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*:*	July 23, 2015
Project Title*:*	Woodland & Watson Tentative Map
Record ID:	PDS2014-TM-5594; LOG NO. PDS2014-ER-14-08-016
Plan Area:	North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area
GP Designation:	Village Residential (VR-7.3)
Density:	7.3 units per gross acre
Zoning:	Single Family Residential (RS)
Min. Lot Size:	6,000 square feet
Special Area Reg.:	N/A
Lot Size:	3.6 acres
Applicant:	Larry Taylor, representative for Anova, Inc, (760) 721-9990
Staff Contact:	Marisa Smith - (858) 694-2621 marisa.smith@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The project is a major subdivision to divide a 3.6-acre property into 18 lots. The site is located on the southeast corner of Woodland Drive and Watson Way, in the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area. Access to lots 1-8 would be from private driveways connecting to Woodland Drive. Access to lots 9-12 would be from private driveways connecting to Watson Way. Access to lots 13-18 would be from private driveways connecting to a proposed private road, which would connect Woodland Drive to Watson Way along the southern portion of the parcel. Water would be provided by Vista Irrigation and Sewer would be provided by Buena Sanitation. Earthwork will consist of 11,500 cubic yards of cut and 12,700 cubic yards of fill, with 500 cubic yards of import for the bio-retention facility, and 700 cubic yards import for road base. The site is subject to the Village Residential General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation Village. Zoning for the site is Single Family Residential, RS. 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 Woodland & Watson Tentative Map (PDS2014-TM-5594) 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 would subdivide a 3.6-acre property into 19 lots, which is consistent with the Village 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 Cultural 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.

Marisa L Smith	**July 23, 2015**
Signature	Date
Marisa Smith	**Project Manager**
Printed Name	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	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
1. AESTHETICS – Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐

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 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 in an area characterized by residential and light agricultural uses. The addition of four new residential lots 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	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?	☐	☐	☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of,	☐	☐	☐

forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?			
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?	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐

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.

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	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)?	☐	☐	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐

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

Discussion

3(a) The project 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 180 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 additional residential homes which are considered new sensitive receptors; 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 that 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	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:			
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 an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, aerial imagery of the site, and site photos, it has been determined that no native vegetation communities or habitats exist on or adjacent to the site. Ornamental vegetation is present along the southern boundary of the property. The remaining portion of the site has been annually cleared per the City of Vista Fire Department's Weed Abatement Policy. Based on these considerations, no direct and indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities supporting candidate, sensitive, or special status species would occur.

4(b) Based on an analysis of the County's GIS records, aerial imagery of the site, and site photos, it has been determined that the proposed project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as defined by the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional

plans, policies or regulations. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

4(c) 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, aerial imagery of the site, and site photos, it has been 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. Adjoining properties surrounding the project site are already developed with residential uses.

4(e) Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, including Habitat Management Plans, Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), and Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

Conclusion
The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological 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.

	Significant Project Impact	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?	☐	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐
d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?	☐	☐	☐
e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

5(a) Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County approved archaeologist Roderick McLean, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in an historical resources report titled, "Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report – Woodland and Watson Tentative Map, PDS2014-TM-5594" (January 20, 2015).

5(b) No archaeological resources were identified on the property during the archaeological survey. 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 Native American cultural resources on record with the commission were present on the project property. The NAHC provided the contact information for fourteen Tribal contacts within the local community for additional consultation, if deemed necessary. Letters to the contacts on the list were transmitted seeking comment on January 22, 2015. Six Tribes responded requesting archaeological monitoring including a Luiseno Native American monitor, notification, copies of all background information, Government-to-Government consultation with the City of San Marcos, and continued consultation. The Native American monitor (Cami Mojado) for the archaeological survey, requested archaeological monitoring due to the sensitivity of the area including Buena Creek. Regional coordination and consultation is identified in the GPU EIR as mitigation measures CUL-2.2, CUL-2.4, and CUL-2.6.

Although no resources were identified during site surveys, the potential exists for subsurface deposits because of the sensitivity of the area including the location of Buena Creek to the project site. 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. The project will be conditioned with archaeological monitoring (Cul-2.5) that includes the following requirements:

- Pre-Construction
  - Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.

- Construction
  - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor are to be onsite during earth disturbing activities. The frequency

and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor. Monitoring of previously disturbed soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor.

- If cultural resources are identified:
  - Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
  - The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist.
  - The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
  - Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation.
  - Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Luiseno Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.
  - If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).

- Fill Soils – On-Site and Imported
  - All fill soils (on-site and imported) shall be evaluated to make the determination that they are clean of cultural resources.

- Human Remains.
  - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
  - Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin.
  - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
  - The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development

activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
    - Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.

- Rough Grading
  - Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered.

- Final Grading
  - A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered.

  - Disposition of Cultural Material.
    - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 or have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated Native American Tribe.
    - Historic materials shall be curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79/
    - The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

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 (cretaceous plutonic, zero sensitivity rating) that do not contain unique paleontological resources. Based on the sensitivity of the resource, monitoring during grading is not required.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: conformance with the County's Paleontological Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered.

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.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
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 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 soils on-site are identified as Bosanko clay that has a soil erodibility rating of moderate. A small portion to the north is Bonsall sandy loam, which has a soil erodibility rating of severe. 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 patters, 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 Bosanko clay and Bonsall sandy loam, which are considered to be an expansive soil as defined within Table 18-I-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	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?	☐	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐

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. Screening thresholds have been published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) for determining the need for additional analysis and mitigation for GHG-related impacts under CEQA. The annual 900 metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO2e) screening level referenced in the CAPCOA white paper (http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/05/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf) is being used by the County as a conservative criterion for determining the size of projects that would require further analysis and mitigation with regard to climate change. The CAPCOA white paper reports that the 900 metric ton screening level would capture more than 90% of development projects, allowing for mitigation towards achieving the State's GHG reduction goals. A project including retail space of 11,000 square feet or general commercial office space of 35,000 square feet would produce 900 metric tons. The project includes approximately 11,500 cubic yards of grading, 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 900 MT CO2e per year, and there would be a less-than cumulatively considerable impact.

7(b) The County has 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 State green building requirements, 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	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?	☐	☐	☐
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐
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?			
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?	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐
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 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 project will 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. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite which could produce a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials.

8(b) The project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. However, the project is a residential subdivision, and the application would not propose 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 (see attached Hazards/Hazardous Materials references), the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the project 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 not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. 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 adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code. The project location and design did not require a Fire Protection Plan; however, the Preliminary Grading Plan and Drainage Study were reviewed by the County Fire Marshal and Vista Fire Protection District. A Fire Service Availability Letter dated October 13, 2014, has been received from the Vista Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be 4 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	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐

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?	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐
d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐
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 Buena (904.32) hydrologic subarea, within the Carlsbad hydrologic unit. The project is in proximity to the Agua Hedionda Lagoon and Buena Creek which are listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list. 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 is a Tentative Map for residences which will involve temporary grading operations. The project will not use any groundwater as it relates to grading activities. 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: The project will not alter the natural drainage patterns and will have facilities to mitigate any increase in flowrate associated with the development

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 housing will be placed within a FEMA mapped floodplain or County-mapped floodplain or drainage with a watershed greater than 25 acres.

9(j) The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows

9(k) The project does not propose to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving any flooding.

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

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	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?	☐	☐	☐
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?

11(a) The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as Resource Potentially Present (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by dense residential uses 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	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?	☐	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

12(a) The area surrounding the project site consists of single family residences. The project will 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: Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires projects to comply with a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Projects which could produce noise in excess of 60 dB(A) are required to incorporate design measures or mitigation as necessary to comply with the Noise Element. Based on a review of the County's noise contour maps, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of 60 dBA CNEL because the nearest substantial noise source is from SR-78 which is approximately 2,000 feet setback from the site. Additionally, this roadway is screen by intervening topography and existing structures which also provide additional reduction to traffic noise.

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 a Tentative and does not involve any permanent noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-408,-409, & -410: 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 75 dBA 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 Circulation Element (CE) 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. Additional project related traffic on nearby roadways would not result in a substantial noise increase to the existing conditions.

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

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) The project will not displace existing housing.

13(c) The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

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	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New 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?	☐	☐	☐

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	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
15. Recreation – Would the Project:			
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?	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐

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 require or propose trails and/or pathways. Impacts from these amenities have been considered as part of the overall environmental analysis contained elsewhere in this document.

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	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?	☐	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐

Discussion
16(a) The project will result in an additional 180 ADT. However, 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 project proposes an additional 180 ADT, therefore the project does 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 outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport.

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 San Diego County Fire Authority and Vista Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.

16(f) The project will 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. 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	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?	☐	☐	☐
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to	☐	☐	☐

accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐

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 Buena Sanitation 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 Vista Irrigation District has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.

17(e) A Service Availability Letter from the Buena 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:

Taylor Group, Inc., Larry Taylor, P.E., G.E. (January 22, 2015), Sight Distance Study.
LSA Associates, Inc., Roderic McLean, M.A., RPA (January 20, 2015) Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report
LSA Associates, Inc., Jacqueline Hall, Archaeologist (July 30, 2014) Archaeological Survey of Parcels
LSA Associates, Inc., Jaime Morales, Biologist (August 14, 2014) Archaeological Survey of Parcels
Taylor Group, Inc., Larry Taylor, P.E., G.E. (May 5, 2015) Major Stormwater Management Plan
Taylor Group, Inc., Larry Taylor, P.E., G.E. (May 5, 2015) CEQA Preliminary Drainage Report
Eilar Associates, Inc, Amy L. Hool (August 13, 2014) Focused Construction Noise Analysis

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