and policies, as well as federal, state, and local regulations in place, to protect species movement. Further, the Safety-EJ Element is a policy document intended to enhance public safety and environmental justice in the City and does not propose any specific development. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**e. Would the project conflict with any applicable policies protecting biological resources?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Future projects in Santee would be required to comply with policies protecting biological resources identified in the Santee General Plan Conservation Element. Any future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to applicable federal, state, and local policies protecting biological resources. Santee’s defensible space requirement is a 100-foot minimum for fuel modification between structures and wildland areas in accordance with the California Fire Code and City of Santee Fire Code Amendments. Policy 12.1 of the Safety-EJ Element states: “Continue to require fire prevention planning and defensible space in all new development within Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones or wildland-urban interface.” Additionally, Santee Municipal Code Section 8.06 (Urban Forestry Ordinance) prohibit arbitrarily removing trees. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element would not conflict with Santee Municipal Code Section 8.06 since tree removal for public safety would not be arbitrary and is in compliance with the California Fire Code and City of Santee Fire Code Amendments. In cases where the potential for adverse impacts to biological resources may occur, individual projects would require consultation and applicable permits with the appropriate regulatory agencies. Project-specific CEQA review would ensure that no significant adverse impacts to biological resources would occur. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other applicable habitat conservation plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City is subject to the San Diego MSCP under the Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program and prepared a Draft MSCP Subarea Plan (City of Santee 2018). Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to the San Diego MSCP and the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan. Future housing that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could result in impacts to or inconsistencies with the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan. Future development would require subsequent CEQA review to identify the potential for conflict with the provisions of the San Diego MSCP and the Draft Santee MSCP Subarea Plan. Therefore, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or any other applicable Habitat Conservation Plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.5 Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Cultural resources are defined as those environmental components that are fragile and non-renewable evidence of human activity as reflected in districts, sites, structures, artifacts, works of art, and natural features that were of importance in human events, which in Santee, primarily consist of archaeological sites, features, and structures ranging from early prehistoric to recent historic age.

### Prehistoric Resources

The City is in the San Diego River Valley, which has been a prime location of human occupation since Native American hunter-gatherers first arrived in the San Diego County region. Climatic conditions are known to have fluctuated during the prehistoric period; however, the valley would have remained an important environment, providing both a reliable water supply and abundant fauna and floral resources. The settlement of this rich environment was both extensive in its range from the coast to the mountains and intensive in its relative density of sites (City of Santee 2003).

As of 2003, based on a review of official records, 65 recorded cultural sites exist within Santee's limits. The majority (60) of the cultural resources in Santee are prehistoric sites, with one that has both a prehistoric and a historic component. Prehistoric sites in the area tend to be characterized by diversity in the archaeological assemblage including bedrock milling stations, artifact scatters, and midden soils varying in size from small, temporary encampments to large, complex habitation areas. This is evidenced by the fact that only 20 sites are defined by only a lithic artifact scatter (City of Santee 2003).

Most are late prehistoric in age though a few may relate to the Early Archaic and Paleo-Indian cultural traditions. The late prehistoric sites may be affiliated with the Kumeyaay people that inhabited the area at the time of Euro-American contact (see Section 2.4.18, Tribal Cultural Resources). Fifteen prehistoric sites have been evaluated for eligibility to the California Register

of Historic Resources (CRHR) or National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Six of these were determined eligible for listing, and nine were determined ineligible. Human remains are known to occur on one site, which was evaluated and determined eligible for listing in the NRHP (City of Santee 2003).

## **Historic Resources**

Whereas those cultural resources related to Native American occupation are classified as prehistoric, those related to Euro-American presence in the region are defined as historic resources. In San Diego, the historic period begins with establishment of the first mission in Alta, California, by Father Junípero Serra in 1769. Lasting until about 1824, this first phase of historic occupation has been designated the Spanish missionization and early agricultural development period. Following this, other phases are delineated: the Mexican land grant distribution (1824–1920) and, finally, the Modern Period (1920–present) (City of Santee 2003).

Five historic sites have been recorded in Santee and represent less than 10 percent of the total cultural resource inventory in Santee. One of these, SDI-5535/H, is a historic trash scatter that also contains a prehistoric component. Two of the sites date to the early 1930s and were recorded during a survey for SR-52. They include a historic trash site near Cuyamaca Street and Mission Gorge Road and a Depression-era agricultural complex in the eastern part of the City near Woodside Avenue. Another site is the Edgemoor Farm Polo Barn within the vicinity of Mission Gorge Road and Magnolia Avenue, an area that may contain numerous historic archaeological remains. The fifth site is a historic trash scatter that has not been assessed. Only SDI-5535/H has been evaluated for NRHP listing and was subsequently determined to be ineligible (City of Santee 2003).

## **Historic Structures**

The City has one structure that is listed on the NRHP: the Edgemoor Farm Dairy Barn, or Polo Barn. Located on the Edgemoor Hospital Grounds on Magnolia Avenue, the barn was built in 1913 by Walter H. Dupee to house his prize cattle and champion polo ponies. The barn was added to the NRHP in 1985. The City also has one officially registered Local Historic Landmark, the James Love House, or Granite House. The Granite House is on the City's maintenance yard property on Hazeldon Drive, just south of Forester Creek. The Granite House was built in 1934 of granite quarried from the Coyote Hill quarry, which is now the site of the Cameron's Mobile Estates Mobilehome Park. The house was officially recognized by the City as a Local Historic Landmark in May 1995. However, the structure does not qualify for listing in the NRHP and was relocated due to construction of SR-52 (City of Santee 2003).

## **Resource Evaluation**

Most of the City is either urbanized and, therefore, of low probability for significant cultural resources or has been subjected to surveys within the last decade resulting in complete resource

inventories. As such, the potential for unexamined areas with significant and CRHR-eligible historic properties (sites) is fairly low. Areas of the City with low cultural resource sensitivity consist of the developed areas and sloping terrain, while areas with cultural resource sensitivity moderate include two pockets of land in the northern area of the City and the San Diego River plain itself, where there is the potential for buried archaeological sites (City of Santee 2003).

Since a few areas remain that have not been surveyed, additional sites can be anticipated, especially buried sites along the San Diego River. This area is delineated as being of moderate potential for CRHR- and NRHP-eligible archaeological deposits that may be encountered during construction-related excavations exceeding a meter in depth. Three areas of the City are either regions of known significant resources or lands of projected resource potential—the San Diego River corridor, Sycamore Canyon, and North Magnolia Avenue (see Section 4.3 of the Santee General Plan Conservation Element for more detailed discussion of the resource potential in these areas) (City of Santee 2003).

## Impact Analysis

### a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Previously unrecorded and recorded built environment resources are in Santee. The Safety-EJ Element is intended to enhance public safety and environmental justice in the City. The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development, but may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as utility improvements, healthcare facilities, and housing repairs (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Therefore, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may have the potential to result in impacts to and removal of historical resources in Santee; for example, to ensure that residences and services in Santee have adequate capacity to address increased needs due to climate change-related impacts and other hazardous events. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to historical resources. Additionally, the Santee General Plan Conservation Element requires either the preservation of significant historic or prehistoric sites or the professional retrieval of artifacts prior to the development of a site, consistent with the provisions of CEQA (Policy 8.1). Preservation may include various measures, including avoidance, preservation in place, incorporation into open space, or covering or capping. The type of preservation would depend on the nature and significance of the archaeological resource and the practical requirements of the proposed land use.

Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to comply with applicable policies to protect historical resources. Therefore, impacts to historical resources would be less than significant.

**b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As described in Section 2.4.5(a), implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may have the potential to result in removal of cultural resources in Santee; however, the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to archaeological resources. Additionally, the Santee General Plan Conservation Element requires curation of any recovered artifacts as a condition of any cultural resources mitigation program (Policy 8.1).

Development that is proposed on known sensitive sites or sites that are discovered to be sensitive require a reconnaissance survey to determine the likelihood of discovering resources during construction. If cultural resources, including archaeological resources, are encountered during construction, developers would be required to cease work and retain a qualified archaeologist to evaluate and conserve the resource(s). Future projects facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local policies to protect archaeological resources. Therefore, impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

**c. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Future development consistent with the Safety-EJ Element has the potential to encounter previously buried known and unknown resources. However, the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Future projects that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to archaeological resources, including human remains.

Additionally, Objective 8 of the Santee General Plan Conservation Element outlines policies that strive to preserve cultural resources, which include human remains, in Santee. Policy 8.1 requires projects to determine the presence and absence of and consider impacts to cultural resources during project review. Policy 8.1 also provides examples of the measures that would be implemented to allow for the preservation of significant cultural resources. Furthermore, if human remains are encountered during project construction, the California Health and Safety Code and CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5, require that work in the immediate area must halt and that the remains must be protected. The County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified immediately, if applicable, per Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of California Health and Safety Code. The responsibilities for acting on notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.94. Future projects facilitated under implementation of the Safety-

EJ Element would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations in place to protect human remains. Therefore, impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.6 Energy

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

The California Building Code (CBC) contains standards that regulate the method of use, properties, performance, or types of materials used in the construction, alteration, improvement, repair, or rehabilitation of a building or other improvement to real property. The CBC includes mandatory green building standards (CALGreen) for residential and nonresidential structures; the most recent version includes the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. These standards focus on four key areas: smart residential photovoltaic systems, updated thermal envelope standards (preventing heat transfer from the interior to the exterior and vice versa), residential and nonresidential ventilation requirements, and nonresidential lighting requirements. The City has adopted the 2022 CBC, including CALGreen, and includes it in the Sustainable Santee Plan: The City's Roadmap to Greenhouse Gas Reductions (Sustainable Santee Plan) (City of Santee 2019).

## Proposed Policies

The following Safety policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to energy efficiency and energy demand:

**Policy 10.5:** Provide information on the benefits of the resiliency of existing residential and commercial development through structural strengthening, fire safe landscaping, and energy efficiency upgrades.

**Policy 11.1:** Increase the energy reliability of municipal facilities to withstand increased energy demands.

**Policy 11.2:** Continue expedited review of building permits for solar equipment and electric vehicle charging stations.

**Policy 11.3:** Encourage the conservation of energy during peak demand hours.

The following EJ policy in the Safety-EJ Element apply to energy efficiency and energy demand:

**Policy 11.5:** Continue to educate and/or provide resources and weatherization (i.e., weatherproofing) measures that can improve housing conditions and reduce energy costs.

## Impact Analysis

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development, but may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as new or renovated fire stations, healthcare facilities, and community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with the Santee General Plan and would not result in any unplanned regional energy use. Implementation of new development has the potential to result in impacts to energy supply due to the anticipated development. Energy resources would be consumed during construction of future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. Energy would also be consumed to provide operational lighting, heating, cooling, and transportation for future development. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to energy use, including analysis of individual project consistency with the CBC, CALGreen, and any other requirements included as part of the Santee General Plan and the Sustainable Santee Plan. Compliance with state and local building regulations and standards would ensure that energy usage would not be inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Additionally, the Safety-EJ Element would improve energy efficiency by incorporating several new policies and actions addressing energy use and energy efficiency in Santee:

**Policy 11.5:** Continue to educate and/or provide resources and weatherization (i.e., weatherproofing) measures that can improve housing conditions and reduce energy costs.

**Policy 14.2:** Reduce greenhouse gas emissions, increase renewable energy, and promote energy efficiency through implementation of the Sustainable Santee Plan.

As such, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to energy efficiency in Santee.

**b. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Sustainable Santee Plan is the applicable plan for energy efficiency in Santee. Goal 10 of the Sustainable Santee Plan promotes energy sustainability by outlining measures to decrease greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through increasing clean energy use (i.e., renewable energy sources, especially those that have zero or near zero emissions, such as photovoltaic solar and wind generation). Measure 10.1 (Increase Distributed Renewable Energy within Santee) and Measure 10.2 (Community Choice Aggregation Program) of the Sustainable Santee Plan provide the blueprint for a more renewable, sustainable city. As described above, future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to energy use, including compliance with applicable energy plans. In addition, as described in Section 2.4.6(b), the Safety-EJ Element would improve energy efficiency by incorporating new policies addressing energy use, renewable energy, and energy efficiency in Santee (refer to Policy 11.5 and Policy 14.2), thereby contributing to implementation of the Sustainable Santee Plan. Because implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with and further implementation of the Sustainable Santee Plan, it would not conflict with applicable energy efficiency plans, and impacts would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.7 Geology and Soils

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

The City is in seismically active Southern California, a region that has experienced numerous earthquakes in the past. The Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act specifies that an area termed an Earthquake Fault Zone is to be delineated if surrounding faults are deemed sufficiently active or well-defined after a review of seismic records and geological studies. The City is not within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The seismic risk in Santee is not considered significantly greater than that of the surrounding municipalities and the San Diego County area in general. Since no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones exist in Santee, no restrictions on development related to the Alquist-Priolo requirements occur.

According to the 2021 Geotechnical/Seismic Hazard Study prepared for the Safety-EJ Element, no active, potentially active, or inactive faults occur in Santee, and the City is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (Geocon, Inc. 2021). While no active or potentially active faults are known to occur in or adjacent to the City, the City is similar to other areas in California in that it is subject to periodic seismic shaking due to earthquakes along remote or regional active faults. An active fault is defined by the California Geological Survey as a fault showing evidence for activity within the last 11,000 years.

The Rose Canyon Fault Zone, approximately 10 miles west of the City, is the closest known active fault. Earthquakes that might occur within the Rose Canyon Fault Zone or other faults in the Southern California and northern Baja California area are potential generators of significant ground motion in Santee. The Rose Canyon Fault Zone is the dominant source of potential ground motion in Santee (City of Santee 2003). Seismic parameters for the Rose Canyon Fault Zone include an estimated maximum earthquake magnitude of 6.9.

According to the California Department of Conservation Geologic Map of California (2022), the southern area of the City is underlain with Mesozoic plutonic granite, quaternary deposits of alluvium, and tertiary sedimentary rocks of Eocene nonmarine sandstone. Areas underlain with alluvium and sandstone would have a moderate paleontological potential (County of San Diego 2009).

The following Safety policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to geology and soils:

**Policy 2.1:** Utilize existing and evolving geologic, geophysical, and engineering knowledge to distinguish and delineate those areas that are particularly susceptible to damage from landslides and slope instability, liquefaction, and dam inundation.

**Policy 2.2:** For projects proposed in areas identified in the geologic hazard category area, the geologic/geotechnical consultant shall establish either that the unfavorable conditions do not exist in the specific area in question or that they can be mitigated through proper design and construction.

**Policy 2.3:** As shown in Table A-1, Determination of Geotechnical Studies Required, of the Geotechnical/Seismic Hazard Study Group II, III, and IV facilities require a Geotechnical Investigation, a Geologic Investigation, and a Seismic Hazard Study specific to the project. Additionally, the State of California require reports for public schools, hospitals, and other critical structures to be reviewed by the State Architect.

## Impact Analysis

- a. **Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**
  - i. **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** No known or suspected fault traces are in the Santee area. As described above, the Rose Canyon Fault Zone, approximately 10 miles west of the City, is the closest known active fault. Additionally, the City is not subject to the provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. The closest fault systems could produce earthquakes that cause substantial ground motion resulting in serious injuries or deaths and significant property damage due to the seismic activity of the region as a whole. However, the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development and, therefore, would not expose people to the risk of loss, injury, or death from rupture of an earthquake fault. Nevertheless, the Safety-EJ Element may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as transportation and utility improvements and recreational spaces/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Future projects facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review and would be required to comply with the CBC, which would reduce exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from seismic ground shaking. Any proposed construction would require the adoption of appropriate engineering design in conformance with the recommended geotechnical standards for construction. Additionally, the proposed Safety-EJ Element would incorporate the updated Geotechnical / Seismic Hazard Study (2021), which includes the following objectives and policies to address seismic shaking and other geologic hazards in Santee:

**Objective 2:** Increase awareness of geotechnical and seismic hazards to avoid or minimize the effects of hazards during the planning process for new development or redevelopment and to mitigate the risks for existing development.

- **Policy 2.1:** Utilize existing and evolving geologic, geophysical, and engineering knowledge to distinguish and delineate those areas that are particularly susceptible to damage from landslides and slope instability, liquefaction, and dam inundation.
- **Policy 2.2:** For projects proposed in areas identified in the geologic hazard category area, the geologic/geotechnical consultant shall establish either that the unfavorable conditions do not exist in the specific area in question or that they can be mitigated through proper design and construction.

