



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

DARREN GRETLER
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

Statement of Reasons for Exemption from Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15183

Date: January 15, 2015
Project Title: Marilla Drive Condominium Tentative Map and Site Plan
Record ID: PDS2014-TM-5584; PDS2013-STP-13-028; LOG NO. PDS2014-ER-14-14-009
Plan Area: Lakeside
GP Designation: Village Residential (VR-24)
Density: N/A
Zoning: Urban Residential (RU)
Min. Lot Size: 6,000 square feet
Special Area Reg.: B, C
Lot Size: 14,400 square feet
Applicant: Elisabeth Reiter (858) 237-4580
Staff Contact: Marisa Smith (858) 694-2621
marisa.smith@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The project is a one-lot subdivision of a 14,400-square foot lot, comprising of a seven-unit multi-family residential condominium. The project would be conditioned for frontage improvements, which includes curb, gutter, and sidewalks, as well as add a fire hydrant along Marilla Drive. The condominium complex would be two stories, with each unit having a private open space area on the roof. A group usable open space would be located on the east side of the property. A Site Plan is also required for review by the Lakeside Design Review Board. The project site is located at 9679 Marilla Drive, south of Woodside Avenue and State Route 67, in the Lakeside Community Plan Area. Access to the site would be a private driveway connecting to Marilla Drive.

There is an existing residential home and accessory structure which would be removed. Water would be provided by Lakeside Municipal Water District, and sewer would be provided by San Diego Sanitation District (Lakeside). Earthwork would consist of 7,497 cubic yards of cut and fill, with 50 cubic yards of exported material. The project site is subject to the Village General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation Village Residential (VR-24). Zoning for the site is Urban Residential (RU). The project is consistent with density and lot size requirements of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Overview

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

General Plan Update Program EIR

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The GPU applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and directs population growth and plans for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The GPU included adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. It also included a corresponding land use map, a County Road Network map, updates to Community and Subregional Plans, an Implementation Plan, and other implementing policies and ordinances. The GPU focuses population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA service area covers approximately the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the GPU.

The GPU EIR was certified in conjunction with adoption of the GPU on August 3, 2011. The GPU EIR comprehensively evaluated environmental impacts that would result from Plan implementation, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts.

Summary of Findings

The Marilla Drive Condominium Subdivision (PDS2014-TM-5584, PDS2013-13-028) is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures (see http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the project qualifies for an exemption because the following findings can be made:

1. The project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.

The project is a one-lot subdivision for a condominium complex within a 14,400-acre property, which is consistent with the Village Residential development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.

2. There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.

The subject property is no different than other properties in the surrounding area, and there are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The project site is located in an area developed with similarly sized, estate residential lots with associated accessory uses. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the project would not result in any peculiar effects.

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The project could result in potentially significant impacts to Noise resources. However, applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.

3. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.

The proposed project is consistent with the density and use characteristics of the development considered by the GPU EIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for build-out of the General Plan. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.

4. There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, no new information has been identified which would result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

5. The project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR.

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, the project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR. These GPU EIR mitigation measures will be undertaken through project design, compliance with regulations and ordinances, or through the project's conditions of approval.

_____ Signature	January 15, 2015 Date
Marisa Smith _____ Printed Name	Project Manager _____ Title

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

This checklist provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Following the format of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, environmental effects are evaluated to determine if the project would result in a potentially significant impact triggering additional review under Guidelines section 15183.

- Items checked “Significant Project Impact” indicates that the project could result in a significant effect which either requires mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level or which has a significant, unmitigated impact.
- Items checked “Impact not identified by GPU EIR” indicates the project would result in a project specific significant impact (peculiar off-site or cumulative that was not identified in the GPU EIR.
- Items checked “Substantial New Information” indicates that there is new information which leads to a determination that a project impact is more severe than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

A project does not qualify for a §15183 exemption if it is determined that it would result in: 1) a peculiar impact that was not identified as a significant impact under the GPU EIR; 2) a more severe impact due to new information; or 3) a potentially significant off-site impact or cumulative impact not discussed in the GPU EIR.

A summary of staff’s analysis of each potential environmental effect is provided below the checklist for each subject area. A list of references, significance guidelines, and technical studies used to support the analysis is attached in Appendix A. Appendix B contains a list of GPU EIR mitigation measures.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
1. AESTHETICS – Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 1(a) The project would be visible from public roads and trails; however, the site is not located within a viewshed of a scenic vista.
- 1(b) The property is not within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project is located within ½ mile of State Route 67; however, the existing buildings screen the building from this viewshed. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property.
- 1(c) The project would be consistent with existing community character. The project is located along Marilla Drive, south of Woodside Avenue and State Route 67, in an area characterized by single and multi-family residential uses. There is an existing residence on the project site, which would be removed. The addition of seven new units would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings.
- 1(d) Residential lighting would be required to conform with the County’s Light Pollution Code to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties and minimize impacts to dark skies.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to aesthetics; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 2(a) The project and surrounding properties do not support any Farmland of Local Importance, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The site is designated as Urban and Disturbed land.
- 2(b) The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract or agriculturally zoned land.
- 2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the property.
- 2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands.
- 2(e) The project site is not located near any important farmlands or active agricultural production areas.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to agricultural resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
3. Air Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Discussion

- 3(a) The applicant proposes development that was anticipated and considered by SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below screening levels, and will not violate any ambient air quality standards.
- 3(b) Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening level criteria established by County air quality guidelines for determining significance. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 56 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants.
- 3(c) The project would contribute PM10, NOx, and VOCs emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening thresholds (see question 3(b) above)).
- 3(d) The project will introduce a seven-unit multi-family residential complex, which is considered a new sensitive receptor; however, the project site is not located within a quarter-mile of any identified point source of significant emissions. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near any carbon monoxide hotspots.
- 3(e) The project could produce objectionable odors during construction and operation; however, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m3).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to air quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	--	--

4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional

plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

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

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

Discussion

4(a) Based on a site visit by staff on June 18, 2014, it was determined that the site is completely disturbed, and no biological resources were found on the site. The site contains a residential home and accessory structure, both which would be removed. No mitigation for biological resources is required.

4(b) Based on a site visit by staff on June 18, 2014, it was determined that the site is completely disturbed, and no biological resources were found on the site. No wetlands or sensitive habitats were identified on the site. No mitigation for biological resources is required.

4(c) Based on a site visit conducted by staff, it has been determined that the proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

4(d) Based on a GIS analysis, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit by County staff, and a Biological Technical Report, it was determined that the site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor as identified on MSCP maps nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The site would not assist in local wildlife movement as it lacks connecting vegetation and visual continuity with

other potential habitat areas in the general project vicinity. The site is already surrounded with residential uses on all sides. Therefore, the project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

- 4(e) The project is consistent with the MSCP, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, and Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) because no mitigation would be required since there is no sensitive habitat.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to biological resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

5(a) Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow on July 30, 2014, it has been determined that the onsite 1953 residence is not historically significant. As such, impacts to the structure would not be significant. The results of the survey and evaluation are provided in a cultural resources report titled, “Cultural Resources Survey Report for Marilla Drive, PDS2014-TM-5584, PDS2013-STP-13-028, APN 382-220-05, Negative Findings”, prepared by Donna Beddow (December 30, 2014). The project site has been previously surveyed by Cook (89-26) and Mooney (89-02), both with negative results.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through conformance with the County’s Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul-1.1, CUL-1.6.

5(b) No archaeological resources were found on the property during the archaeological survey. The project site has been completely disturbed over time by development of the

site as a single-family residence. The project site has been previously surveyed by Cook (89-26) and Mooney (89-02), both with negative results. Based on a review of the SCIC database and mapping applications, there are no cultural resources in the general vicinity of the project site. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a listing of Native American Tribes whose ancestral lands may be impacted by the project. The NAHC response indicated that no sacred sites, on record with the commission, were present on the project property. No responses have been received from the tribes that were contacted related to Sacred Lands consultation. Regional coordination and consultation is identified in the GPU EIR as mitigation measures CUL-2.2, CUL-2.4, and CUL-2.6.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through compliance with the Grading Ordinance and through conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered.

- 5(c) The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.
- 5(d) A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations (sensitivity rating of zero) that do not contain unique paleontological resources.
- 5(e) Based on an analysis of records and archaeological surveys of the property, it has been determined that the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong

Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	--	--

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?

- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Discussion

- 6(a)(i) The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault.
- 6(a)(ii) To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.
- 6(a)(iii) The project site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain.
- 6(a)(iv) The site is not located within a “Landslide Susceptibility Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards.
- 6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soil on-site is identified as Placentia sandy loam, which have a soil erodibility rating of medium. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.
- 6(c) The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project.
- 6(d) The project is underlain by Placentia sandy loam, which are considered to be expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). However, the

project will not result in a significant impact because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.