- **Policy 2.3:** As shown in Table A-1, Determination of Geotechnical Studies Required, of the Geotechnical/Seismic Hazard Study Group II, III, and IV facilities require a Geotechnical Investigation, a Geologic Investigation, and a Seismic Hazard Study specific to the project. Additionally, the State of California require reports for public schools, hospitals, and other critical structures to be reviewed by the State Architect.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### **ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Ground shaking is responsible for most of the damage from earthquakes and can damage or destroy buildings. Shaking intensity depends on the type of fault, distance to the epicenter, magnitude of the earthquake, and subsurface geology. The closest fault systems could produce earthquakes that cause substantial ground motion that could result in serious injuries or deaths and significant property damage due to the seismic activity of the region as a whole. However, the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Future projects facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review and would be required to comply with the CBC, which would reduce exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from seismic ground shaking. Any proposed construction would require the adoption of appropriate engineering design in conformance with the recommended geotechnical standards for construction. Additionally, the proposed Safety-EJ Element would incorporate the updated Geotechnical / Seismic Hazard Study (2021). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### **iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction results when water-saturated, sandy, unstable soils are subject to intense shaking, such as that caused by an earthquake. These soils lose cohesiveness, causing unreinforced structures to fail. According to the Santee General Plan Safety Element, portions of the City are within a liquefaction hazard area. The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may have the potential to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from liquefaction. Future projects proposed as a result of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review and would be required to comply with all relevant federal and state regulations and building standards, including the preparation of a project-specific Geotechnical Investigation Report. Future projects would require the adoption of appropriate engineering design in conformance with the recommended geotechnical standards for construction. Additionally, the Safety-EJ Element would incorporate Policy 2.1 to address vulnerabilities to landslides and slope instability, liquefaction, and dam inundation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### iv. Landslides?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The nearest earthquake fault within the vicinity of the City is the Rose Canyon Fault Zone, which is approximately 10 miles west of the City. An earthquake large enough to result in moderate ground shaking is possible. Seismic risks are significantly higher in areas closer to the region's major faults, and a moderate or major earthquake could result in potentially damaging ground shaking. Development on the hillside areas where steep slopes are present can exacerbate landslide hazards. The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Future projects proposed as a result of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent CEQA review. Future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to comply with the CBC and the recommendations of the project-specific Geotechnical Investigation Report, including engineered site preparation and adequate structural design, which would reduce potential adverse impacts from landslides. Additionally, the Safety-EJ Element would incorporate Policy 2.1 to address vulnerabilities to landslides and slope instability, liquefaction, and dam inundation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development plans. Therefore, the nature of construction activities for future individual projects, such as the amount of grading, excavation, and vegetation removal, is unknown. If a project proposes to disturb more than one acre of soil, it is required by the state to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would include best management practices (BMPs) for erosion and sedimentation control. BMP examples include an effective combination of erosion and sediment controls, which include barriers such as silt fences, hay bales, drain inlet protection, and gravel bags. Existing vegetation should be preserved as much as possible. Additionally, Santee Municipal Code, Section 11.40.300(B)(5), requires development projects to design ground cover to provide 100 percent coverage within nine months after planting or to provide additional landscaping to meet this standard. Future development facilitated by implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to these conditions for a construction permit. Following construction, implementation of individual projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element would not increase the potential for soils to be subject to wind or water erosion. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**c. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Development on hillside areas when steep slopes are present can increase rates of erosion and exacerbate landslide hazards, lateral spreading, liquefaction, or collapse, which may threaten structures. Portions of the City have areas where slopes exceed 15 percent. The development on slopes with this degree of inclination is difficult and should be avoided, if possible, to prevent property damage resulting from slope failure. Policy 2.2 of the existing Santee General Plan Safety Element addresses impacts related to slope instability and steep slopes (e.g., hillside areas). The Safety-EJ Element would retain these existing policies and actions.

The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Future projects proposed as a result of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent CEQA review and would be required to adhere to the CBC, the Santee Municipal Code, and other standards and regulations for building designs. Additionally, the Safety-EJ Element would incorporate Policy 2.2, which would require geotechnical studies for development proposed on seismically and/or geologically hazardous sites.

Impacts resulting from unstable geologic units or soil would be reduced through compliance with the Santee General Plan and existing codes and adherence to the recommendations of the project-specific Geotechnical Investigation Report, including engineered site preparation and adequate structural design. Any proposed construction would require the adoption of appropriate engineering design in conformance with the recommended geotechnical standards for construction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**d. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Certain types of clay soils expand when they are saturated and shrink when dried. These are called expansive soils and can pose a threat to the integrity of structures built on them without proper engineering. Expansion and contraction of soils in response to changes in moisture content could lead to differential and cyclical movements that could cause damage or distress to structures and equipment. Thus, they are less suitable for development compared to non-expansive soils.

Future development consistent with the Safety-EJ Element would have the potential to be adversely impacted by expansive soils; however, the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Future projects that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review. Any future development that is supported by the Safety-EJ Element would be required to adhere to the CBC, the Santee Municipal Code, and other standards and regulations for building designs. Impacts resulting from expansive soils would be reduced through compliance with existing codes and adherence to the

recommendations of the project-specific Geotechnical Investigation Report, including engineered site preparation and adequate structural design. Any proposed construction would require the adoption of appropriate engineering design in conformance with the recommended geotechnical standards for construction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**e. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may include septic tanks for wastewater disposal. Soils incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are subject to provisions of the Santee Municipal Code, which require soils engineering investigations, including soil bearing capacity and soil expansion. The Santee General Plan Safety Element requires projects to complete soil and geologic/geotechnical investigations in hazard areas as identified by federal, state, and regional agencies. Sites would be required to be developed in accordance with recommendations from geological investigations. Therefore, with compliance with the Santee Municipal Code and the proposed Safety-EJ Element policies, impacts would be less than significant.

**f. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would have the potential to (directly or indirectly) destroy a unique paleontological resource or site if located in the southern area of the City where the surface is underlain with alluvium and sandstone (County of San Diego 2009). Future development projects proposed as a result of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to paleontological resources. If resources are encountered on an unknown site, the Santee Municipal Code requires that grading cease until the resource can be evaluated. Santee Municipal Code, Title 11, Chapter 40, Article 5, Archaeological and Paleontological Resources, states, “If any archaeological or paleontological resources are discovered during grading operations, the permittee must immediately cease all grading operations and notify the City Engineer of the discovery. Grading operations must not recommence until the permittee has received written authority from the City Engineer to do so.” Future projects facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to comply with applicable policies to protect paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

GHGs trap heat in the atmosphere and occur from natural processes and human activities. Human activities that produce GHGs are the burning of fossil fuels (e.g., coal, oil, and natural gas for heating and electricity, gasoline and diesel for transportation), decaying of landfill waste and raising of livestock (which produce methane [CH<sub>4</sub>]), deforestation activities, and some agricultural practices. Scientific evidence indicates a correlation between the worldwide proliferation of GHG emissions by humankind over the past century and increasing global temperatures (IPCC 2014). The following are the principal GHGs that enter the atmosphere because of human activities:

- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) enters the atmosphere through the burning of fossil fuels (oil, natural gas, and coal), agriculture, irrigation, and deforestation, as well as the manufacturing of cement.
- CH<sub>4</sub> is emitted through the production and transportation of coal, natural gas, and oil, as well as from livestock. Other agricultural activities (e.g., ranching, dairy production, and fertilizer) influence CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and the decay of waste in landfills.
- Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) is released most often during the burning of fuel at high temperatures. This GHG is caused mostly by motor vehicles, which also include non-road vehicles, such as those used for agriculture.
- Fluorinated gases are emitted primarily from industrial sources, which often include hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>). Although they are often released in smaller quantities, they are referred to as high global warming potential gases because of their ability to cause global warming.

These gases have different global warming potentials for trapping heat in the atmosphere. For example, one pound of CH<sub>4</sub> has 21 times more heat capturing potential than one pound of CO<sub>2</sub>. When dealing with an array of emissions, GHG emissions are typically reported in terms of pounds or metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year for comparison purposes.

## Proposed Policies

The following EJ policy in the Safety-EJ Element apply to GHG emissions:

**Policy 14.2:** Reduce greenhouse gas emissions, increase renewable energy, and promote energy efficiency through implementation of the Sustainable Santee Plan.

## Impact Analysis

- a. **Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The greatest source of GHG emissions associated with development projects in California is vehicular emissions. The second greatest source is emissions from energy consumption (both natural gas and electrical) (California Air Resources Board 2018).

The Safety-EJ Element would not authorize specific development project. As such, its adoption and implementation would not directly generate any GHG emissions. The Safety-EJ Element may, however, facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as transportation and utility improvements, new or renovated fire stations, healthcare facilities, and recreational spaces/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). As described in Section 2.4.6, Energy, future development facilitated by the proposed Safety-EJ Element would be designed and constructed in compliance with Title 24 energy efficiency requirements of the CBC, Building Energy Efficiency Standards, CALGreen, and any other requirements included as part of the Santee General Plan and the Sustainable Santee Plan (City of Santee 2019). For example, the Sustainable Santee Plan identifies goals, measures, and actions that will contribute to better air quality in Santee. Sustainable Santee Plan goals that reduce GHG emissions include increasing energy efficiency in existing and new residential and commercial units (Goals 1–4), decreasing energy demand through reducing urban heat island effect (Goal 5), reducing VMT (Goal 6), increasing the use of electric vehicles (Goal 7), improving traffic flow (Goal 8), reducing solid waste generation (Goal 9), and increasing clean energy use (Goal 10). Compliance with these proposed policies and actions would further increase energy efficiency in new buildings, reducing total energy demand and the level of GHG emissions generated from coal, natural gas, and oil-based energy sources. The Safety-EJ Element would not include any policies that would encourage inefficient building practices that could affect the volume of GHG emissions. The Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with the City’s overall efforts for energy and conservation policies to reduce GHGs; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Additionally, the Safety-EJ Element would improve energy efficiency, reduce energy demand, and reduce GHG emissions in Santee with the following new policies and actions addressing GHG emissions from energy use and transportation:

**Policy 2.2:** Remove particulate matter from mobile source emissions through implementation of the Sustainable Santee Plan’s public transit, active transportation, and electrification strategies.

**Policy 2.6:** Create land use patterns that encourage people to bicycle, walk, or use public transit to reduce emissions from mobile sources, such as plans that (1) require vegetative barriers to be included in industrial developments near residential areas in Santee and/or (2) improve tree canopy and promote green infrastructure development in disadvantaged communities, particularly the neighborhoods that do not already have access to green space.

**Policy 3.4:** Encourage the use of alternative transportation modes, such as walking, cycling, and public transit. Maintain and implement the policies and recommendations of the Active Santee Plan and the San Diego Association of Governments San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan to improve safe bicycle and pedestrian access to major destinations.

**Policy 3.5:** Coordinate with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System and San Diego Association of Governments to provide efficient, cost-effective, and responsive systems; multimodal support facilities; and adequate access near and to and from transit stops for bicyclists and pedestrians, including children and youth, older adults, and people with disabilities.

**Policy 3.6:** Encourage and provide ridesharing, park and ride, and other similar commuter programs that eliminate vehicles from freeways and arterial roadways. Encourage businesses to provide flexible work schedules for employees and employers to offer shared commute programs and/or incentives for employees to use public transit.

**Policy 3.7:** Work to increase public transit ridership among transit-dependent populations by providing greater access to public transit throughout Santee.

**Policy 5.5:** Continue to increase sidewalks, crosswalks, and safety for people who walk and/or use mobility devices, such as wheelchairs.

**Policy 5.6:** Implement the Complete Streets Policy in the Santee General Plan Mobility Element.

**Policy 5.7:** Continue to plan for and implement a comprehensive network of safe pedestrian facilities to promote pedestrian travel.

**Policy 5.8:** Continue to design pedestrian walkways in a way that promotes walking by providing a safe, aesthetically pleasing path of travel.

**Policy 5.9:** Maintain access for pedestrian travel where it already exists and provide it where it does not to prevent or eliminate barriers to pedestrian travel.

**Policy 7.5:** Continue and expand the City of Santee’s community garden program and provide information on how existing community gardens operate and how residents can get involved.

**Policy 7.6:** Assess and, if feasible, develop open land for community gardens.

**Policy 7.7:** Identify and implement opportunities to incorporate open spaces suitable for community gardens into larger development projects.

**Policy 8.1:** Consider creating an environmental education program that will include the following to encourage the appreciation of Santee’s natural resources:

- Development of trails, interpretive signs, and overlooks at public parks adjacent to sensitive environments
- Encouragement of private environmental organizations to sponsor wetlands enhancement programs and to provide docents for wetlands tours
- Coordination with school districts to use specified areas as outdoor learning laboratories

**Policy 8.2:** Consider developing and implementing a Green Infrastructure Plan, including a combination of stormwater features, habitat, trees, and other greenery.

**Policy 8.3:** Identify strategies for grassroots implementation of green infrastructure and restoration by Santee residents, such as through the promotion of eco-literacy with a focus on urban gardening.

**Policy 11.5:** Continue to educate and/or provide resources and weatherization (i.e., weatherproofing) measures that can improve housing conditions and reduce energy costs.

**Policy 14.2:** Reduce greenhouse gas emissions, increase renewable energy, and promote energy efficiency through implementation of the Sustainable Santee Plan.

As such, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to reduction of GHG emissions in Santee.

**b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. As such, its adoption would not directly generate GHG emissions. However, future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would have the potential to generate short-term construction and long-term operational GHG emissions.

The City adopted its Sustainable Santee Plan in January 2020 to present the City’s GHG inventory, identify the effectiveness of California initiatives to reduce GHG emissions, and identify local measures to reduce citywide GHG emissions to achieve the City’s GHG reduction target. The Sustainable Santee Plan allows developers to demonstrate that their projects are consistent with the plan by demonstrating compliance with the Sustainable Santee Action Plan CEQA Project Consistency Checklist. The checklist allows developers to streamline CEQA review and bypass a complete GHG analysis on their own for CEQA processing, if applicable. Emissions associated with projects that are consistent with the Sustainable Santee Plan are considered less than significant, and their contributions to cumulative emissions are not considered cumulatively considerable.

Future projects under the Safety-EJ Element would be required to demonstrate consistency with the Sustainable Santee Plan through project-specific CEQA review and to implement mitigation measures as needed; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

The California Health and Safety Code defines a hazardous material as “any material that because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment.” Thus, the term “hazardous material” is a broad term for all substances that may be hazardous, specifically including hazardous substances and hazardous waste. Substances that are flammable, corrosive, reactive, oxidizers, radioactive, combustible, or toxic are considered hazardous.

Hazardous materials in Santee are transported through the City using the area’s primary transportation routes—SR-52, SR-67, and SR-125.

Hazardous materials sites in Santee include EnviroStor cleanup sites as identified and regulated by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control in Table 1, City of Santee EnviroStor Cleanup Sites.

**Table 1. City of Santee EnviroStor Cleanup Sites**

Facility Name	Address	Program Type	Status
Coneen Property	8656 Cuyamaca Street	Evaluation	Refer: 1248 Local Agency
Dave's Auto Service	10438 Mission Gorge Road	State Response	Certified
El Capitan Quarry/El Cajon Mountain Mill Site	16820 El Monte Road	State Response	Certified
Ketema Process Equipment Co., C/O Baker Process	9484 Mission Park Place	Tiered Permit	No Action Required
Marine Parachute School La Mesa	In El Cajon, about 12 miles northeast of downtown San Diego	Military Evaluation	No Further Action
Montes Metal Finishing	10039 Prospect Avenue, K	Tiered Permit	No Further Action
Quiroz Recycling	8514 Mast Avenue, Suite B	Inspection	No Action
Santee Army Camp	—	Military Evaluation	Inactive – Needs Evaluation

**Source:** DTSC 2022.

The Santee Fire Department is responsible for hazardous material incident management in Santee. The City also belongs to the San Diego County Joint Powers Authority Hazardous Materials Response Team, which assists with major incidents (City of Santee 2003).

The San Diego County Hazardous Waste Management Plan is the primary planning document providing overall policy on hazardous waste management in San Diego County. The plan describes how the San Diego County’s hazardous waste stream can be safely managed and serves as the guide for local decisions regarding hazardous waste management (City of Santee 2003).

The Hazardous Materials Division of the County of San Diego’s Department of Environmental Health and Quality protects the health and safety of the public and the environment by ensuring that hazardous materials and biomedical waste are properly handled and stored. The Hazardous Materials Division assists regulated businesses in Santee in developing their business plans and an area plan for hazardous material emergency response coordination in Santee and San Diego County (City of Santee 2003).

The City also provides residential curbside pickup of waste automotive oil and filters in addition to participating in a Household Hazardous Waste Program, which allows residents to safely dispose of any unused or leftover portions of products containing toxic chemicals. Residents can bring these types of materials to one of two collection facilities in their original containers for no-cost, safe disposal (City of Santee 2003).

## Proposed and Existing Policies

The following Safety policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to hazards and hazardous materials:

**Policy 7.1:** Continue reviewing all development proposed in the Gillespie Field Airport Influence Areas using the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, which provides guidance on appropriate land uses surrounding airports to protect the health and safety of people and property within the vicinity of an airport. Ensure consistency determinations are received from the Airport Land Use Commission to ensure that design features are incorporated into the site plan to address identified aircraft safety and noise hazards.

**Policy 7.2:** Continue to discourage the establishment of additional high-risk uses, including schools, hospitals, nursing homes, and daycare centers in Airport Safety Zones and receive consistency determinations from the Airport Land Use Commission.

**Policy 7.3:** Receive final airspace determination from the Federal Aviation Administration for projects in Airport Influence Areas in accordance with Code of Federal Regulations, Title 14, Part 77, Safe, Efficient Use, and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace.

**Policy 8.1:** Continue to hold periodic disaster exercises in cooperation with the appropriate state and federal agencies.

**Policy 8.2:** Update the adopted Santee Emergency Operations Plan periodically to ensure the safety of residents, employees, and visitors in times of natural or human-caused disaster.

**Policy 8.3:** Maintain an Emergency Operations Center to coordinate resources, information, and communication, which would strengthen the City of Santee's ability to detect and respond to threats.

**Policy 9.1:** Continue to implement the County of San Diego's Hazardous Waste Management Plan or develop and implement an equivalent plan.

**Policy 9.2:** Continue to participate in the San Diego County Joint Powers Authority Hazardous Materials Response Team in dealing with hazardous materials incidents.