6(e) The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from geology/soils; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	--	--

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the Project:

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 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 type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

7(a) The project would produce GHG emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion. However, the project falls below the screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that would have less-than-cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.

Table 3 of the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/Guidelines_for_Determining_Significance_Climate_Change.pdf) identify the various project types and sizes that would fall below the screening criteria. The project is a one-lot subdivision for a condominium complex of seven residential units, and would therefore fall below the screening criteria. For projects of this size, it is presumed that the construction and operational GHG emissions would not exceed 2,500 MT CO2e per year, and there would be a less-than cumulatively considerable impact. This assumes that the project does not involve unusually extensive construction and does not involve operational characteristics that would generate unusually high GHG emissions. Projects that comply with this screening criteria or “Bright Line” threshold are required to incorporate at least one CAP measure to ensure cumulatively considerable impacts to not occur. The project applicant has agreed to incorporate the following CAP measure to demonstrate compliance with the County’s Climate Action Plan: The entire construction fleet will be required to utilize California Air Resources Board (CARB)-certified Tier 2 or better equipment and equipped with diesel particulate filters; mitigation will be incorporated for dust emissions, and fireplaces would be required to use natural gas.

7(b) The County has an adopted Climate Action Plan (CAP) (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/Climate_Action_Plan.pdf) and numerous goals and policies in the County General Plan that address greenhouse gas reductions. Implementation of these measures will ensure that the County can achieve an emissions

reduction target consistent with the state-mandated reduction target of Assembly Bill 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act. Through compliance with the General Plan and the County's CAP, as discussed in additional detail in 7(a) above, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gas emissions.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to greenhouse gas emissions; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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 type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

residences are intermixed with wildlands?

h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

Discussion

- 8(a) The applicant proposes a seven-unit residential condominium complex. The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. However, the existing structures on-site which are designated for demolition have the possibility to contain ACM or LBP. Therefore, the project will be conditioned for a Lead Survey and Asbestos Survey prior to approval of the plans or issuance of any permit, including demolition, to determine if there is a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities. If the LBP or ACM are found, the applicant would be required to contact DEH Hazmat for further processing.
- 8(b) The project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing school. However, the project will not produce hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.
- 8(c) Based on a site visit and a comprehensive review of regulatory databases, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the applicant does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.
- 8(d) The proposed project is located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, however it is not located within a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. The project was reviewed and determined that the subdivision does not warrant further review or conditions, since the height of the future multi-unit complex would be regulated by the Zoning Ordinance, and the proposed subdivision meets zoning and General Plan density. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.
- 8(e) The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip.
- 8(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.
- 8(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.

- 8(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project is not located along the coastal zone.
- 8(f)(iv) EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN: The project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.
- 8f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.
- 8(g) The proposed project is not located near or adjacent to wildlands, that have the potential to support wildland fires. Furthermore, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires because the project complies with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code, as noted by County Fire Marshal, James Pine. The project has been reviewed and approved by both PDS and the Lakeside Fire Protection District, which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be approximately 1.5 minutes which is within the 5 minute maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element.
- 8(h) The project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by County staff, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hazards/hazardous materials; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

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

f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Discussion

9(a) The project will require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

- 9(b) The project lies in the Santee (907.12) hydrologic subarea, within the San Diego hydrologic unit. The site is a tributary to the San Diego River and Forester Creek, according to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list. However, the project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) The project will obtain its water supply from the Lakeside Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- 9(e) As outlined in the project's SWMP, the project will implement source control and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.
- 9(f) The project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons: based on a Drainage Study prepared by Von Reiter Group on January 5, 2015, drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- 9(g) The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.
- 9(h) The project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.
- 9(i) No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations.
- 9(j) No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations.
- 9(k) The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area.
- 9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(m)(i) SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.
- 9(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.
- 9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hydrology/water quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
10. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project:			
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

10(a) The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area.