**Policy 9.3:** Require that any potential hazardous materials issues be fully investigated at the environmental review stage prior to project approval.

**Policy 9.4:** Review any proposed uses involving the use, transport, storage, or handling of hazardous waste to ensure that such uses will not represent a significant risk to surrounding uses or the environment.

**Policy 9.5:** Continue to provide for a household hazardous waste collection program for Santee residents as part of the contract with the City of Santee trash franchisee.

**Policy 9.6:** Control the location, manufacture, storage, or use of hazardous materials in Santee through Zoning Ordinance implementation and the development review process.

**Policy 9.7:** Encourage safe and proper disposal of household hazardous waste.

**Policy 9.8:** Promote safe, environmentally sound means of solid waste disposal for the community.

**Policy 9.9:** Investigate ways to encourage businesses to recycle their waste.

**Policy 9.10:** Continue to implement the Construction and Demolition Diversion Ordinance as required by Cal Recycle.

**Policy 10.2:** Ensure that emergency management activities are conducted equitably and are responsive to the needs of all community members, primarily by communicating emergency plans in many different formats and in multiple languages, as appropriate, and conducting outreach with and to seek feedback from members of the community who face equity issues.

**Policy 10.3:** Continue to collaborate with local and regional partners to support business resiliency through preparedness education, trainings, and resources.

**Policy 10.4:** Collaborate with local, regional, state, and federal partners to provide community-wide outreach to educate people on how to prepare for and recover from climate change effects.

**Policy 10.5:** Provide information on the benefits of the resiliency of existing residential and commercial development through structural strengthening, fire safe landscaping, and energy efficiency upgrades.

The following EJ policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to hazards and hazardous materials:

**Policy 11.2:** Continue to prioritize and enforce the existing Buildings and Construction Code based on safety and blight as required through existing—and, if necessary, expanded—code enforcement efforts. Continue to use the City of Santee’s Code Compliance Program to bring substandard units into compliance with City of Santee codes and to improve overall housing quality and neighborhood conditions in Santee.

**Policy 14.3:** Prioritize disproportionately vulnerable populations for adaptation and mitigation investments identified in the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.

**Policy 14.4:** Plan responsive measures to wildfire events. Provide public information on emergency preparedness, evacuation, shelters, food, water, and recovery in both Spanish and English. Use the City of Santee’s social media and newsletter to provide information for climate-related hazards.

**Policy 14.7:** Prioritize dissemination of public information on emergency preparedness, evacuation, shelters, food, water, and recovery in languages primarily spoken by the ethnic and immigrant groups in the community.

## Impact Analysis

**a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element would be a policy document and does not propose specific development. However, construction activities associated with future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could involve the use of chemical substances, such as solvents, paints, fuel for equipment, and other potentially hazardous materials. These materials are common for typical construction activities and do not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. New developments may contain hazardous materials, such as paint, herbicides/pesticides, diesel fuel, and cleaning products, which have the potential to spill. Long-term operation of future land uses would not involve large quantities of hazardous materials. Future development of the sites would be consistent with designated land uses in the Santee General Plan Land Use Element. Adherence to regulations, including federal and local regulations, and standard protocols during the storage, transportation, disposal, and use of any hazardous materials would minimize the hazard to the public or the environment. Additionally, the Safety-EJ Element builds upon policies in the existing Safety Element, and Safety Policies 9.1 through 9.8 of the Safety-EJ Element address the transport, handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials in Santee.

Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts related to hazardous materials. Individual projects would be subject to adopted development guidelines and standards when a development proposal is considered. Project-specific CEQA review and compliance with the standards and regulations at the time of future development would ensure less than significant impacts.

**b. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Human exposure to hazardous substances might occur through accidental release. Incidents that result in an accidental release of hazardous substances into the environment can cause contamination of soil, surface water, and groundwater in addition to any toxic fumes that might be generated. If not cleaned up immediately and completely, hazardous substances can migrate into the soil or enter a local stream or channel, causing contamination of soil and water. Human exposure to contaminated soil, soil gas, or water can have potential health

effects depending on a variety of factors, including the nature of the contaminant and the degree of exposure.

The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, construction of new development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may result in accidental releases, such as petroleum-based fuels or hydraulic fluid used for construction equipment. The level of risk associated with the accidental release of hazardous substances is not considered significant due to the small volume and low concentration of hazardous materials that would be used during new construction. The construction contractor would be required to use standard construction controls and safety procedures that would avoid and minimize the potential for accidental release of such substances into the environment. Standard construction practices would be observed such that any materials released are appropriately contained and remediated as required by local, state, and federal law, including the California Hazardous Waste Control Law, California Division of Occupational Safety and Health requirements, federal Resources Conservation and Recovery Act, and the federal Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act. Compliance with existing laws and regulations would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

Long-term operation of future land uses would not involve large quantities of hazardous materials. Adherence to regulations and standard protocols during the storage and use of hazardous materials would minimize and avoid the potential for significant upset and accident condition impacts. In addition, the Santee Municipal Code establishes a hazardous materials release response program to initiate quick response to accidental releases (e.g., discharge, spills). All future development would require project-specific environmental evaluation to determine if potential impacts are less than significant. Potential hazard-related impacts would be location-specific and could not be assessed in a meaningful way until the location of a project site is known. When a development proposal is considered, the project would be subject to adopted development guidelines and standards, and impacts identified with the development project would be addressed through mitigation measures specific to the impact. Therefore, impacts related to accidental releases would be less than significant.

The Safety-EJ Element would build upon existing policies to address the transport, handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials in Santee (refer to Safety Policies 9.1 through 9.8 of the Safety-EJ Element). Therefore, impacts related to hazardous waste sites would be less than significant.

**c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Schools are throughout the City. However, development that would be facilitated as a result of the Safety-EJ Element would not use or store large quantities of hazardous waste. New developments would be subject to planning, zoning, and procedures

involved in site plan approvals, and land use planning would typically separate uses that would place a school near a development where hazardous materials may be used. Through the City's environmental review process, future development projects would be evaluated for the potential release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous materials near a school would be less than significant.

- d. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element would be a policy document and does not propose specific development. However, future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could locate new development on a hazardous materials site (refer to Table 1).

Through the City's environmental review process, it would be determined if a potential development site is on or within the immediate vicinity of any known hazardous materials site. If applicable, projects may be required to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, which would include a database search for existing hazardous materials sites; identify potential violations under federal and/or applicable state and local environmental laws; and provide recommendations for correcting deficiencies or problems. Where appropriate, mitigation measures would be required for specific projects to reduce potential hazards to the public. With implementation of the City's environmental review process and proposed goals, policies, and actions addressing hazards in Santee, impacts related to hazardous waste sites would be less than significant.

The Safety-EJ Element would build upon existing policies to address the transport, handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials in Santee (refer to Safety Policies 9.1 through 9.8 of the Safety-EJ Element). Therefore, impacts related to hazardous waste sites would be less than significant.

- e. Would the project 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, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City is serviced by one airport, Gillespie Field, directly on the southern boundary of Santee in the City of El Cajon. Gillespie Field is a 757-acre, publicly owned facility that is owned and operated by the County of San Diego, Department of Public Works. Gillespie Field is a general aviation airport used primarily for business and recreational purposes, which does not function as a major transportation mode for City residents. The majority of the operations at Gillespie Field are categorized as General Aviation. The smallest portions of the annual operations are categorized as Air Taxi and Military. No regularly scheduled commercial flights occur at Gillespie Field. The Gillespie Field Comprehensive Land Use Plan has a designated Airport Influence Area, which is the area that may be subject to either noise hazards or height

restrictions required to prevent obstructions to navigable airspace. The Clear Zones are areas of significant risk resulting from aircraft takeoff and landing patterns. While the Clear Zones for Gillespie Field fall mainly within airport boundaries, several San Diego County-owned properties north of the airport on Prospect Avenue are designated as Clear Zones. These properties are designated as Park/Open Space to reflect their airport function (San Diego County Airport Land Use Commission 2010).

To minimize the risk and to reduce the severity of aviation accident, six Airport Safety Zones have been established for Gillespie Field by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Division of Aeronautics based on the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook guidelines (Caltrans 2011). To ensure that community land uses are outside areas where aviation accidents are most likely to occur, three Gillespie Field Safety Zones are identified with policies formulated to address the specific safety concerns of those areas. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to comply with the Gillespie Field safety hazard zone guidelines to ensure development is safe from air traffic hazards. Through the City's environmental review process, future development projects would be evaluated for compatibility with the existing Airport Safety Zones to ensure a project would not result in a safety hazard of excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

In addition, the Safety-EJ Element would build on in the City's existing General Plan Safety Element policies addressing airport hazards (refer to Safety Policies 7.1 through 7.3 above). Therefore, the proposed Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to public safety from airport hazards, and impacts would be less than significant.

**f. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City prepared its own Emergency Operations Plan (City of Santee 2020) in compliance with the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services and San Diego County Office of Emergency Services the Santee Municipal Code, which identifies responses and actions depending on the nature and scope of the disaster. In addition, the Safety-EJ Element includes emergency preparedness planning consisting of three primary components: (1) hazard identification and risk assessment, (2) hazard prevention and abatement, and (3) emergency response and action. The Safety-EJ Element would identify hazards present in Santee and focus on assessing the scope of risk associated with the hazards and emergency preparedness procedures.

Construction activities associated with future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would have the potential to interfere with emergency plans and procedures if authorities are not properly notified or multiple projects are constructed during the same time and multiple roadways used for emergency routes are concurrently blocked. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would

be consistent with the current Santee General Plan land use designations. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific changes in Santee's existing circulation network. However, the proposed Safety-EJ Element includes an Emergency Evacuation Route Analysis to determine the vulnerability of the City's evacuation routes to potential hazards and to identify areas of the City that do not have at least two emergency evacuation routes (i.e., neighborhoods or households within a hazard area that have limited accessibility) in accordance with AB 747 and SB 99. The results of the Emergency Evacuation Route Analysis indicate that residents closest to the northern region of the City center are most vulnerable to general hazards given the distance they would need to travel to access an outbound road for evacuation. The Emergency Evacuation Route Analysis identified that residents closest to the southern and southwestern regions of the City are most vulnerable to evacuation from earthquake hazards because of the bridges they would need to traverse to access an outbound road.

Future development projects would be subject to site-specific review and would be subject to City regulations regarding street design, site access, and internal emergency access. Therefore, impacts associated with the physical interference of an Emergency Operations Plan would be less than significant.

**g. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As described in Section 2.4.20, Wildfire, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE)'s Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Viewer (CAL FIRE 2022) designates the City as a moderate to high, unzoned Local Responsibility Area. Several Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZs) are in Santee, notably in the northern/northwestern and the southern/southwestern portions of the City. The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, the goals, policies, and actions incorporated into the proposed Safety-EJ Element may facilitate construction and operation of transit and utilities infrastructure construction and repairs, healthcare facilities, and recreational space/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Development of future projects in a Moderate to High Fire Hazard Severity Zone could result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of 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 residents are intermixed with wildlands.

To minimize risk from wildfire, future development would be required to comply with the 2022 (or most current) California Fire Code and the CBC, which contains measures to reduce fire hazards in structures, including the use of materials, fire separation walls, building separation, and fire sprinklers. In addition, the City adopted amendments to the California Fire Code (Section 11.18.020, Santee Municipal Code), which requires a Fire Protection Plan, approved by the fire chief, to be established for all new development within declared Fire Hazard Severity Zones and/or wildland-urban interface. Additionally, as described in Section 2.4.20, the Safety-EJ Element

would include several new goals, policies, and actions intended to reduce the exposure of people and the environment to wildland fire risks. Compliance with existing regulations and proposed Safety-EJ Element policies would ensure that impacts related to wildfire risk are below significant. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

### San Diego River Watershed

The City is in the San Diego River Watershed, which is in central San Diego County. The watershed is bordered to the north by the Peñasquitos and San Dieguito River Watersheds and to the south by the Pueblo San Diego and Sweetwater River Watersheds. According to the San Diego River Watershed Management Area Water Quality Improvement Plan (City of El Cajon et al. 2015), the San Diego River originates in the Cuyamaca Mountains near Santa Ysabel, over 6,000 feet above sea level, along the western border of the Anza Borrego Desert State Park. The San Diego River extends over 52 miles across central San Diego County, forming a watershed with an area of approximately 277,543 acres, or approximately 434 square miles. The San Diego River ultimately discharges to the Pacific Ocean at Dog Beach in Ocean Beach, a community in the City

of San Diego. The San Diego River Watershed is the fourth largest of the 10 watershed management areas in the San Diego region.

The San Diego River Watershed (Hydrological Unit [HU] 907) consists of four hydrologic areas: Lower San Diego (907.1), San Vicente (907.2), El Capitan (907.3), and Boulder Creek (907.4). The City is in the Lower San Diego Hydrologic Area (907.1). The Lower San Diego Hydrologic Area includes portions of the Cities of San Diego, El Cajon, La Mesa, Poway, and Santee and several unincorporated jurisdictions.

## **Water Quality**

Water quality in the San Diego River Watershed is governed by the San Diego RWQCB. The San Diego RWQCB's Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan) is the RWQCB's master water quality control planning document. The Basin Plan, most recently updated in September 2021, recognizes and reflects regional differences in existing water quality, the beneficial uses of the region's ground surface waters, and local water quality problems. The Basin Plan is designed to preserve and enhance water quality and protect the beneficial uses of all regional waters. Specifically, the Basin Plan (1) designates beneficial uses for surface and ground waters; (2) sets narrative and numerical objectives that must be attained or maintained to protect the designated beneficial uses and conform to the state's anti-degradation policy; (3) describes implementation programs to protect the designated beneficial uses of all waters in the region; and (4) describes surveillance and monitoring activities to evaluate the effectiveness of the Basin Plan (California Water Boards 2021).

Four waterbodies in Santee are listed in the CWA Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waterbodies: the Lower San Diego River, Sycamore Canyon, Forester Creek, and Eucalyptus Hills Creek. These creeks are listed as Category 5 water body segments (i.e., a water segment where standards are not met and a total maximum daily load is required, but not yet completed, for at least one of the pollutants being listed for this segment) (SWRCB 2021).

## **Stormwater and Flooding**

The City updated its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan in 2021. The local plan addresses water quality issues in the primary water basins in Santee. The goal of the plan is to reduce or eliminate contaminants that are transported in stormwater and ultimately delivered to the rivers and creeks in Santee and downstream (City of Santee 2021). The program focuses on reducing pollution in the three major areas of development: planning, construction, and existing development. Other components of the program include storm drain monitoring to detect pollution, public reporting of illegal dumping, and provision of education information to a variety of audiences describing water quality issues.

The San Diego County’s Low Impact Development (LID) Handbook integrates the most current research on LID implementation in the county (County of San Diego 2014). The handbook provides a comprehensive list of LID planning and stormwater management techniques as guidance to reference before developing a project site. The City also prepared a BMP Design Manual as required by the re-issued National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) Permit that covers the San Diego region. The manual addresses updated on-site post-construction stormwater requirements for development projects and provides updated procedures for planning, preliminary design, selection, and design of permanent stormwater BMPs based on the performance standards presented in the MS4 Permit. The City modified the manual to include jurisdiction-specific requirements (City of Santee 2016). The City prepared its own Guidelines for Surface Water Pollution Prevention in June 2015. The guidelines establish minimum stormwater management requirements and controls to address the highest priority water quality condition in the Water Quality Improvement Plan for the San Diego River Watershed Management Area. The guidelines also supports the City’s Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (Stormwater Ordinance), codified as Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 9.06, and supports the water quality protection provisions of Santee Municipal Code, Chapters 15.58, Excavation and Grading (City of Santee 2015).

Chapter 9.06, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control, of the Santee Municipal Code prohibits discharge of pollutants and non-stormwater into the stormwater conveyance system or the receiving waters and provides BMPs for construction projects, commercial and industrial activities, and new development and redevelopment. Section 13.36.070, Stormwater Management and Rainwater Retention, of the Santee Municipal Code requires that all projects promote on-site stormwater and dry weather runoff capture and use through recommended measures, such as minimizing the area of impervious surfaces; draining impervious surfaces to vegetated areas; incorporating rain gardens, cisterns, and other catchment systems; and implementing other design concepts recommended in the San Diego County’s LID Handbook.

## **Groundwater**

The City gets its water supply from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District (Padre Dam) (see Section 2.4.19, Utilities and Service Systems). Currently, Padre Dam pumps a small amount of groundwater from the basin using a Padre Dam-owned well that supplements the recycled water system. Since the well is unreliable, the groundwater supplies from the well are assumed to not be available as a future supply, and Padre Dam has no plans for other groundwater supplies in the future. The San Diego River Valley Groundwater Basin aquifer is designated as a Very Low Priority Basin by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR 2022). The basin is unadjudicated and not critically overdrafted. The pueblo water rights are the key water rights doctrine that governs allocation of surface and groundwater of the San Diego River. The basin has

multiple users; however, given its status as a Very Low Priority Basin, the basin is not required to have a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (Padre Dam 2021).

### **Proposed and Existing Policies**

The following Safety policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to hydrology and water quality:

**Policy 1.1:** Encourage the use of innovative site design strategies within the floodplain, which ensure the minimization of flood hazards and maintenance of the natural character of waterways.

**Policy 1.2:** Require that developments proposed within a floodplain area use design and site planning techniques to ensure that structures are elevated at least 1 foot above the 100-year flood level.

**Policy 1.3:** Ensure that proposed projects that would modify the configuration of any of the three main waterways in Santee (San Diego River and Sycamore and Forester Creeks) are required to submit a report prepared by a registered hydrologist that analyzes potential effects of the project downstream and within the local vicinity.

**Policy 1.4:** Actively pursue the improvement of drainage ways and flood control facilities to lessen recurrent flood problems and include such public improvements in the Capital Improvements Program for Santee.

**Policy 1.5:** Pursue the identification of flood hazard areas along Fanita and Big Rock Creeks and apply protective measures where necessary.

**Policy 1.6:** Require a hydrologic study, including the analysis of effects on downstream and upstream properties and on the flood-carrying characteristics of the stream, for development proposed in the floodplain.

**Policy 1.7:** Ensure that critical emergency uses (hospitals, fire stations, police stations, the Emergency Operations Center, public administration buildings, and schools) are not in flood hazard areas or in areas that would affect their ability to function in the event of a disaster.

**Policy 1.8:** Prohibit development within the 100-year floodway, subject to the provisions of the City of Santee's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.

**Policy 1.9:** Ensure that floodway areas are not included in the calculation of net area for the purpose of land division.

**Policy 13.1:** Continue to encourage the implementation of low-impact development (e.g., rain gardens, rainwater harvesting, green roofs) to reduce flooding.

**Policy 14.1:** Provide information on water efficiency and conservation efforts.

**Policy 14.2:** Continue to implement the City of Santee's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance for private and public projects.

**Policy 14.3:** Provide information on building code requirements for water conservation features (e.g., low-flow toilets, faucets, appliances).

**Policy 14.4:** Explore programs to expand access to limited water resources for at-risk, vulnerable populations (e.g., people experiencing homelessness).

The following EJ policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to hydrology and water quality:

**Policy 1.1:** Continue to protect natural resources from pollution, such as trash and debris in creeks, rivers, and storm drainage areas, especially in areas where transient populations are prevalent.

**Policy 1.3:** Continue to reduce the potential danger related to the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials to an acceptable level of risk.

**Policy 1.4:** Continue to protect the air, water, soil, and biotic resources from damage by exposure to hazardous materials.

## Impact Analysis

**a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may facilitate development associated with transit and utilities infrastructure construction and repairs, healthcare facilities, and recreational space/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Clearing, grading, excavation, and construction activities associated with this development may result in short-term impacts to water quality due to sheet erosion of exposed soils and subsequent deposition of particulates in local drainages. Grading activities lead to exposed areas of loose soil and sediment stockpiles that are susceptible to uncontrolled sheet flow. Future development may also result in long-term impacts to the quality of stormwater and urban runoff associated with an increase in impervious surfaces, subsequently impacting downstream water quality, and could potentially create new sources of polluted runoff.

Future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to comply with all applicable water quality standards. Any future development in Santee would be subject to the CWA, which is established through compliance with the requirements of the NPDES Construction General Permit, and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. In Santee, the San Diego RWQCB issues and approves NPDES Permits per the CWA. Under Section 402 of the CWA, NPDES Construction General Permits require individual projects to develop and implement a SWPPP, which must list the BMPs the applicant will employ to “prevent all construction pollutants from contacting stormwater,” and BMPs must be developed “with the intent of keeping all products

of erosion from moving off site into receiving water channels.” The SWPPP must also include a visual monitoring program and a chemical monitoring program for non-visible pollutants.

The NPDES also requires local governments to obtain an NPDES Permit for stormwater-induced water pollutants in its jurisdiction. The San Diego RWQCB regulates discharges from Phase I MS4s in the San Diego region under the Regional MS4 Permit. The Regional MS4 Permit covers 39 municipal, County government, and special district entities (referred to jointly as “copermittees”) in San Diego County, southern Orange County, and southwestern Riverside County that own and operate large MS4s that discharge stormwater (wet weather) runoff and non-stormwater (dry weather) runoff to surface waters throughout the San Diego region. The City is one of 18 municipal copermittees in the county. The permit establishes a regionwide Stormwater Management Plan to control discharges of sanitary wastewater, septic tank effluent, car wash wastewaters, improper oil disposal, radiator flushing, laundry wastewater, spills from roadway accidents, and improper disposal of toxic materials. Pollutant control measures in the Stormwater Management Plan include a specific focus on failing septic tanks, industrial/business connections, recreational sewage, and illegal dumping. Developers are required to implement appropriate BMPs on construction sites to control erosion and sediment. Future development would be subject to the NPDES MS4 Permit, which requires the development and implementation of a SWPPP, which specifies BMPs that reduce or prevent construction pollutants from leaving the site in stormwater runoff and minimize erosion caused by flooding associated with the construction project.

In addition, future projects would be required to comply with the City’s Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan (City of Santee 2002), BMP Design Manual (City of Santee 2016), Guidelines for Surface Water Pollution Prevention (City of Santee 2015), and Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 9.06, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control, and Section 13.36.070, Stormwater Management and Rainwater Retention, which contain requirements and BMPs for water quality controls and LID techniques. The Santee General Plan Conservation Element Policy 4.2 encourages grading, erosion control measures, and replanting to minimize erosion and prevent slippage of human-made slopes.

In the instance that individual development projects are required to implement construction activities within a waterbody (e.g., construction or repairs of bridges), these projects would be required to obtain applicable permits, which may include a CWA Section 404 Nationwide Permit, Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement prior to commencement of project construction activities. These permits would include standard construction BMPs (e.g., off-site fueling and maintenance of construction equipment), which would be in place for the duration of project construction to avoid potential impacts to surface or groundwater quality. Compliance with federal, state, and City regulations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**b. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City receives its water supply from Padre Dam, which currently does not use groundwater as a source of potable water supply. Padre Dam currently pumps a small amount (less than 200 acre-feet per year) of groundwater from the basin using a Padre Dam-owned well that supplements the recycled water system for irrigation and other non-potable uses. Padre Dam has no plans for other groundwater supplies in the future. Further, the basin is designated as a Very Low Priority Basin by the California Department of Water Resources and is not showing signs of overdraft and has not been identified by the California Department of Water Resources as a basin at risk of being critically overdrafted (Padre Dam 2021). As such, while future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may generate planned population growth that would increase the demand for potable water, the City would continue to source its potable water supply from imported California State Water Project and Colorado River water (see Section 2.4.19). The Safety-EJ Element includes two policies related to water supply for fire suppression, including Policy 3.1, which requires that proposed development be assessed for adequate water pressure to maintain the required fire flow at the time of development, and Policy 3.7, which requires the installation of fire hydrants and establishment of emergency vehicle access, notably before construction with combustible materials can begin on an approved project. The City's Fire Code includes requirements for water supply, such as fire hydrants and storage tanks. Within FHSZs and WUI areas, fire hydrants must be spaced every 300 feet and must have a fire flow of 2,500 gallons per minute, or a fire flow approved by the Fire Chief. Developments that require new or "stand alone" water storage facilities may also be required to provide secondary or backup systems, such as independently powered pumps that will ensure adequate water supply for firefighting emergencies. Given that the policies related to water supply for fire suppression do not require additional fire flow and are consistent with the City's Fire Code, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies.

In addition, the City requires development projects to incorporate appropriate stormwater controls, such as site design measures, source controls, and LID techniques. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to incorporate LID features that would reduce impervious area, as feasible, and promote water infiltration. Redevelopment of developed sites requires compliance with water quality standards intended to reduce runoff, increase infiltration, and improve water quality. Therefore, future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Compliance with federal, state, and City regulations would reduce impacts to less than significant.

- c. **Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:**
  - i. **Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**
  - ii. **Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?**
  - iii. **Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**
  - iv. **Impede or redirect flood flows?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could result in the alteration of drainage patterns, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, during and after construction activities. Stormwater drainage and system modifications and improvements associated with future housing development would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, including discharge rate controls, and be designed for a 100-year storm event. Additionally, future projects would be required to comply with Section 9.06.230, Best Management Practices for Construction Projects, of the Santee Municipal Code, which requires construction and grading permits, BMPs, and compliance with the Construction General Permit.

Future development would be subject to the NPDES MS4 Permit, which requires the development and implementation of a SWPPP, which specifies BMPs that reduce or prevent construction pollutants from leaving the site in stormwater runoff and minimize erosion caused by flooding associated with the construction project. In addition, future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to comply with Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 9.06, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control, and Section 13.36.070, Stormwater Management and Rainwater Retention, which contain requirements and BMPs for water quality controls and LID techniques, and Santee General Plan Conservation Element and Land Use Element objectives and policies for implementing Water Quality Plans and incorporating BMPs. Considering these requirements, while future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, this development would minimize impacts related to erosion and stormwater runoff. Additionally, future development would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts related to erosion and stormwater runoff. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**d. Would the project, in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A tsunami is a very large ocean wave caused by an underwater earthquake or volcanic eruption. Tsunamis can cause flooding to coastlines and inland areas less than 50 feet above sea level and within 1 mile of the shoreline. The City is approximately 18 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and would not be susceptible to inundation or flooding due to a tsunami.

Seiches are defined as wave-like oscillatory movements in enclosed or semi-enclosed bodies of water, such as lakes or reservoirs, and are most typically associated with seismic activity. The City is not subject to inundation by seiche. The City's lakes, including the Santee Recreation Lakes, are in areas that would make it difficult for the City to be inundated. The Santee Municipal Code contains provisions to protect against the overflow of floodwaters in Title 13, Chapter 36, Article 5, Flood Damage Prevention. Project developments associated with the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to flooding, damage, and public safety issues, where applicable. Further, the City is primarily in Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Zone X, which is outside the 100- and 500-year flood hazard areas. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element would not result in release of pollutants due to inundation caused by a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche.

The City's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance contains provisions to safeguard the public and structures from flood hazards, including restrictions on uses that are dangerous to health, safety, and property; controls on alterations of natural floodplains, stream channels, and natural flood barriers; and prohibition of development within 100- year flood zone areas as identified by Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Maps and on Santee land use and zoning maps. Santee Municipal Code, Title 13, Chapter 36, Article 5, Flood Damage Prevention, contains methods of preventing and reducing flood hazards. In the Santee General Plan Conservation Element and existing Safety Element, objectives and policies are provided to protect the community from flooding hazards. The objectives and policies reinforce the Santee Municipal Code by ensuring that development proposals are outside designated floodways and development in the 100-year floodplain is consistent with the City's Flood Damage Protection Ordinance. With implementation of the Santee General Plan objectives and policies and Santee Municipal Code, impacts would be less than significant.

Further, the Safety-EJ Element would build on existing flood policies and incorporate the following new policies addressing flood hazards in Santee:

**Objective 1:** Minimize injuries, loss of life, and property damage resulting from flood hazards.

- **Policy 1.1:** Encourage the use of innovative site design strategies within the floodplain, which ensure the minimization of flood hazards and maintenance of the natural character of waterways.

- **Policy 1.2:** Require that developments proposed within a floodplain area use design and site planning techniques to ensure that structures are elevated at least 1 foot above the 100-year flood level.
- **Policy 1.3:** Ensure that proposed projects that would modify the configuration of any of the three main waterways in Santee (San Diego River and Sycamore and Forester Creeks) are required to submit a report prepared by a registered hydrologist that analyzes potential effects of the project downstream and within the local vicinity.
- **Policy 1.4:** Actively pursue the improvement of drainage ways and flood control facilities to lessen recurrent flood problems and include such public improvements in the Capital Improvements Program for Santee.
- **Policy 1.5:** Pursue the identification of flood hazard areas along Fanita and Big Rock Creeks and apply protective measures where necessary.
- **Policy 1.6:** Require a hydrologic study, including the analysis of effects on downstream and upstream properties and on the flood-carrying characteristics of the stream, for development proposed in the floodplain.
- **Policy 1.7:** Ensure that critical emergency uses (hospitals, fire stations, police stations, the Emergency Operations Center, public administration buildings, and schools) are not in flood hazard areas or in areas that would affect their ability to function in the event of a disaster.
- **Policy 1.8:** Prohibit development within the 100-year floodway, subject to the provisions of the City of Santee’s Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.
- **Policy 1.9:** E Ensure that floodway areas are not included in the calculation of net area for the purpose of land division.

As such, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to flooding in Santee.

**e. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City is under the jurisdiction of the San Diego RWQCB. Water quality standards and control measures for surface and ground waters of the San Diego region are contained in the Basin Plan for the San Diego region. The plan designates beneficial uses for water bodies and establishes water quality objectives, waste discharge prohibitions, and other implementation measures to protect those beneficial uses.

Future projects associated with the Safety-EJ Element would comply with the requirements under the NPDES Permit program, the Phase I MS4 General Permit in the San Diego River Watershed, the San Diego RWQCB Basin Plan. Future project would also require implementation of associated BMPs and other requirements of the SWPPP, as well as a City-approved Stormwater Quality

Management Plan, which would ensure that stormwater discharges associated with construction and use of future development projects comply with regulatory requirements in Santee and would not conflict with a Water Quality Control Plan or Groundwater Management Plan. Compliance with state and local requirements for avoiding and minimizing construction and operational impacts to prevent conflicts with or obstruction of implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan or sustainable Groundwater Management Plan, including the Basin Plan for the San Diego RWQCB, and with federal, state, and City regulations would reduce impacts to less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

### 2.4.11 Land Use and Planning

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Environmental Setting

Physical development in Santee is currently governed by the existing Santee General Plan adopted in August 2003. The Santee General Plan identifies land use designations in Santee and its sphere of influence, with residential being the predominant existing land use.

### Proposed Policies

The following EJ policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to land use and planning:

**Policy 5.4:** Ensure that industrial uses are compatible with adjacent land uses, ensure that natural and human-induced hazards are adequately addressed in the location and intensity of development in Santee, and minimize land use conflicts between land uses in adjacent areas and existing and planned land uses in Santee.

**Policy 10.1:** Encourage the establishment and operation of additional farmers markets, farm stands, ethnic markets, mobile health food markets, and convenience/corner stores that sell healthy foods, including fresh produce where feasible and appropriate.

**Policy 10.4:** Prioritize healthy food supplies in economic development efforts, especially in areas where a healthy food supply, farmers market, or community garden is not within a half mile of residential areas.

**Policy 10.6:** Provide healthy food options at all municipal buildings and at City of Santee event where food is made available by the City.

### Impact Analysis

#### a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Projects that divide an established community can involve large scale linear infrastructure, such as freeways, highways, and railroads, that bisect an established community or create barriers to movement within that community. “Locally undesirable land

uses,” such as prisons or landfills, sited within economically depressed areas can also divide an established community. The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Development that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element would primarily consist of transit and utilities infrastructure construction and repairs, healthcare facilities, and recreational space/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not facilitate large scale linear infrastructure, such as freeways, highways, and railroads, or locally undesirable land uses. Future development facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with the Santee General Plan land use designations and would not physically divide the community. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element would be a component of the Santee General Plan that improves the capacity of the City to respond to natural and human-caused changes in the environment. In addition, the Safety-EJ Element would define the goals, objectives, and policies that would guide the City’s approach to increasing its resiliency and would recommend a set of programs that would implement policies over the next several years. The Safety-EJ Element would be concerned with identifying ways in which the needs of existing and future residents can be met. Specifically, the Safety-EJ Element would establish specific policies that align with the San Diego County’s Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, including the City’s chapter in this plan, and Sustainable Santee Plan to bring policies into compliance with current state laws and to allow for increased adaptability in the light of a changing climate. The Safety-EJ Element would not increase residential density and intensify land use designations in the City and therefore, is not subject to Measure N.

Future projects consistent with the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to the Santee General Plan, updates to the Santee General Plan (once approved) and Santee Municipal Code. These documents and ordinances include standards to protect aesthetic quality and scenic viewsheds, biological resources, cultural resources, and public health and safety. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.12 Mineral Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 requires the classification of land into mineral resource zones (MRZs) according to known or inferred mineral resource potential. The process is based solely on geology without regard to existing land use or land ownership. According to the Santee General Plan Conservation Element, the City has land designated in two categories: MRZ-2 and MRZ-3. MRZ-2 designates “areas where adequate information exists to indicate that significant mineral deposits are present or where it was judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists,” while MRZ-3 includes “areas containing mineral deposits whose significance cannot be evaluated from available data” (City of Santee 2003). According to the Santee General Plan Land Use Element, areas in Santee that contain valuable mineral resources are along the floodplain of the San Diego River and on the surrounding hills underlain by granite. The remainder of the City is designated MRZ-3 (City of Santee 2003).

Three aggregate mining operations are in Santee—RCP Pit 1, RCP Pit 2, and RCP Pit 3—in the San Diego River east of Magnolia Avenue. These three mining operations have been active since the 1970s and are approaching completion. Despite the potential for mineral recovery from any MRZ, economics, land use compatibility, and environmental protection, including regional habitat protection efforts, must be considered when deciding on the appropriateness of mining in a particular area (City of Santee 2003).

## Impact Analysis

- 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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with the Santee General Plan land use designations and would not substantially limit the future availability of known mineral resources; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the Santee General Plan Conservation Element, the portion of the upper San Diego River that flows through the City and Lakeside to the east of the City contains a significant share of the available construction sand reserves of the metropolitan San Diego market area. San Diego River sand is of high enough quality to be competitive with other sources in San Diego County. The sand and gravel mining used in Santee’s aggregate mining operations (i.e., RCP Pit 1, RCP Pit 2, and RCP Pit 3) meets the definition of a mineral resource as any form of natural rock materials that have commercial value. However, these sand deposits are not classified by the California Division of Mines and Geology as important mineral resources. Further, implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element would not facilitate development in the San Diego River where sand and gravel mining could occur. In fact, the Safety-EJ Element would incorporate restrictions on development and limitations for development types in the San Diego River flood hazard areas (refer to Policies 1.2 through 1.9 listed in Section 2.4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality). Therefore, implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element would not facilitate development in the San Diego River that would result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recover site, and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

### 2.4.13 Noise

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Noise is usually defined as unwanted or excessive sound. Noise consists of any sound that may produce physiological or psychological damage and/or interfere with communication, work, rest, recreation, and sleep. The primary sources of noise in Santee are freeways and roadways, rapid transit (San Diego Trolley), aircraft operations from Gillespie Field and Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, and stationary sources (e.g., commercial/industrial, construction, community).

## Impact Analysis

- a. **Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development, but may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as new or renovated fire stations, healthcare facilities, and recreational spaces/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would have the potential to generate both short-term and long-term noise impacts. Short-term noise impacts could occur during grading and construction. Construction activities have the potential to expose adjacent land uses to noise levels that could temporarily exceed the City’s Noise Standards. The degree of noise impact would depend on the distance between the construction activity and the noise sensitive receptor. Long-term noise impacts would be associated with vehicular traffic to/from the site (including residents and visitors), outdoor activities, and stationary mechanical

equipment on site. Traffic associated with future developments consistent with Santee General Plan land use designations would result in long-term increases in ambient noise levels. However, depending on the size of each development, this increase may be noticeable for some people but may not significantly impact surrounding sensitive uses and may not generate a substantial increase in ambient noise levels.

However, the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety Element would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to noise. Individual projects would also be subject to existing local noise policies. For example, Santee General Plan Noise Element provisions, particularly Policy 1.1, would reduce harmful and annoying noise: “The City shall support a coordinated program to protect and improve the acoustical environment of the City including development review for new public and private development and code compliance for existing development.” The City’s Noise Ordinance (Santee Municipal Code, Chapter 5.04) establishes the City’s noise regulation, generally prohibits nuisance noise, and states that it is unlawful for any person to make, continue, or cause to be made or continued within the City limits any disturbing, excessive, or offensive noise that causes discomfort or annoyance to reasonable persons of normal sensitivity residing in the area. For example, Section 5.04.090 prohibits construction activities outside the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Mondays through Saturday, unless expressly approved by the City’s Director of Development Services. Section 5.04.040 details several specific sources of nuisance noise and outlines how it may be determined that the noise is in violation of the code. Specific sources of nuisance noise include but are not limited to devices for producing or reproducing sound, drums, and other musical instruments, yelling, and animals. Compliance with the Santee General Plan Noise Element policies and the City’s Noise Ordinance standards would reduce potential temporary and permanent noise impacts as a result of future development under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**b. Would the project result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction activities from developments facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could generate varying degrees of groundborne vibration, depending on the construction procedure and the construction equipment used. Operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in amplitude with distance from the source. The effect on buildings in the vicinity of a construction site often varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and construction characteristics of the receiver buildings. Results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibration at moderate levels to slight

damage at the highest levels. Groundborne vibration from construction activities rarely reach levels that damage structures.

The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Future projects that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to groundborne vibration and groundborne noise. Compliance with the Santee General Plan Noise Element policies would reduce groundborne noise impacts. Adherence to the Santee Municipal Code, particularly Chapter 5.04, Noise Abatement and Control, which sets limits on the time of day and days of the week that construction can occur, as well as noise limits for construction activities, would also reduce groundborne noise impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. Would the project, for a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As stated in Section 2.4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the City has one airport, Gillespie Field, which is directly on the southern boundary of the City in the City of El Cajon. The Gillespie Field ALUCP identifies an Airport Influence Area around the airport, which is the area that could be impacted by noise levels exceeding 60 decibels (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL).

Several policies in the Santee General Plan Noise Element seek to ensure that no conflict or inconsistency between the operation of Gillespie Field and future land uses in Santee occur. For example, the Noise Element discourages any future expansion of the facilities of Gillespie Field or intensification of operation, other than what has been already planned in the airport's Master Plan, that would result in greater noise impacts to the City (Policy 1.7); requires disclosure of airport noise impacts as a condition of all future residential development in the 65–70 dB noise contours (Policy 1.11); and requires the recordation of aviation easements for new development proposed within the 65–70 dB noise contours and the Runway Protection and Inner Approach/Departure Zones for Gillespie Field (Policy 1.12). The policies require the City to continue to monitor Gillespie Field operations and add these activities into the planning process. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to comply with both the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Gillespie Field and the Santee General Plan compatibility policies so it would not expose people residing or working in Santee to excessive noise levels. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.14 Population and Housing

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

The City’s Sixth Cycle 2021 -2029 General Plan Housing Element was adopted on May 11, 2022. The Housing Element of the General Plan is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community. The Housing Element is an eight-year plan for the 2021-2029 period. The Housing Element identifies strategies and programs that focus on:

1. Matching housing supply with need
2. Maximizing housing choice throughout the community
3. Assisting in the provision of affordable housing
4. Removing governmental and other constraints to housing investment
5. Promoting fair and equal housing opportunities

According to the Census, Santee’s population rose by almost nine percent from 53,413 in 2010 to 57,999 in 2020 (Table 2, City of Santee Population Growth). Population, housing, and employment are anticipated to grow in both the City and the county over the next 2 decades. Specifically, SANDAG forecasts that the Santee population will reach 63,812 by the year 2035. This represents a growth of 10 percent or 5,813 people from the 2020 population (City of Santee 2022c).

**Table 2. City of Santee Population Growth**

2000	2010	2020	2035 (Projected)	% Change 2010-2020	Projected % Change 2020-2035
<b>City of Santee</b>					
53,090	53,413	57,999	63,812	8.6%	10.0%
<b>San Diego County</b>					
2,813,833	3,095,313	3,343,355	3,853,698	8.0%	15.3%

**Sources:** Census 2000 and 2010; California Department of Finance, 2020; and SANDAG 2050 Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast (data extracted in July 2020).

## Proposed Policies

The following EJ policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to population and housing:

**Policy 5.3:** Allow for the development of a wide range of commercial and residential building and structure types in Santee and ensure that development in Santee is consistent with the overall community character and contributes positively to Santee’s image.

**Policy 11.1:** Continue to support and coordinate with social service providers and regional agencies to address the housing-related needs of Santee residents, particularly those with special needs. Continue the operation of the Residential Rehabilitation Program, which offers a limited amount of low-interest, deferred loans to income-eligible homeowners to facilitate home improvements and/or correct any health and safety or building code violations.

**Policy 11.3:** Continue to use HOME Investment Partnerships and other funding sources to assist residents with extremely low, very low, and low incomes with housing rehabilitation citywide. Develop and maintain collaborative efforts among nonprofits, for-profit developers, and public agencies to encourage the development, maintenance, and improvement of affordable housing.

**Policy 11.4:** Continue to provide information to the public regarding resources for housing repairs for single-family homes, multi-family properties, and mobile or manufactured homes to address unsafe and unhealthy conditions in neighborhoods.

**Policy 12.1:** Address housing affordability through the Housing Element and Land Use Element to optimize land use for housing and to encourage affordable housing development.

**Policy 12.2:** Consider establishing a Community Revitalization and Investment Authority in the Santee Town Center area that would allow the City of Santee to use a portion of the property tax increment generated in that area to develop affordable housing and otherwise support Santee Town Center community revitalization projects.

**Policy 12.3:** Encourage both the private and public sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower-income households, including extremely low-income households, and housing suitable for people with disabilities, older adults, large families, and female-headed household.

**Policy 12.4:** Ensure that all new housing development and redevelopment in Santee is properly phased in amount and geographic location so that City of Santee services and facilities can accommodate growth.

**Policy 12.5:** Coordinate with affordable housing developers and social service providers in Santee to provide Santee residents with education on how to qualify and apply for affordable housing and other housing-related needs.

**Policy 12.6:** Increase affordable homeownership opportunities for Santee’s low-income households and provide free homeownership education programs.

**Policy 12.7:** Collaborate with local social service providers to address the needs of Santee’s homeless population.

**Policy 14.6:** Prevent or limit significant increases in housing costs or essential supplies (“price gouging”) following disasters either through ordinances or other measures.

## **Impact Analysis**

- a. Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element would be a component of the Santee General Plan that would assess the needs of all economic segments of the City and would address the City’s ability to adapt to a changing climate as determined by the State of California. In addition, the Safety-EJ Element would define the goals, objectives, and policies that would guide the City’s approach to resolving those needs and recommend a set of programs that would implement policies over the next few years. The Safety-EJ Element is concerned with specifically identifying ways in which the needs of existing and future residents can be met as necessary to meet state safety- and environmental justice-related legal requirements. The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development, but may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as transportation and utility improvements and recreational spaces/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). The Safety-EJ Element would identify a series of implementing actions to improve the City’s adaptive capacity to climate change-related impacts. Given this objective and the City’s existing development patterns, it is not anticipated that future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would directly (by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (through extension of roads or other infrastructure) induce unplanned population growth.

Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to subsequent project-specific CEQA review. The development of new projects holds the potential to increase the number of families and individuals in the area. However, as described above, SANDAG forecasts the City’s population to grow by 5,813 people (approximately 10 percent from the 2020 population) by the year 2035. As such, new development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not induce unplanned population growth. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** As described in Section 2.4.14(a), the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development plans, and new development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not induce unplanned population growth. The Safety-EJ Element would facilitate accommodating the City’s share of the regional housing needs, notably the provision of affordable housing options through Policy 12.1: “The City shall address housing affordability through the Housing Element and Land Use Element. Implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing; therefore, no impact would occur.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

### 2.4.15 Public Services

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Environmental Setting

Public services for fire protection, police protection, school, parks, and other facilities are described below.

#### Proposed and Existing Policies

The following Safety policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to public services (see also Section 2.4.20, Wildfire, for a detailed list of Safety policies related to fire hazards):

**Policy 3.25:** The Santee Fire Department shall continue be involved in the review of development applications to minimize fire hazards. Considerations shall be given to adequate emergency access, driveway widths, turning radii, fire hydrant locations, and needed fire flow requirements.

**Policy 3.27:** Ensure that the timing of additional fire station construction or renovation (or new services) relates to the rise of service demand in Santee and surrounding areas. Evaluate redevelopment after a large fire.

**Policy 3.30:** Support mutual aid agreements and communications links with the County of San Diego and the other municipalities participating in the Unified San Diego County Emergency Service Organization.

**Policy 4.1:** Encourage citizen participation in the Neighborhood and Kids Watch Programs and promote the establishment of new neighborhood watch programs to encourage community participation in the patrol and to promote the awareness of suspicious activity.

**Policy 4.2:** Incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design principles into site planning for new developments and renovations of existing developments, considering the concepts of defensible space, surveillance, territoriality, access control, and maintenance.

**Policy 4.4:** Continue to involve law enforcement personnel in the review of new development applications through participation in the Development Review process.

**Policy 4.5:** Ensure that structures are adequately identified by street address and lighted sufficiently to deter criminal activity.

**Policy 4.6:** Work with the school districts in the establishment of a permanent School Resource Officer program or similar measure to provide a law enforcement presence at City schools.

The following EJ policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to public services (parks and public facilities):

**Policy 3.1:** Implement the Santee Parks and Recreation Master Plan to increase access to diverse, high-quality parks, green space, recreation facilities, and natural environments for disadvantaged communities.

**Policy 4.1:** Prioritize seeking public funding to upgrade public facilities in disadvantaged communities, particularly the neighborhoods around Magnolia Avenue, Prospect Avenue, Cuyamaca Street, and Mission Gorge Road.

**Policy 4.2:** Continue the City of Santee’s maintenance and operation of parks and other recreational spaces throughout Santee, especially in the regions along the river, with more frequency. Provide and maintain the highest level of service possible for all community public services and facilities.

**Policy 4.3:** Continue to evaluate current agreements and work to improve joint-use agreements with schools for access to indoor facilities and use of fields to adopt a more cooperative approach to providing services to the community.

**Policy 4.4:** Explore providing more community centers throughout Santee, especially in residential areas that lack a community center within walking distance from home, such as the southwestern areas of Santee.

**Policy 4.5:** Prioritize new investments in community-building facilities that will foster a sense of belonging among its residents.

**Policy 6.3:** Provide readily accessible meeting space and inclusive programming at the community centers to meet the needs of people of all ages, physical conditions, and socioeconomic situations, especially Santee’s diverse communities, including but not limited to the art and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender communities.

**Policy 6.5:** Consider providing affordable and free educational programming in disadvantaged communities to highlight practices that can improve one’s health, such as physical activity and healthy eating.

**Policy 7.5:** Continue and expand the City of Santee’s community garden program and provide information on how existing community gardens operate and how residents can get involved.

**Policy 7.6:** Assess and, if feasible, develop open land for community gardens.

**Policy 7.7:** Identify and implement opportunities to incorporate open spaces suitable for community gardens into larger development projects.

**Policy 15.2:** Use tools and services, such as Neighborhood Watch, law enforcement, community services, rehabilitation loan programs, code compliance, and waste management services, to support and enhance neighborhoods and streetscapes in need of revitalization.

**Policy 10.7:** Find incentives that encourage school districts to develop a program that integrates gardening and nutrition, making the connection between healthy food choices and fresh, locally grown produce.

**Policy 13.8:** Continue community outreach that introduces residents to the City of Santee’s functions and services while equipping residents to get involved in their community.

**Policy 14.1:** Invest in census tracts in the areas of Santee that are more exposed to extreme heat events to build community resilience to and minimize impacts from climate change-induced phenomena.

## **Impact Analysis**

- a. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

### **Fire protection**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Fire protection and emergency medical services for the City are provided by the Santee Fire Department. Within the City limits, two fire stations and one fire administration building are staffed and operated by fire staff at the Santee Fire Department (City of Santee 2022a). The Santee Fire Department also operates the following emergency services on a daily basis: three paramedic assessment engine companies, paramedic assessment truck company, and two paramedic transport ambulances (24-hour units). The mission of the Santee Fire Department is “to protect life and property in our community through aggressive fire suppression,

public education, and emergency medical services, with leadership and professionalism” (City of Santee 2022a).

The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development, but may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as new or renovated fire stations, healthcare facilities, and recreational spaces/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). As described in Section 2.4.14, Population and Housing, future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could generate planned population growth in alignment with SANDAG’s population forecasts for the City, which could incrementally increase the demand for fire services. Future development would be subject to subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts related to fire protection. Additionally, future development would be required to comply with CBC standards, which include site access requirements and fire safety standards, and with Santee Municipal Code, Title 12, Chapter 30, Article 4, Development Impact Fees, which would offset impacts of new development on Santee Fire Department resources. Additionally, future development would be subject to Santee Fire Department review through the Site Plan Review process to ensure that adequate emergency access and fire safety features are provided as part of the project. With incorporation of development fees and adherence to local and state regulations, impacts would be less than significant.

Additionally, the Safety-EJ Element would incorporate several new goals, policies, and actions intended to reduce impacts from fire hazards in Santee (see Section 2.4.20[b]). As such, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to fire protection in Santee.

### **Police protection**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Police protection for the City is provided by the Santee Sheriff Station, which is contracted with the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department. The Santee Sheriff Station is located at 8811 Cuyamaca Street. The Santee Sheriff Station serves as the City’s police department and provides a full range of law enforcement services including patrol, traffic, investigations, parking enforcement, emergency services, crime prevention programs, crime analysis, and narcotics enforcement. The Santee Sheriff’s Station has more than 60 employees providing patrol and traffic services, criminal investigations, juvenile intervention, crime analysis, and crime prevention education. A Sheriff’s storefront is operated in the Santee Town Center near the San Diego Trolley line and San Diego Christian College.

The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would generate planned population growth, which could incrementally increase the demand for police services. Future development

would be subject to subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to the Santee Police Department.

Additionally, the Safety-EJ Element would retain all existing Santee General Plan goals, policies, and actions addressing public safety and would incorporate one new policy:

**Policy 4.8:** Ensure that critical facilities, hazardous facilities, and special occupancy structures are located and designed to be functional in an event of a disaster. These facilities and structures include fire and police stations, hospitals, communication centers, schools, churches, and other high occupancy structures.

As such, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to public safety in Santee.

### **Schools**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City is served by the Santee School District (for elementary schools) and the Grossmont Union High School District. The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could generate planned population growth in alignment with SANDAG's population forecasts for the City, which could incrementally increase the demand for school facilities and services. However, future development would be subject to the requirements of AB 2926 and SB 50, which allow school districts to collect development impact fees to minimize potential impacts to school districts as a result of new development. Thus, upon payment of development fees consistent with existing state requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

### **Parks**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Outdoor recreation resources in Santee include public parks, public access lakes, bicycle paths, pedestrian trails, and ground-level linkages between recreation areas and urbanized places. Per the Santee General Plan Recreation Element, the City operates one mini-park, four neighborhood parks, and two community parks:

- Mini-parks are small areas, no larger than 2 acres, and serve a population of approximately 500 to 1,000 people.
- Neighborhood parks are adjacent to elementary schools and should provide three types of recreation: open areas for passive recreation and relaxation, active sports areas, and a neighborhood center; neighborhood parks serve a larger population, from 2,000 to 5,000 people, and generally range in size from 2 to 20 acres.
- Community parks supplement neighborhood parks by providing activities that require more space and specialized functions that serve a larger population of up to 25,000 people. They range in size from 20 to 200 acres and include school playgrounds,

ballfields, and the Santee Lakes Recreation Area, in addition to approximately 200 acres of Mission Trails Regional Park.

The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, new development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could incrementally increase the volume of residents that may use public parks. Future development would be required to comply with Santee Municipal Code, Title 12, Chapter 30, Article 4, Development Impact Fees, which would offset impacts of new development on the City's parks and recreation resources. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Additionally, the Safety-EJ Element would incorporate several new policies for the improvement and expansion of park systems in Santee:

**Policy 1.2:** Increase maintenance of public spaces, such as parks and trails, to protect natural resources from pollution.

**Objective 3:** Promote access to public transit by increasing frequency of buses and trolleys, decreasing travel duration for commuters, and updating system networks to connect riders to priority areas, such as shopping centers, schools, and parks and recreation facilities.

- **Policy 3.1:** Implement the Santee Parks and Recreation Master Plan to increase access to diverse, high-quality parks, green space, recreation facilities, and natural environments for disadvantaged communities.
- **Policy 3.2:** Work with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System and the San Diego Association of Governments to encourage transit providers to establish, maintain, and increase frequency of routes to jobs, shopping, schools, daycares, parks, and healthcare facilities that are convenient to the disadvantaged communities in both the southeastern and the southwestern portions of Santee.
- **Policy 4.2:** Continue the City of Santee's maintenance and operation of parks and other recreational spaces throughout Santee, especially in the regions along the river, with more frequency. Provide and maintain the highest level of service possible for all community public services and facilities.

**Objective 6:** Improve access to and connectivity between community services, including group meetings, recreation programs, and health classes.

- **Policy 6.2:** Continue to consider alternative recreation programs, such as providing basketball equipment to private groups, using church and commercial center facilities, and closing streets to through-traffic, in neighborhoods with park deficiencies.

**Objective 7:** Continue to create green spaces, such as community gardens, open spaces, and public parks, that support food education, promote healthy lifestyles, and foster community building.

- **Policy 7.1:** Continue to create safe, attractive spaces for recreation, including well-lit parks and pedestrian paths, through implementation of the Santee Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which is a roadmap used to address the need for additional trails for activities such as biking and hiking to improve connectivity throughout the Santee and to provide a system of public parks and recreation facilities that serve the residents of Santee.
- **Policy 7.2:** Continue to provide adequate recreational acreage and facilities in all areas of Santee by identifying vacant lots and underused public land that can be turned into neighborhood-run community gardens. Provide additional park and recreational facilities for Santee residents, which could include a combination of local parks, trails, school playgrounds, and other public facilities that meet part of the need for local recreational facilities.
- **Policy 7.3:** Encourage the development of a San Diego River Park with passive recreation uses throughout Santee as part of an overall master plan concept for the entire San Diego River. Encourage the inclusion of recreational facilities in all mixed land use developments, especially in the Santee Trolley Square Town Center.
- **Policy 7.4:** Locate mini-parks in the built-up areas of Santee where recreational facilities are needed and where available land is limited. Pursue the development of additional publicly owned parks and recreation facilities that are distributed throughout Santee to meet the needs of all residents.

**Objective 13:** Increase community involvement and participation in defining community needs, establishing local priorities, and creating programs to meet these needs.

- **Policy 13.3:** Continue to encourage the use of climate-smart landscaped surfaces (e.g., permeable pavement, stormwater parks, green streets) in new and existing development.

As such, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to parks.

#### **Other public facilities**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element could increase the volume of residents that may use other public facilities, including the Santee Civic Center and the Santee Public Library. Future development would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts to public facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

Outdoor recreation resources in Santee include public parks, public access lakes, bicycle paths, pedestrian trails, and ground-level linkages between recreation areas and urbanized places.

### Proposed Policies

The following EJ policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to recreation:

**Policy 3.1:** Implement the Santee Parks and Recreation Master Plan to increase access to diverse, high-quality parks, green space, recreation facilities, and natural environments for disadvantaged communities.

**Policy 4.2:** Continue the City of Santee’s maintenance and operation of parks and other recreational spaces throughout Santee, especially in the regions along the river, with more frequency. Provide and maintain the highest level of service possible for all community public services and facilities.

**Policy 6.1:** Continue to provide a comprehensive program of recreational services for all ages, with an emphasis on programs for children and youth.

**Policy 6.2:** Continue to consider alternative recreation programs, such as providing basketball equipment to private groups, using church and commercial center facilities, and closing streets to through-traffic, in neighborhoods with park deficiencies.

**Policy 6.4:** Encourage service clubs, civic groups, individual donors, and others to help develop recreational facilities. Encourage private employee recreation in business and industrial areas to provide recreational opportunities for employees.

**Policy 6.6:** Actively seek public and private funding sources to support recreation development, programs, and operation in the process of reviewing recreation programming to ensure that recreation programs reach all segments of the community.

**Policy 7.1:** Continue to create safe, attractive spaces for recreation, including well-lit parks and pedestrian paths, through implementation of the Santee Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which is a roadmap used to address the need for additional trails for activities such as biking and hiking to improve connectivity throughout the Santee and to provide a system of public parks and recreation facilities that serve the residents of Santee.

**Policy 7.2:** Continue to provide adequate recreational acreage and facilities in all areas of Santee by identifying vacant lots and underused public land that can be turned into neighborhood-run community gardens. Provide additional park and recreational facilities for Santee residents, which could include a combination of local parks, trails, school playgrounds, and other public facilities that meet part of the need for local recreational facilities.

**Policy 7.3:** Encourage the development of a San Diego River Park with passive recreation uses throughout Santee as part of an overall master plan concept for the entire San Diego River. Encourage the inclusion of recreational facilities in all mixed land use developments, especially in the Santee Trolley Square Town Center.

**Policy 7.4:** Locate mini-parks in the built-up areas of Santee where recreational facilities are needed and where available land is limited. Pursue the development of additional publicly owned parks and recreation facilities that are distributed throughout Santee to meet the needs of all residents.

## **Impact Analysis**

- a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development, but may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as transportation and utility improvements, healthcare facilities, and recreational spaces/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with existing Santee General Plan land use designations; nevertheless, future development could result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and recreation facilities. Santee Municipal Code, Title 12, Chapter 30, Article 4, Development Impact Fees, requires that new development pay a fee to ensure that the parkland and recreational facility standards established by the City are met with respect to the additional needs created by such development, if applicable. Future development would be required to pay the fee before the issuance of building permits. The Safety-EJ Element, in its implementation, could result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, but it is unlikely this increase would result in or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of the facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** An increase in demand for existing recreational resources is anticipated with new development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element. The Safety-EJ Element would include policies aimed at the expansion of recreation facilities, as identified in Section 2.4.15(a).

Individual development projects, including future recreational facilities, would be subject to project-specific CEQA review, including an assessment of potential physical effects on the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.17 Transportation

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

The City’s circulation system is composed of freeways and their interchanges; arterial, collector, and local streets; public transportation; and non-motorized transportation. In addition to these facilities and services, implementation and management of the circulation system include parking policies and goods and freight movement.

The City’s roadway network is composed of regional facilities, such as SR-52, SR-67, and SR-125, as well as numerous arterials and local streets. North–south travel through the City is primarily provided by Magnolia Avenue, Cuyamaca Street, SR-67, and SR-125, while east–west travel is provided for mainly by Mast Boulevard, Mission Gorge Road, Prospect Avenue, and SR-52 (City of Santee 2017).

## Proposed and Existing Policies

The following Safety policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to transportation:

**Policy 5.1:** Continue to review traffic safety problems annually and enforcement of parking regulations.

**Policy 5.2:** Promote the use of traffic control devices such as signals, medians, and other street design measures along busy roadways to regulate, warn, and guide traffic, thereby diminishing traffic hazards.

**Policy 5.3:** Encourage ridesharing and the use of transit and other transportation systems management programs to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and traffic congestion.

**Policy 5.4:** Preclude through-city truck traffic on local roadways and limit truck routes through Santee to principal and major arterial roadways.

**Policy 5.5:** Promote the establishment of shared driveways and reciprocal access between adjoining properties to reduce the number of curb cuts and conflicting traffic movements on major roads.

**Policy 6.1:** Consider methods of improving service safety along and across the trolley line in coordination with San Diego Association of Governments, San Diego Metropolitan Transit System, and other relevant agencies.

**Policy 6.2:** Coordinate with San Diego Metropolitan Transit System to encourage transit stops in areas serving vulnerable populations, such as near senior housing projects, medical facilities, major employment centers, and mixed-use areas.

**Policy 10.6:** Coordinate with transportation agencies to identify local and regional transportation corridors that are at risk from climate change effects while using the best available science and resilient design features to improve resiliency to extreme climate events.

**Policy 10.7:** Coordinate with regional transit providers to identify alternative routes, stops, and modes of transit if normal infrastructure is damaged or closed as a result of extreme events.

The following EJ policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to transportation:

**Policy 3.2:** Work with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System and the San Diego Association of Governments to encourage transit providers to establish, maintain, and increase frequency of routes to jobs, shopping, schools, daycares, parks, and healthcare facilities that are convenient to the disadvantaged communities in both the southeastern and the southwestern portions of Santee.

**Policy 3.3:** Promote and support the continued expansion of the San Diego Trolley system that benefits residents of Santee, especially in higher-density areas. Work with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System to ensure that public transportation is provided from disadvantaged communities to commercial and recreational facilities. Work with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System to increase frequency of the Green Line, particularly during weekends, which provides access to and from the City of Santee and the City of San Diego.

**Policy 3.4:** Encourage the use of alternative transportation modes, such as walking, cycling, and public transit. Maintain and implement the policies and recommendations of the Active Santee Plan and the San Diego Association of Governments San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan to improve safe bicycle and pedestrian access to major destinations.

**Policy 3.5:** Coordinate with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System and San Diego Association of Governments to provide efficient, cost-effective, and responsive systems; multimodal support

facilities; and adequate access near and to and from transit stops for bicyclists and pedestrians, including children and youth, older adults, and people with disabilities.

**Policy 3.6:** Encourage and provide ridesharing, park and ride, and other similar commuter programs that eliminate vehicles from freeways and arterial roadways. Encourage businesses to provide flexible work schedules for employees and employers to offer shared commute programs and/or incentives for employees to use public transit.

**Policy 3.7:** Work to increase public transit ridership among transit-dependent populations by providing greater access to public transit throughout Santee.

## Impact Analysis

### a. Would the project conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose any programs, policies, or ordinances that are inconsistent with current provisions of the 2017 Santee General Plan Mobility Element (City of Santee 2017). The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development, but may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as transportation improvements to encourage biking and walking (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Future development would be required to comply with all goals, policies, and objectives addressing the City's circulation system, including alternative transportation. These include but are not limited to working with other agencies in the region to develop traffic and congestion management programs to improve commute times and improve air quality (Policy 2.9); implementing the recommendations of the Active Santee Plan to improve safe bicycle and pedestrian access to major destinations (Policy 9.4); and encouraging complete streets and the expansion of multimodal transportation (Policy 1.1). Future development would be required to be consistent with City standards, including the Santee Municipal Code, Title 11, Buildings and Construction, which adopts the CBC standards and regulations related to access and circulation. Future development would be subject to review by the City during final design to ensure adherence to local requirements for internal site circulation and site access. Due to the conceptual nature of future development, future development proposals would require project-specific CEQA review, including an assessment of potential impacts to City plans, programs, or policies supporting alternative transportation. Compliance with the Santee General Plan Mobility Element goals and policies and the Santee Municipal Code would ensure impacts are less than significant.

In addition, the Safety-EJ Element would contain several new policies that would encourage opportunities for transit and active transportation:

**Policy 2.2:** Remove particulate matter from mobile source emissions through implementation of the Sustainable Santee Plan’s public transit, active transportation, and electrification strategies.

**Policy 2.6:** Create land use patterns that encourage people to bicycle, walk, or use public transit to reduce emissions from mobile sources, such as plans that (1) require vegetative barriers to be included in industrial developments near residential areas in Santee and/or (2) improve tree canopy and promote green infrastructure development in disadvantaged communities, particularly the neighborhoods that do not already have access to green space.

**Objective 3:** Promote access to public transit by increasing frequency of buses and trolleys, decreasing travel duration for commuters, and updating system networks to connect riders to priority areas, such as shopping centers, schools, and parks and recreation facilities.

- **Policy 3.1:** Implement the Santee Parks and Recreation Master Plan to increase access to diverse, high-quality parks, green space, recreation facilities, and natural environments for disadvantaged communities.
- **Policy 3.2:** Work with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System and the San Diego Association of Governments to encourage transit providers to establish, maintain, and increase frequency of routes to jobs, shopping, schools, daycares, parks, and healthcare facilities that are convenient to the disadvantaged communities in both the southeastern and the southwestern portions of Santee.
- **Policy 3.3:** Promote and support the continued expansion of the San Diego Trolley system that benefits residents of Santee, especially in higher-density areas. Work with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System to ensure that public transportation is provided from disadvantaged communities to commercial and recreational facilities. Work with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System to increase frequency of the Green Line, particularly during weekends, which provides access to and from the City of Santee and the City of San Diego.
- **Policy 3.4:** Encourage the use of alternative transportation modes, such as walking, cycling, and public transit. Maintain and implement the policies and recommendations of the Active Santee Plan and the San Diego Association of Governments San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan to improve safe bicycle and pedestrian access to major destinations.
- **Policy 3.5:** Coordinate with the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System and San Diego Association of Governments to provide efficient, cost-effective, and responsive systems; multimodal support facilities; and adequate access near and to and from transit

stops for bicyclists and pedestrians, including children and youth, older adults, and people with disabilities.

- **Policy 3.6:** Encourage and provide ridesharing, park and ride, and other similar commuter programs that eliminate vehicles from freeways and arterial roadways. Encourage businesses to provide flexible work schedules for employees and employers to offer shared commute programs and/or incentives for employees to use public transit.
- **Policy 3.7:** Work to increase public transit ridership among transit-dependent populations by providing greater access to public transit throughout Santee.

**Objective 5:** Continue to create a “livable community” by offering supportive community programs and services, providing alternative transportation choices, and promoting equitable, affordable housing.

- **Policy 5.1:** Create a vibrant town center by developing a connected system of multimodal corridors that encourages walking, biking, and riding public transit. A mobility hub should be considered at the existing Santee Trolley Square to provide features such as bike-share, bike parking, car-share, neighborhood electric vehicles, real-time traveler information, demand-based shuttle services, wayfinding signage, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and urban design enhancements. Continue to implement the Santee Town Center Specific Plan, which provides retail commercial, office, recreational, and other appropriate uses to establish a focal point for Santee.
- **Policy 5.10:** Coordinate with local school districts and nonprofit organizations to improve access and resources to engage in active forms of transportation (e.g., bicycles, skates, helmets, and related equipment) for disadvantaged communities.

**Objective 6:** Improve access to and connectivity between community services, including group meetings, recreation programs, and health classes.

- **Policy 6.7:** Collaborate with organizations like California Walks to improve active transportation in Santee through policy, project, and program development and implementation; grant writing; and neighborhood needs assessments.

As such, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities in Santee.

**b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may result in an increase in vehicle miles that would have the potential to impact the circulation system. Future development would be consistent with the Santee General Plan land use designations. Additionally, future development in Santee would be subject to the City of Santee VMT Analysis Guidelines during project-specific CEQA environmental review (City of Santee

2022). The City of Santee VMT Analysis Guidelines include screening criteria and thresholds of significance to assess an individual project's impact on VMT during CEQA environmental review. Screening criteria for development projects that are presumed to have less-than-significant impacts to the transportation system, and therefore would not be required to conduct a VMT analysis, include the following: projects in a transit-accessible area, small projects, projects in a VMT-efficient area, local serving retail projects and public facilities, and infill affordable housing (City of Santee 2022d).

Therefore, future development projects in Santee would be required to adhere to the City of Santee VMT Analysis Guidelines, assess VMT impacts, and require project-specific mitigation measures as applicable. Therefore, impacts related to VMT would be less than significant.

Additionally, the proposed Safety-EJ Element would incorporate new policies that would support reduction in VMT citywide and regionally, as described in Section 2.4.17(a). As such, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to VMT reduction in Santee.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Design features of future development would need to be consistent with road design standards in the Santee Municipal Code and San Diego County's Public Roads Standards (County of San Diego 2012). Through the City's environmental review process, future development projects would be evaluated for potential safety impacts due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use.

The existing Santee General Plan Safety Element includes several policies to address public safety-related roadway designs, including promoting the use of traffic control devices such as signals, medians, and other street design measures along busy roadways to regulate, warn, and guide traffic, thereby diminishing traffic hazards (Policy 5.2); precluding through-city truck traffic on local roadways and limiting truck routes through the City to principal and major arterial roadways (Policy 5.4); and promoting the establishment of shared driveways and reciprocal access between adjoining properties to reduce the number of curb cuts and conflicting traffic movements on major roads (Policy 5.5). The Safety-EJ Element would retain these policies and would incorporate new related policies:

**Policy 5.6:** Implement the Complete Streets Policy in the Santee General Plan Mobility Element.

**Policy 5.7:** Continue to plan for and implement a comprehensive network of safe pedestrian facilities to promote pedestrian travel.

As such, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to roadway design features in Santee.

**d. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section 2.4.9, the City has prepared its own Emergency Operations Plan (City of San Diego 2010) in compliance with the State Office of Emergency Services and the Santee Municipal Code that identifies responses and actions depending on the nature and the scope of the disaster. The Safety-EJ Element would identify hazards present in Santee and would focus on assessing the scope of risk associated with the hazards and emergency preparedness procedures and fire, police, and medical facilities and/or staffing.

Construction activities associated with future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would have the potential to interfere with emergency access and procedures if authorities are not properly notified or multiple projects are constructed during the same time and multiple roadways used for emergency routes are concurrently blocked. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with the current Santee General Plan land use designations. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific changes in Santee’s existing circulation network. However, the proposed Safety-EJ Element includes an Emergency Evacuation Route Analysis to determine the vulnerability of the City’s evacuation routes to potential hazards and to identify areas of the City that do not have at least two emergency evacuation routes (i.e., neighborhoods or households within a hazard area that have limited accessibility) in accordance with AB 747 and SB 99. Refer to Section 2.4.9(f) for a description of the analysis results.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

### 2.4.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Environmental Setting

Tribal Cultural Resources are sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that are either included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR or included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in subdivision (k) of California Public Resources Code, Section 5020.1, or determined to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in California Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1.

The people who traditionally occupied the region along the Pacific coast from the central part of San Diego County southward into Baja California and eastward into the County of Imperial were originally referred to by Europeans as the “Diegueño” or “Diegueno” because they lived on the lands granted to Mission San Diego de Alcalá by the Spanish crown. Today, the Native Americans dubbed Diegueño generally refer to themselves as the “Kumeyaay.” Linguistic studies support the division of the Kumeyaay people into northern (Ipai) and southern (Tipai) dialect groups while often identifying the Desert Kumeyaay of the eastern county, portions of northeastern Baja California, and the majority of the western portion of the County of Imperial as Kamia. Prior to European contact, the boundary between the Kumeyaay groups was not rigid and the distinction between them likely existed as a gradient rather than a clear division of cultural and political units. These groups shared closely related Yuman languages, as well as customs, beliefs, and material culture.

## Impact Analysis

- a. **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:**
  - i. **Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or**
  - ii. **A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

**Less than Significant Impact.** Tribal outreach pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18 was initiated on November 17, 2022, with the following Tribes: Barona Band of Mission Indians, Jamul Tribe, Kumeyaay Tribe, and Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians. The Native American Heritage Commission provided a list of Tribes who should be contacted for information related to Tribal Cultural Resources. The additional Tribes and individuals identified by the Native American Heritage Commission were contacted on January 4, 2023.

Two requests for consultation were received by the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians and the Campo Band of Mission Indians. Staff held a meeting with each tribal representative and explained that the project is an update to a planning-level document and future site-specific development would be subject to additional environmental review. The tribal representative from the Campo Band of Mission Indians requested a copy of the completed Negative Declaration for their records. No additional questions or requests were received by any of the tribes within the 30 and 90-day consultation period. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.19 Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

### Water Supply

The City, along with parts of El Cajon and Lakeside, is included in the Western Service Area for Padre Dam. The source of drinking water supply for Padre Dam is from the San Diego County Water Authority. The San Diego County Water Authority receives the majority of its supply from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan). The tap water customers receive from Padre Dam is blended water from the Colorado River System, the California State Water Project, ocean water from the desalination plant, and local watersheds in San Diego County (Padre Dam 2022). Water travels through over 600 miles of aqueducts and 1,100 miles of pipeline to get to the county. Padre Dam has a large infrastructure of its own, including over 300 miles of water mains, to provide water to residents of the City. The water is treated at Metropolitan's Skinner Treatment Plant near Temecula, the San Diego County Water Authority's Twin Oaks Valley Treatment Plant in San Marcos, Aberdeen Standard Investments' Claude "Bud" Lewis Carlsbad Desalination Plant in Carlsbad, and the Helix Water District's Levy Treatment Plant in Lakeside (Padre Dam 2022).

Padre Dam produces 2 million gallons per day of recycled water at their Ray Stoyer Water Recycling Facility. The recycled water provides irrigation water throughout the City and provides the water that fills the Santee Recreation Lakes (Padre Dam 2022).

## **Wastewater**

The City, through Padre Dam, provides sewer service to residents and businesses in the Western Service Area. Approximately 40 percent of the wastewater (sewer) is sent to the Ray Stoyer Water Recycling Facility where it is treated and becomes part of Padre Dam's recycled water supply. The remaining 60 percent of the wastewater collected travels from Padre Dam's wastewater system into the City of San Diego's Metropolitan Wastewater Treatment Facility in Point Loma (Padre Dam 2022).

## **Stormwater**

City-maintained storm draining systems include drain pipes, catch basins, and drainage channels. The City's Public Services Division of the Community Services Department is responsible for maintaining the City's streets, storm drains, and curbs and gutters in addition to the City's parks, landscape, and public buildings.

## **Solid Waste**

Commercial and residential trash hauling, as well as industrial solid waste and recycling collection and disposal services, are provided by Waste Management, Inc., under an exclusive franchise agreement with the City (City of Santee 2022).

## **Impact Analysis**

- a. **Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development, but may facilitate minor development and infrastructure projects, such as transportation and utility improvements and recreational spaces/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element). Future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be expected to be connected to the existing domestic water supply system, wastewater infrastructure, and existing stormwater infrastructure. Given the programmatic nature of the Safety-EJ Element, specific development projects are unknown at this time. Potential impacts to utility infrastructure would be location- and project-specific and cannot be assessed in a meaningful way until the location of the project site and nature of the project is known. Overall, future development construction and operation would result in increased water, wastewater treatment, electric power,

natural gas, and telecommunications demands and wastewater and solid waste generation, which would require the expansion or construction of utility infrastructure. However, future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with SANDAG's planned population growth in its Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Individual development projects would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review to identify the potential for significant impacts related to utilities infrastructure. Future development would be required to comply with Santee Municipal Code, Title 12, Chapter 30, Article 4, Development Impact Fees, which would offset impacts of new development on the City's utilities infrastructure. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**b. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Padre Dam would provide water services to future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element. Padre Dam's Urban Water Management Plan addresses the District's water system and includes a description of the water supply sources, magnitudes of historical and projected water use, and a comparison of water supply and water demands during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years (Padre Dam 2020).

No specific development is proposed as part of the Safety-EJ Element. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would rely on existing Santee General Plan land use designations and would be consistent with SANDAG's planned population growth in its RTP/SCS. According to Padre Dam's Urban Water Management Plan, the City is projected to have an adequate supply of water to meet the increase in demand. In addition, the City is projected to have enough water to meet demand during single-dry year and multiple-dry year scenarios, primarily through the implementation of the East County Water Purification Program (Padre Dam 2020). The East County Water Purification Program is a collaborative effort between Padre Dam, the City of El Cajon, the County of San Diego, and Helix Water District. Notably, the East County Water Purification Program will create "a new, local, sustainable, and drought-proof drinking water supply by using state-of-the-art technology to produce up to 30 percent of East County's drinking water supply" (East County Advanced Water Purification 2022).

All new development is required to comply with applicable state and local laws and regulations governing conservation of water supply resources. New development would be required to undergo subsequent project-specific CEQA review, including an analysis of water supply impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As described previously, Padre Dam operates a 2-million-gallons-per-day wastewater treatment plant through its Ray Stoyer Water Recycling Facility. The remainder of the City's wastewater flows into the City of San Diego's Metropolitan Wastewater Treatment Facility in Point Loma. Development facilitated by the Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with the adopted Santee General Plan and land use designations and would be consistent with SANDAG's planned population growth in its RTP/SCS. Based on Padre Dam's Urban Water Management Plan, the City's wastewater treatment facility has adequate capacity to serve additional planned growth in the region, including development facilitated by the Safety-EJ Element. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d. Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the Santee General Plan, non-hazardous solid and liquid waste generated in Santee is currently deposited in the Sycamore Landfill, which is in the northwestern region of the City at 8514 Mast Boulevard. Based on information provided by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), the Sycamore Landfill has a maximum daily throughput of 5,000 tons per day and a remaining capacity of 113,972,637 cubic yards (CalRecycle 2019). It is anticipated that this landfill will have sufficient permitted capacity to service solid waste generated by future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, construction activities for future development would be subject to conformance with relevant federal, state, and local requirements related to solid waste disposal. Specifically, future projects would be required to demonstrate compliance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939), which requires all California cities to "reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste generated in the state to the maximum extent feasible." AB 939 requires that at least 50 percent of waste produced be recycled, reduced, or composted. Local jurisdictions, including the City, are monitored by the state (CalRecycle) to verify if waste disposal rates set by CalRecycle that comply with the intent of AB 939 are being met. Future projects would also be required to demonstrate compliance with CALGreen, which includes design and construction measures that act to reduce construction-related waste through material conservation measures and other construction-related efficiency measures. Compliance would be verified by the City through review of project plans and specifications. Lastly, the future projects would be subject to compliance with all

applicable solid waste handling, processing, and disposal requirements stipulated in Title 9, Chapter 2, Article 120, Solid Waste Management, of the Santee Municipal Code. Therefore, future projects would be required to comply with the City's efforts in reducing solid waste and with solid waste regulations at the state level. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 2.4.20 Wildfire

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Setting

According to California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE)'s Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Viewer (CAL FIRE 2022), the City is designated as a moderate to high, unzoned Local Responsibility Area. CAL FIRE also maps fire threat for the state. Fire threat is a combination of two factors: (1) fire probability, or the likelihood of a given area burning, and (2) potential fire behavior (hazard). These two factors are combined to create five threat classes ranging from low to extreme. The mapping shows that portions of the City are within high, very high, and extreme fire threat areas, although small portions of the City are not mapped for fire threat (CAL FIRE 2019).

## Proposed Policies

The following Safety policies in the Safety-EJ Element apply to fire hazards:

### New Development

**Policy 3.1:** Mandate that a proposed development in State Responsibility Area or Very High Fire Severity Zone be approved only after it is determined that a Fire Protection Plan is in place that includes measures to avoid or minimize fire hazards, such as adequate water pressure to maintain the required fire flow at the time of development.

**Policy 3.2:** Ensure that all new development meets established response time standards for fire and life safety services and that all new development in State Responsibility Areas or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones requires fuel modification around homes and subdivisions.

**Policy 3.3:** Avoid expanding new residential development, essential public facilities, and critical infrastructure in areas subject to extreme threat or high risk, such as High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, or areas classified by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection as having an Extreme Threat classification on Fire Threat Maps unless all feasible risk reduction measures have been incorporated into project designs or conditions of approval.

**Policy 3.4:** Prohibit land uses that could exacerbate the risk of ignitions in High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, such as outdoor storage of hazardous or highly flammable materials, automobile service or gas stations, or temporary fireworks sales.

**Policy 3.5:** Prohibit land uses that could place occupants at unreasonable risk in High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, such as areas with large events or assembly of people and healthcare facilities.

**Policy 3.6:** Encourage the use of conservation easements or establish a Transfer of Development Rights Program in undeveloped wildland areas within High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.

**Policy 3.7:** Require the installation of fire hydrants and establishment of emergency vehicle access, notably before construction with combustible materials can begin on an approved project.

**Policy 3.8:** Require emergency access routes in developments to be adequately wide to allow the entry and maneuvering of emergency vehicles to ensure that new development has adequate fire protection.

**Policy 3.9:** Mandate that proposed development satisfy the minimum structural fire protection standards in the adopted edition of the California Building Standards Code and California Fire Code; however, where deemed appropriate, the City of Santee shall enhance the minimum standards to provide optimum protection.

**Policy 3.10:** Mandate that all new development in the Very High Fire Severity Zones comply with the most current version of the California Building Codes and California Fire Code.

**Policy 3.11:** Mandate that all new development shall meet or exceed Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Articles 1-5 (commencing with section 1270) (SRA Fire Safe Regulations) and Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 3, Article 3 (commencing with Section 1299.01) (Fire Hazard Reduction Around Buildings and Structures Regulations) for State Responsibility Areas and/or Very High Fire Severity Zones.

### **Existing Development**

**Policy 3.12:** Increase resilience of existing development in high-risk areas built prior to modern fire safety codes or wildfire hazard mitigation guidance.

**Policy 3.13:** Mandate that public and private landowners for all existing land uses comply with all applicable state and local requirements and implement site-specific safety measures that mitigate to a low-risk condition around or near public facilities, infrastructure, and natural resources.

**Policy 3.14:** Provide information regarding defensible space and building retrofits to achieve a low-risk condition.

**Policy 3.15:** Require public and private landowners to minimize the risk of wildfire moving from wildland areas to developed properties or from property to property by increasing structural hardening measures (e.g., fire-rated roofing and fire-resistant construction materials and techniques), maintaining and improving defensible space on site, and supporting vegetation management in adjacent undeveloped areas.

**Policy 3.16:** Require structures with fire protection sprinkler systems to provide for outside alarm notification.

**Policy 3.17:** Mitigate existing non-conforming development to contemporary fire safe standards (e.g., road standards, vegetative hazards). Support state legislation that would provide tax incentives to encourage the repair or demolition of structures that could be considered fire hazards.

### **Infill Development**

**Policy 3.18:** Prioritize infill development within the existing developed footprint to reduce vehicle miles traveled; improve access to jobs, services, and education; increase active transportation choices; avoid future unfunded infrastructure repair and maintenance liabilities; and avoid hazardous or environmentally sensitive open space areas.

**Policy 3.19:** Ensure that all infill development projects within State Responsibility Areas or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones are required to comply with applicable state or local fire safety and defensible space regulations or standards and any applicable fire protection or risk reduction measures identified in locally adopted plans.

**Policy 3.20:** Ensure that discretionary infill projects may be required to prepare a project-specific fire hazard and risk assessment and incorporate project-specific risk reduction measures, subject to the determination and approval of the Fire Marshal.

## **All Development**

**Policy 3.21:** Support the continuation of long-term maintenance of fire hazard reduction projects, such as a weed abatement program (existing), community fire breaks, and private and public road clearance.

**Policy 3.22:** Ensure that the distribution of fire hydrants and capacity of water lines is adequate through periodic review. Collaborate with the Padre Dam Municipal Water District to ensure the City's water supply location and long-term integrity are sufficient and future water supply needs are met.

**Policy 3.23:** Encourage and support the delivery of a high level of emergency services through cooperation with other agencies and use of available financial opportunities.

**Policy 3.24:** Encourage the continued development, implementation, and public awareness of fire prevention programs.

**Policy 3.25:** The Santee Fire Department shall continue be involved in the review of development applications to minimize fire hazards. Considerations shall be given to adequate emergency access, driveway widths, turning radii, future water supply needs, fire hydrant locations, needed fire flow requirements, street addressing, and signage.

**Policy 3.26:** Coordinate with the Padre Dam Municipal Water District on future water supply needs and existing water infrastructure constraints and deficiencies that could affect their ability to meet fire flow requirements.

**Policy 3.27:** Ensure that the timing of additional fire station construction or renovation (or new services) relates to the rise of service demand in Santee and surrounding areas.

**Policy 3.28:** Ensure that re-development after a large fire complies with the requirements for construction in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones for fire safety.

**Policy 3.29:** Ensure that the planning and design of re-development in very high Fire Hazard Severity Zones minimizes the risks of wildfire and includes adequate provisions for vegetation management, emergency access, and firefighting while also complying with current fire codes.

**Policy 3.30:** Support mutual aid agreements and communications links with the County of San Diego and the other municipalities participating in the Unified San Diego County Emergency Service Organization.

**Policy 3.31:** Provide adequate staffing, equipment, technology, training, and funding for the Santee Fire Department to meet the existing and projected service demands and response times.

**Policy 10.5:** Provide information on the benefits of the resiliency of existing residential and commercial development through structural strengthening, fire safe landscaping, and energy efficiency upgrades.

**Policy 12.1:** Continue to require fire prevention planning and defensible space in all new development within Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones or wildland-urban interface.

**Policy 12.2:** Review development proposals and coordinate with regional transportation agencies, as needed, to ensure that multiple evacuation routes are available under a range of scenarios and to identify alternative routes that are accessible to people without life-supporting resources.

**Policy 12.3:** Continue to educate the public on the importance of fire safety with information on topics including but not limited to defensible space, evacuation routes, and road clearance, with a focus on reaching at-risk, vulnerable populations.

**Policy 12.4:** Identify fire-prone habitats to plan for increased risk of larger and more frequent wildfires.

## **Impact Analysis**

### **a. Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section 2.4.9, the City has prepared its own Emergency Operations Plan (City of Santee 2020) in compliance with the State Office of Emergency Services and the Santee Municipal Code, which identifies responses and actions depending on the nature and the scope of the disaster. The Safety-EJ Element would identify hazards present in Santee and would focus on assessing the scope of risk associated with the hazards and emergency preparedness procedures and fire, police, and medical facilities and/or staffing.

Construction activities associated with future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would have the potential to interfere with emergency plans and procedures if authorities are not properly notified or multiple projects are constructed during the same time and multiple roadways used for emergency routes are concurrently blocked. Future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would potentially increase the extent of development, such as healthcare facilities and recreational space/community centers, in Santee, which could result in development in areas of the City adjacent to or in fire hazard areas. In the case of a wildfire evacuation, an increase in development, such as healthcare facilities and recreational space/community centers, would incrementally increase vehicular traffic on evacuation routes. Future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be consistent with the current Santee General Plan land use designations, and therefore, the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific changes in Santee's existing circulation network. However, the proposed Safety-EJ Element includes an Emergency

Evacuation Route Analysis to determine the vulnerability of the City's evacuation routes to potential hazards and to identify areas of the City that do not have at least two emergency evacuation routes (i.e., neighborhoods or households in a hazard area that have limited accessibility) in accordance with AB 747 and SB 99. Refer to Section 2.4.9(f) for a description of the analysis results.

Future projects would be subject to site-specific review and City regulations regarding street design, site access, and internal emergency access. Compliance would prevent multiple roadways used for emergency routes from being concurrently blocked. Therefore, impacts associated with the physical interference of an Emergency Response or Evacuation Plan would be less than significant.

Policy 4.4 of the City's existing General Plan Safety Element requires emergency access routes in all developments to be adequately wide to allow the entry and maneuvering of emergency vehicles. The Safety-EJ Element would retain and update this policy and incorporate several new policies related to evacuation routes:

**Policy 3.8:** Require emergency access routes in developments to be adequately wide to allow the entry and maneuvering of emergency vehicles to ensure that new development has adequate fire protection.

**Policy 10.7:** Coordinate with regional transit providers to identify alternative routes, stops, and modes of transit if normal infrastructure is damaged or closed as a result of extreme events.

**Policy 12.2:** Review development proposals and coordinate with regional transportation agencies, as needed, to ensure that multiple evacuation routes are available under a range of scenarios and to identify alternative routes that are accessible to people without life-supporting resources.

**Policy 12.3:** Continue to educate the public on the importance of fire safety with information on topics including but not limited to defensible space, evacuation routes, and road clearance, with a focus on reaching at-risk, vulnerable populations.

As such, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would result in beneficial impacts related to evacuation routes and implementation of an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan.

**b. Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, the goals and policies incorporated into the proposed Safety-EJ Element may facilitate development of transit and utilities infrastructure construction and repairs, healthcare facilities, and recreational space/community centers (refer to Section 1.4, Proposed Element, for further discussion of the types of projects that may be facilitated under the Safety-EJ Element).

Development of facilities in high, very high, and extreme fire threat areas are subject to wildfire hazards due to slope and prevailing winds based on location, which would consequently result in higher fire-related risks to people and structures. Through the City's environmental review process, future development projects associated with the Safety-EJ Element would be required to abide by the 2022 (or most current) California Fire Code and the CBC, which contains measures to reduce fire hazards in structures, including the use of materials, fire separation walls, building separation, and fire sprinklers. In addition to existing policies addressing wildfire in the Santee General Plan Safety Element, the Safety-EJ Element would build upon these policies and include several new policies intended to reduce the exposure of people and the environment to wildland fire risks:

**Policy 3.1:** Mandate that a proposed development in SRA or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone be approved only after it is determined that a Fire Protection Plan is in place that includes measures to avoid or minimize fire hazards, such as adequate water pressure to maintain the required fire flow at the time of development.

**Policy 3.2:** Ensure that all new development meets established response time standards for fire and life safety services and that all new development in State Responsibility Areas or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones requires fuel modification around homes and subdivisions.

**Policy 3.3:** Avoid expanding new residential development, essential public facilities, and critical infrastructure in areas subject to extreme threat or high risk, such as High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, or areas classified by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection as having an Extreme Threat classification on Fire Threat Maps unless all feasible risk reduction measures have been incorporated into project designs or conditions of approval.

**Policy 3.4:** Prohibit land uses that could exacerbate the risk of ignitions in High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, such as outdoor storage of hazardous or highly flammable materials, automobile service or gas stations, or temporary fireworks sales.

**Policy 3.5:** Prohibit land uses that could place occupants at unreasonable risk in High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, such as areas with large events or assembly of people and healthcare facilities.

**Policy 3.6:** Encourage the use of conservation easements or establish a Transfer of Development Rights Program in undeveloped wildland areas within High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.

**Policy 3.7:** Require the installation of fire hydrants and establishment of emergency vehicle access, notably before construction with combustible materials can begin on an approved project.

**Policy 3.8:** Require emergency access routes in developments to be adequately wide to allow the entry and maneuvering of emergency vehicles to ensure that new development has adequate fire protection.

**Policy 3.9:** Mandate that proposed development satisfy the minimum structural fire protection standards in the adopted edition of the Uniform Fire and Building Codes; however, where deemed appropriate, the City of Santee shall enhance the minimum standards to provide optimum protection.

**Policy 3.10:** Increase resilience of existing development in high-risk areas built prior to modern fire safety codes or wildfire hazard mitigation guidance.

**Policy 3.11:** Mandate that public and private landowners for all existing land uses comply with all applicable state and local requirements and implement site-specific safety measures that mitigate to a low-risk condition around or near public facilities, infrastructure, and natural resources.

**Policy 3.12:** Provide information regarding defensible space and building retrofits to achieve a low-risk condition.

**Policy 3.13:** Require public and private landowners to minimize the risk of wildfire moving from wildland areas to developed properties or from property to property by increasing structural hardening measures (e.g., fire-rated roofing and fire-resistant construction materials and techniques), maintaining and improving defensible space on site, and supporting vegetation management in adjacent undeveloped areas.

**Policy 3.14:** Require structures with fire protection sprinkler systems to provide for outside alarm notification.

**Policy 3.15:** Mitigate existing non-conforming development to contemporary fire safe standards (e.g., road standards, vegetative hazards). Support state legislation that would provide tax incentives to encourage the repair or demolition of structures that could be considered fire hazards.

**Policy 3.16:** Prioritize infill development within the existing developed footprint to reduce vehicle miles traveled; improve access to jobs, services, and education; increase active transportation choices; avoid future unfunded infrastructure repair and maintenance liabilities; and avoid hazardous or environmentally sensitive open space areas.

**Policy 3.17:** Ensure that all infill development projects within State Responsibility Areas or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones are required to comply with applicable state or local fire safety and defensible space regulations or standards and any applicable fire protection or risk reduction measures identified in locally adopted plans.

**Policy 3.18:** Ensure that discretionary infill projects may be required to prepare a project-specific fire hazard and risk assessment and incorporate project-specific risk reduction measures, subject to the determination and approval of the Fire Marshal.

**Policy 3.19:** Support the continuation of long-term maintenance of fire hazard reduction projects, such as a weed abatement program (existing), community fire breaks, and private and public road clearance.

**Policy 3.20:** Ensure that the distribution of fire hydrants and capacity of water lines is adequate through periodic review.

**Policy 3.21:** Encourage and support the delivery of a high level of emergency services through cooperation with other agencies and use of available financial opportunities.

**Policy 3.22:** Encourage the continued development, implementation, and public awareness of fire prevention programs.

**Policy 3.23:** The Santee Fire Department shall continue be involved in the review of development applications to minimize fire hazards. Considerations shall be given to adequate emergency access, driveway widths, turning radii, fire hydrant locations, and needed fire flow requirements.

**Policy 3.24:** Ensure that the timing of additional fire station construction or renovation (or new services) relates to the rise of service demand in Santee and surrounding areas. Evaluate redevelopment after a large fire.

**Policy 3.25:** Support mutual aid agreements and communications links with the County of San Diego and the other municipalities participating in the Unified San Diego County Emergency Service Organization.

Compliance with existing regulations and proposed Safety-EJ Element policies would ensure that impacts related to wildfire risk are below significant. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. However, future development facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element may require the installation of new water, emergency water, wastewater, stormwater, and natural gas infrastructure and connections to City infrastructure. Any new infrastructure components would be required to comply with applicable CBC and California Fire Code regulations. Therefore, implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Any future development that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would be required to adhere to the CBC and other standards and regulations for building designs, which would minimize any potential risks associated with landslides. In addition, future development

would be subject to City and state drainage and stormwater quality requirements that are designed to reduce stormwater runoff from individual projects sites by promoting infiltration, minimizing impervious surfaces, and requiring LID measures. Therefore, future development would not expose people or structures to significant risk associated with post-fire landslides, mudflows, and flooding.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

### 2.4.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Note:** Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino,(1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

### Impact Analysis

- a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Instead, the Safety-EJ Element would identify action programs that could be implemented to provide additional capacity for the City to adapt to hazard- and climate-related changes in the environment. Implementation of the Safety-EJ Element would not directly remove sensitive vegetation communities or species or eliminate cultural resources because the Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development projects. Development facilitated by the Safety-EJ Element would be subject to compliance with the regulations and guidelines set forth in the Santee General Plan, the update to the General Plan (once approved), Santee Municipal Code, and development review process. Due to the conceptual nature of future development, proposals would require

project-specific CEQA review, including an assessment of potential impacts to biological and cultural resources. If necessary, additional mitigation would be required to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Adoption of the proposed Safety-EJ Element would not significantly 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. Therefore, the proposed Safety-EJ Element's contribution to adverse impacts on wildlife resources, individually or cumulatively, would be less than significant.

- 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)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element would be a policy document designed to assist the City in future planning. Cumulative impacts associated with development consistent that may be facilitated under implementation of the Safety-EJ Element have been evaluated at a program or policy level. In addition, future development would be required to be consistent with Santee General Plan policies aimed at reducing cumulative impacts. Furthermore, through the City's environmental review process, future development projects would be evaluated for potential cumulative impacts. Where needed, appropriate mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts. Therefore, the Safety-EJ Element's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

- c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Safety-EJ Element would consist of an updated determination of public safety and environmental justice needs in Santee and revisions to policies and procedures the City uses in addressing those needs. The Safety-EJ Element would be a policy document designed to assist the City in future planning. The Safety-EJ Element does not propose specific development. Environmental impacts with the potential to adversely affect people that may result from development have been evaluated at a program or policy level. Due to the conceptual nature of future development, future development proposals would require project-specific CEQA review, including an assessment of potential impacts to hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and other environmental topics that would directly or indirectly affect people. Where needed, appropriate mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts. Therefore, impacts associated with adoption of the Safety-EJ Element would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

The analysis completed for this section indicates that no significant impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Safety-EJ Element. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## Section 3 List of Preparers

---

### 3.1 Lead Agency

City of Santee  
10601 Magnolia Avenue  
Santee, California 92071  
Christina Rios, Senior Planner

### 3.2 Consultants

Harris & Associates  
600 B Street, Suite 2000  
San Diego, California 92101

Diane Sandman, AICP, Principal in Charge  
Darin Neufeld, AICP, Project Manager  
Kelsey Hawkins, Deputy Project Manager  
Michael RupiĆ, Environmental Analyst  
Sydnie Margallo, Environmental Analyst  
Randy Deodat, GIS Analyst  
Lindsey Messner, Technical Editor  
Eija Blocker, Technical Editor

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## Section 4 References

---

- CAL FIRE (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2019. Fire Threat. Accessed July 2023. [https://frap.fire.ca.gov/media/10315/firethreat\\_19\\_ada.pdf](https://frap.fire.ca.gov/media/10315/firethreat_19_ada.pdf).
- CAL FIRE. 2022. FHSZ Viewer. Accessed July 2023. <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>.
- California Department of Finance. 2021. “E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011–2020 with 2010 Census Benchmark.” Accessed July 2023. <https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates/estimates-e5-2010-2020/>.
- California Water Boards. 2021. Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. Accessed July 2023. [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water\\_issues/programs/basin\\_plan/](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/).
- CalRecycle. 2019. SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details, Sycamore Landfill (37-AA-0023). Accessed July 2023. <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/484?siteID=2871>.
- Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2011. California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. Accessed July 2023. <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/aeronautics/documents/californiaairportlanduseplanninghandbook-a11y.pdf>.
- California Air Resources Board. 2018. California Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory - 2018 Edition. Accessed July 2023. <https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm>
- City of El Cajon, City of La Mesa, City of San Diego, City of Santee, County of San Diego, California Department of Transportation. 2016. San Diego River Watershed Management Area Water Quality Improvement Plan. Accessed July 2023. <https://projectcleanwater.org/download/san-diego-river-sdr-water-quality-improvement-plan-wqip/>.
- City of Santee. 2003. Santee General Plan. Accessed July 2023. <https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/services/development-services/planning-and-zoning-services/general-plan>.
- City of Santee. 2020. City of Santee Emergency Operations Plan.
- City of Santee. 2015. City of Santee Guidelines for Surface Water Pollution Prevention. Accessed July 2023. <https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/17964/637024042748900000>.
- City of Santee. 2016. City of Santee BMP Design Manual. Accessed July 2023. <https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/8700/636366824217170000>.
- City of Santee. 2017. City of Santee Mobility Element. Accessed July 2023. <https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/11054/636446327420070000>.
- City of Santee. 2018. Draft Santee Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan. Wildlife Agency Review Draft available December 2018.

- City of Santee. 2019. Sustainable Santee Plan. Accessed July 2023.  
<https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/home/showdocument?id=18422>.
- City of Santee. 2021. Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program. Accessed July 2023.  
<https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/8379/637751838225770000>.
- City of Santee. 2022a. "Department Overview." Accessed July 2023.  
<https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/government/fire-department/department-overview>.
- City of Santee. 2022b. "Reduce, Reuse & Recycle." Accessed July 2023.  
<https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/services/solid-waste-recycling-services>.
- City of Santee. 2022c. "City of Santee Housing Element Sixth Cycle 2021 -2029." May 11, 2022.  
Accessed July 2023. <https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/8551/638066250344200000>.
- City of Santee. 2022d. City of Santee VMT Analysis Guidelines. April 13, 2022.
- County of San Diego. 2009. County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance of Paleontological Resources. Land Use and Environment Group, Department of Planning and Land Use, Department of Public Works.
- County of San Diego. 2012. Public Roads Standards. Accessed July 2023.  
[https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/ceqa/Soitec-Documents/Final-EIR-Files/references/rtcref/ch3.1.8/2014-12-19\\_CountyofSanDiego2012\\_PublicRoadStandards.pdf](https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/ceqa/Soitec-Documents/Final-EIR-Files/references/rtcref/ch3.1.8/2014-12-19_CountyofSanDiego2012_PublicRoadStandards.pdf).
- County of San Diego. 2014. Low Impact Development Handbook: Stormwater Management Strategies. Accessed July 2023.  
[https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dpw/WATERSHED\\_PROTECTION\\_PROGRAM/susmpdf/lid\\_chapters\\_1-4.pdf](https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dpw/WATERSHED_PROTECTION_PROGRAM/susmpdf/lid_chapters_1-4.pdf).
- County of San Diego. 2022. Transportation Study Guidelines. Accessed July 2023.  
<https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/SB743/Transportation%20Study%20Guide%20-%20FINAL%20-%20September%202022.pdf>.
- DOC (California Department of Conservation). 2016. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed July 2023. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.
- DTSC (California Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2022. EnviroStor. Accessed July 2023.  
[https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?CMD=search&ocieerp=&HWMP=False&business\\_name=&main\\_street\\_name=&city=santee&zip=&county=&censustract=&case\\_number=&apn=&Search=Get+Report](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?CMD=search&ocieerp=&HWMP=False&business_name=&main_street_name=&city=santee&zip=&county=&censustract=&case_number=&apn=&Search=Get+Report).
- DWR (California Department of Water Resources). 2022. SGMA Basin Prioritization Dashboard. Accessed July 2023. <https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/bp-dashboard/final/>.
- East County Advanced Water Purification. 2022. "Welcome." Accessed July 2023.  
<https://eastcountyawp.com/>.

- Geocon, Inc. 2021. Geotechnical/Seismic Hazard Study for the Safety Element of the Santee General Plan. Prepared for the City of Santee. March 29.
- IPCC (International Panel on Climate Change). 2014. Fifth Assessment – Climate Change Synthesis Report. Accessed July 2023. <https://archive.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/>
- Padre Dam (Padre Dam Municipal Water District). 2020. Urban Water Management Plan. Accessed July 2023. <https://www.padredam.org/397/5035/Urban-Water-Management-Plan#:~:text=Padre%20Dam's%20Urban%20Water%20Management,%2C%20and%20multiple%20dry%20years.>
- Padre Dam. 2021. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. Accessed July 2023. <https://www.padredam.org/DocumentCenter/View/5620/2020-Urban-Water-Management-Plan.>
- Padre Dam. 2022. “Your Water.” Accessed July 2023. <https://www.padredam.org/35/Your-Water.>
- San Diego County Airport Land Use Commission. 2010. Gillespie Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Accessed July 2023.  
[http://sntbberry.cityofsantee.ca.gov/sites/FanitaRanch/Public/Remainder%20of%20the%20Record/\(2\)%20Reference%20Documents%20from%20EIR%20&%20Technical%20Reports/Tab%20302%20-%202010-12-20%20SDCRAA%202010\\_Gillespie%20Field%20Airport%20Land%20Use%20Compatibility%20Plan.pdf.](http://sntbberry.cityofsantee.ca.gov/sites/FanitaRanch/Public/Remainder%20of%20the%20Record/(2)%20Reference%20Documents%20from%20EIR%20&%20Technical%20Reports/Tab%20302%20-%202010-12-20%20SDCRAA%202010_Gillespie%20Field%20Airport%20Land%20Use%20Compatibility%20Plan.pdf)
- SANDAG (San Diego Association of Governments). 2021. 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. Accessed July 2023. [https://www.sandag.org/uploads/2050RTP/F2050RTPTA2.pdf.](https://www.sandag.org/uploads/2050RTP/F2050RTPTA2.pdf)
- SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 2021. “2018 Integrated Report Map.” Accessed July 2023. [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_assessment/2018\\_integrated\\_report/2018IR\\_map.html.](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/water_quality_assessment/2018_integrated_report/2018IR_map.html)

*This page intentionally left blank.*