10(b) The project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to land use/planning; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
11. Mineral Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>

11(a) The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as MRZ-2. However, the project site is surrounded by residential and commercial properties, which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

11(b) The project site is not located in an Extractive Use Zone (S-82), nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to mineral resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
12. Noise – Would the Project:			
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

12(a) Noise measures would ensure that the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the General Plan, Noise Ordinance, or other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element: Project design features and conditioning would be needed to ensure the project complies with County noise standards. The project is subject to the County Noise Element which allows up to 65 dBA CNEL at proposed exterior outdoor areas for multi-family developments. The project falls under this category and would be subject to this noise threshold. Ground level group usable areas are proposed on the eastern portion of the site and private outdoor areas would be located on the roof. Primary noise sources to the project site would be from traffic traveling along SR 67 which is approximately over 1,000 feet to the north. There are

existing structures which reduce the noise generated along SR 67. In addition, the proposed condominium development would also provide adequate noise reduction to the ground level group usable areas. Additionally, noise attenuation by distance would further reduce sound levels at the project site. The roof top private outdoor areas would be designed with a solid perimeter wall that would reduce traffic noise at these locations. The project would be conditioned to require an interior noise evaluation prior to issuance of any building permits. Therefore, noise attenuation by distance, screening from intervening structure, and project noise control features would ensure the project is in conformance with the County Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404: Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project's property line. The project is also subject to the County Noise Ordinance and is subject to the most restrictive 45 dBA one-hour average sound level limit. The primary noise source associated with the project would be from the proposed rooftop HVAC units. The roof top HVAC units would be screened by solid parapet wall design with a minimum height limit of 42 inches. Based on the solid parapet screen wall design, staff does not anticipate project related noise levels to exceed County noise standards. The project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-408 and-409: The project will not generate construction noise in excess of Noise Ordinance standards. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

- 12(b) The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the facilities are typically setback more than 50 feet from any County Mobility Element (ME) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 38 VdB or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities would insure that these proposed uses or operations do not have any chance of being impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment 1995, Rudy Hendriks, Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations 2002). This setback insures that this project site will not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

- 12(c) As indicated in the response listed under Section 12(a), the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of any applicable noise

standards. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to direct and cumulative noise impacts over existing ambient noise levels.

12(d) The project does not involve any operational uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the Noise Ordinance. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, the project will not operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24 hour period.

12(e) The project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

12(f) The project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from noise; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	--	--

13. Population and Housing – Would the Project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion

13(a) The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area.

13(b) Although the existing single family residence would be demolished, the project will not displace existing housing, since seven condominium units are proposed.

13(c) Although the existing single family residence would be demolished, the project will not displace existing housing, since seven condominium units are proposed.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to populations/housing; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by	Substantial New Information
---	--	--

	Impact	GPU EIR	Information
14. Public Services – Would the Project:			
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

14(a) Based on the project’s service availability forms, the project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to public services; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
15. Recreation – Would the Project:			
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

15(a) The project would incrementally increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities; however, the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance.

15(b) The project does not include trails and/or pathways.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to recreation; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
16. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 16(a) The project proposes additional 56 ADT. The project will not conflict with any established performance measures because the project trips do not exceed the thresholds established by County guidelines. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.
- 16(b) The additional 56 ADTs from the project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region’s Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG.
- 16(c) The proposed project is located within an Airport Influence Area, but is more than two miles outside of a public or public use airport. However, the project was reviewed for conformance with the Gillespie Airport Land Use Conformance Plan, and is found to be compatible without conditions.

- 16(d) The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.
- 16(e) The Lakeside Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.
- 16(f) While the project will require frontage improvements of curb, gutter, and sidewalks, it would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. The improvements would not impede or interfere with current traffic flow. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to transportation/traffic; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
17. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project:			
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 17(a) The project would discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project facility availability form has been received from the Olivenhain Municipal Water District that indicates that there is adequate capacity to serve the project.
- 17(b) The project involves new water and wastewater pipeline extensions. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(c) The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(d) A Service Availability Letter from the Lakeside Municipal Water District has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.
- 17(e) A Service Availability Letter from the Lakeside Sanitation District has been provided, which indicates that there is adequate wastewater capacity to serve the project.
- 17(f) All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the project.
- 17(g) The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to utilities and service systems; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Attachments:

Appendix A – References

Appendix B – Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067

Appendix A

The following is a list of project specific technical studies used to support the analysis of each potential environmental effect:

- Donna Beddow, County of San Diego, December 30, 2014, Negative Cultural Study
- Elizabeth Reiter, Von Reiter Group, November 20, 2014, Drainage Study
- Elizabeth Reiter, Von Reiter Group, April 17, 2014, Minor Stormwater Management Plan

For a complete list of technical studies, references, and significance guidelines used to support the analysis of the General Plan Update Final Certified Program EIR, dated August 3, 2011, please visit the County's website at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00_-_References_2011.pdf

Appendix B

A Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067 is available on the Planning and Development Services website at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf