



# 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](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds)

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

July 16, 2015

David Kovach  
RCS Harmony Partners, LLC  
2305 Historic Decatur Rd, Ste. 100  
San Diego, CA 92106

## **HARMONY GROVE VILLAGE SOUTH SCOPING LETTER**

**RECORD ID:** PDS2015-GPA-15-002; PDS2015-SP-15-002; PDS2015-TM-5600; PDS2015-REZ-15-003; PDS2015-MUP-15-008; PDS2015-ER-15-08-006; **PROJECT ADDRESS:** Southeast of the intersection of Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive; **APN:** 235-011-06, 238-021-09, 238-021-08, 238-021-10; **TRUST ACCOUNT NO.:** [2030691-D-02756](#)

Dear Mr. Kovach:

Planning & Development Services (PDS) appreciates your continued efforts and coordination on the Harmony Grove Village South project. The information provided in this letter is intended to identify the major issues and additional information and analysis needed to complete the processing of the applications. We are committed to work with you and your team to help resolve the issues outlined in this letter and where possible provide alternatives. We will proactively be scheduling meetings with the individual team members and responsible agencies to provide guidance on specific issues identified in the letter.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Below is the project description that staff has generated from the information provided in the application package. Please review this project description and verify with staff that the project description is correct:

The proposed project, Harmony Grove Village South, consists of a General Plan Amendment (GPA), Specific Plan (SP), Rezone (REZ), and a Vesting Tentative Map (TM). The applications would allow for 453 residential units on 111 acres (approximately 4.08 units per acre) with clustering. When clustering, units are proposed within the buildable area of the site, yielding a density of 8.58 units per acre. The remaining site area is proposed for SR-0.5, and preserved open space. The applications also allow for 10 private parks, community gardens, and an equestrian friendly commercial/civic use that may contain private clubhouse and lodging, and incidental food and beverage service open to the public. A "D" designator is proposed as part of the Rezone and will require a Site Plan be submitted in the future to ensure that the project design of residences and commercial/civic buildings conform to the Specific Plan.

The below chart lists the pre and post designations proposed by the applications.

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Existing Designation</b>	<b>Proposed Designation</b>
<b>General Plan Regional Category</b>	<b>Semi-Rural</b>	<b>Village and Semi-Rural</b>
<b>General Plan Land Use Designation</b>	<b>SR-0.5</b>	<b>VR-10.9 and SR-0.5*</b> (see note below table)
<b>Zone</b>	<b>A70 – Limited Agricultural RR – Rural Residential ** ** Only along southern boundary</b>	<b>S88 – Specific Plan</b>

\*Density may be calculated per the General Plan Chapter 3 Land Use Element (Page 3-10) as “the maximum number of dwelling units per gross acre (exclusive of public road rights-of-way)”.

The applicant may consider other density configurations and alternatives that support clustering and the Village/DCM concept

The project site is located southeast of the intersection of Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive, in the San Dieguito Community Planning area, within unincorporated San Diego County.

Access to the project site is provided from Country Club Lane. The project would be served by a proposed on-site wastewater treatment facility. Alternative wastewater treatment options will also be evaluated through the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Water will be imported from the Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District. Approximately 850,000 cubic yards of grading is proposed, with balanced cut and fill.

The project includes a mix of multi-family and single family homes, with five uniquely designed architectural styles that include: the Cottage, Bungalow, Harmony Court, Farmhouse, and Granary. The breakdown of homes is as follows:

- Cottages – detached single-family homes and attached duplexes. Buildings range from two – three stories in height (approximately 36-46 feet). Total number of Cottage homes would equal 72.
- Bungalow – four clustered single-family detached or attached homes. Buildings range from one-and-a-half – two stories in height (maximum height 36 feet). Total number of Bungalow homes would equal 56.
- Harmony Court – four clustered single-family detached homes that measure slightly larger than Bungalows. Buildings range from one – three stories in height (maximum height 36 feet). Total number of Harmony Court homes would equal 65.
- Farmhouse – multi-family detached homes consisting of approximately five homes each in a single building. Buildings range from three – three and a half stories in height (maximum height 44 feet). Total number of Farmhouse homes would equal 140.
- Granary – multi-family detached homes consisting of 15 homes each in a single building. Buildings would be three and a half stories in height. The typical structure height would be 49 feet, with architectural projection up to another 15 feet, making the maximum height 64 feet. Total number Granary homes would equal 120.

## PROJECT ISSUES

A Project Issue Checklist (Attachment A) has been prepared that details all issues, revisions or processing requirements that must be completed for this project. **This checklist shall be used by the County and the applicant as a comprehensive list of project issues that must be resolved and revisions that must be completed prior to public review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).** In response to the Project Issues Checklist, the applicant is expected to include a letter with every submittal made to the Department stating how each item number in the Checklist has been addressed.

## MAJOR PROJECT ISSUES

The following project issues were identified during the project scoping and are further discussed in the attachments to this letter. The issues require resolution and in some cases may require a change in the project design and/or density. The issues discussed below were identified based upon information presently available to the County and are subject to change upon submittal of further information and studies:

1. **Consistency with the General Plan:** The proposed General Plan Amendment is “reviewed to ensure that the change is in the public interest and would not be detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare” (Page 1-15, County’s General Plan). Additionally, a final determination of consistency with the General Plan will be made after completion of the environmental review process and prior to public hearings on the project.

Staff received and reviewed the General Plan Consistency supplied with the application. Upon completion of this review, staff classifies the project as an expansion of an existing Village and therefore will apply General Plan policy 1.4 Village Expansion.

Based on the review of the General Plan Consistency, Staff requests that additional information be provided to demonstrate compatibility with the community character and its changing conditions; provide evidence of compatibility with environmental constraints and demonstrate conformance with the following policies:

- 1) **Land Use Policy LU-1.4:** Additional evidence to support and demonstrate conformance with General Plan Land Use Policy 1.4, is requested. Specifically, evidence is required to demonstrate how the project is compatible with the first and fourth criteria within Policy 1.4. The first and fourth criteria require that Village Expansions demonstrate how they would be compatible with the environmental conditions and constraints of a site and demonstrate how the expansion of the Village Category is consistent with the community character, the scale and the orderly and continuous growth of the Harmony Grove Village.
- 2) **Land Use Policies LU-6.9, LU-9.2, LU-9.8, LU 9.10 and LU-9.11:** Additional evidence to support and demonstrate conformance with Land Use Policies 6.9, 9.2 and 9.8- 9.11 is requested. Specifically evidence is required that demonstrates how the proposal conforms to the natural topography and to the extent practicable would not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of the site. Further, the proposal should provide additional evidence as to how it creates or maintain connectivity and sites buildings and landscape design that is compatible with the surrounding areas.

The proposed plan should also provide further evidence as to how it demonstrates an efficient residential development pattern that enhances established neighborhoods or creates new neighborhoods in identified growth areas as is required by LU Policy 9.9. Please provide additional support as to how the project integrates new villages with existing neighborhoods through the use of connected streets, pathways and recreational open space networks.

- 3) **Conservation and Open Space Policies:** Additional evidence is required to demonstrate conformance with other policies that directly relate to the appropriateness of land uses with environmental conditions and constraints such as topography (steep slopes), wetlands, flooding, biology, scenic resources. Therefore, the following policies are also applicable to the project. COS-2.1 and COS-2.2, COS-3.1, COS-5.1, COS-11.1, and COS-12.1.

Please note that the policies referenced above are inherently related and connected. Specifically, each policy reinforces the need for projects to be compatible with the environmental features and topography present on the site as well as the surrounding context – both the changing and existing circumstances.

Therefore, by addressing conformance issues related to this one policy may result in achieving conformance with other policies.

Please refer to the General Plan Consistency Review in the project issues checklist for more information.

2. **RPO/Steep Slopes/ Development Conformance with Topography:**

The project site contains RPO steep slopes. In designing lot configurations on lands that contain steep slopes, lots shall be designed in a manner which minimizes encroachment into steep slopes.

Staff received and reviewed the RPO Waiver Request supplied with the application. Upon completion of this review and the review of the RPO Slope Maps, staff finds that additional evidence is required from the applicant. Staff will determine support for the waiver based on evidence that the required waiver findings are met. Specifically finding number one requires additional information from the applicant to demonstrate that the steep slope is considered *“an insignificant visual feature and isolated from other landforms or surrounding properties, or that surrounding properties have been developed on steep slopes such that this project would be considered infill.”*

3. **Secondary Access/ Dead-End Road Length:** Section 503.1.3 of The County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code and Section 1273.09 of the California Code of Regulations requires a second means of access when the maximum dead-end road length of 800 feet is exceeded. Therefore based on staff’s review a second means of access is required.

PDS Staff has noted that the applicant will need to request a modification to the County Consolidated Fire Code. Where modifications are proffered to meet and/or exceed the secondary access requirement, or where additional mitigation measures are to be proposed, supporting evidence of such measures shall be provided in a Fire Protection Plan. The Fire Protection Plan must demonstrate evidence as to how such mitigation

measures or modifications conform to or exceed the applicable Fire Code and shall ultimately be accepted by the San Diego County Fire Marshal.

4. **MSCP Draft North County Plan and Natural Communities Conservation Program (NCCP) Consistency:** The subject site is located within the draft North County MSCP and is located within an area designated as the Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA). The goal of the North County Plan is to conserve 75 percent of natural lands in the PAMA, which includes currently preserved public lands, future public acquisitions and future privately owned preserve lands.

The project is subject to the PAMA and the future adoption of the draft North County Plan and its requirements for projects in PAMA, including avoidance of critical populations of sensitive species and adherence to preserve design and linkage principals. If the North County Plan is not approved prior to the project moving forward, the project will require compliance with the Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance and County and Wildlife Agencies Planning Agreement.

Staff has received and reviewed the Biological Report supplied with the application. Upon completion of this review and the request for waivers of applicable guidelines, staff requires that additional evidence be supplied to demonstrate the appropriate level of mitigation. The Biological Report shall demonstrate conformance with applicable ordinances, guidelines, and policies and must be accepted by the PDS staff, and should be vetted through consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

PDS staff suggests that the applicant begin the batching process in order for PDS staff, the applicant, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services and California Department of Fish and Wildlife to begin discussing, reviewing and working toward the appropriate level of mitigation for this site and to meet the draft PAMA and NC MSCP requirements. Please note that additional information throughout this process may result in and require a decrease in density and/or a change in design.

5. **Sewer/Waste Water Treatment Facility:** The applicant is proposing a new on-site wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) as an EIR project alternative design. If this option is chosen, it would require a Major Use Permit. Another EIR project alternative is proposed to include the potential for the project to rely on a portion of the Harmony Grove Village wastewater facility.

As noted in the Major Pre Application Letter, the Harmony Grove Village EIR specifically states that the wastewater treatment facility is sized only for their project and would not include equipment or capacity to treat other areas or future growth (Page 1-25, Section 1.7.3 of the Harmony Grove Village Final EIR dated December 4, 2006). All options for sewer must be explored and reviewed by the County of San Diego through the EIR process.

6. **Significant and Unavoidable Impacts:** The project has a potential to result in significant and unavoidable impacts to environmental resources. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, implications and the reasons why the project is being proposed must be described. Staff will

continue to evaluate the proposed design and mitigation potential as the project progresses.

If any impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable, a “statement of overriding considerations” must be prepared for consideration by the Board of Supervisors. The information in the record must conclude that even though the project would result in one or more unavoidable adverse impacts, specific economic, social or other stated benefits are sufficient to warrant project approval.

### **ESTIMATE OF DISCRETIONARY PROCESSING COSTS AND SCHEDULE**

An estimate of discretionary processing time and costs that include several assumptions has been generated for your project and is included in Attachment A. Based on the project scope, it is estimated that in order to begin the second phase of the process, an initial deposit of \$75,000 is required upon next submittal. An estimated total will be provided at a later date with the scheduled scope of work.

The estimated hearing date for this project is still undetermined. Please note that the estimated cost and hearing date is based on certain assumptions detailed in the Attachment and could be more or less than the estimate provided. If the cost and schedule assumptions prove to be incorrect, the estimate will be revised. The estimate includes only the costs to get your present application(s) to hearing.

Should your application be approved, there will be additional processing costs in the future (e.g., Final Map processing costs, park fees, drainage fees, building permit fees). To obtain an estimate of future building permit and plan check fees, parks fees, and Traffic Impact Fees, see <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/bldgforms/index.html#fees>.

Please note that building permits are required to construct, enlarge, alter, repair, move, improve, remove, convert, or demolish a building or structure. Permits are also required for plumbing, electrical, and mechanical work. A permit must be obtained prior to construction and prior to occupancy. Failure to obtain a building permit is a violation of the County of San Diego Ordinances.

### **DEFENSE AND INDEMNIFICATION**

The Board of Supervisors may require a defense and indemnification agreement from the project owner and/or applicant on a case-by-case basis where significant risk to the County is identified in connection with the processing of a discretionary land use development project. The County will notify applicants of the requirement for a defense and indemnification agreement as early in the project processing as possible. Please see the Defense and Indemnification FAQ sheet (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/docs/ZC001.pdf>) for more information.

### **DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION**

Comments and information in this letter, or lack thereof, should not be construed as the Department implying an overall recommendation on your project. Planning & Development Services generally makes a final recommendation to approve or deny a project when all planning analysis and environmental documentation is complete and Planning Group input is received.

## DETERMINATION OF COMPLETENESS

### Completeness Determination – Section 65943 of the Government Code

PDS has completed its initial review of your application and has found it complete pursuant to Section 65943 of the Government Code at this time.

Planning & Development Services has completed its review of your AEIS and determined it not to be “complete” as defined by the CEQA. Additionally, it has been determined that there is substantial evidence that your project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

## RECORDATION OF PERMIT

Pursuant to the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance Section 7019, Permit Decisions for Administrative Permits, Density Bonus Permits, Site Plans, Use Permits, Variances, Reclamation Plans, or any modifications to these permits shall be recorded to provide constructive notice to all purchasers, transferees, or other successors to the interests of the owners named, of the rights and obligations created by this permit. The Recordation form, with Decision attached, will be provided immediately after the Decision determination for this project and must be signed, notarized and returned to PDS at the initiation of the Condition Satisfaction Process, or as otherwise specified. Once received, PDS staff shall have the document recorded at the County Recorder’s Office.

## SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Unless other agreements have been made with County staff, you must submit all of the following items concurrently and by the submittal date listed below in order to make adequate progress and to minimize the time and costs in the processing of your application. The submittal must be made to the PDS Zoning Counter at 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110, San Diego, CA 92123 and must include the following items:

- a. **A COPY OF THIS LETTER.** The requested information will not be accepted unless accompanied by this letter.
- b. **SUBMIT A LETTER ADDRESSING EACH ITEM IN THE PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST (Attachment A), BY REFERENCE NUMBER.** This letter must explain in detail (e.g. description of the revision and location of changes in submitted documents) how every unresolved item has been addressed in the resubmittal package.
- c. The following information and/or document(s) with the requested number of copies as specified. **The Project Number and Environmental Log Number must be clearly and visibly labeled on all submitted documents. All changes to the document(s) must be in strikeout/underline format.**
- d. **In order to prepare for Notice of Preparation, please submit the following documents:**

# NOP Submittal

(The purpose is to submit documents for Public Noticing)

Information/Document	# of Copies	Electronic Copy on USB Drive	Document Distribution <i>(For Admin Purposes Only)</i>
<b>Note: All PDF files have to be unlocked.</b>			
<b>Revised Project Description</b>	2	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), Peter Eichar (1)  <small>Business Rule: Project Description</small>
<b>Initial Study Checklist</b>	2	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), Peter Eichar (1)  <small>Business Rule: Initial Study</small>
<b>Vicinity Map</b>	2	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), Peter Eichar (1)  <small>Business Rule: Vicinity Map</small>
<b>Conceptual Plan of overall project (for public review)</b>	2	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), Peter Eichar (1)  <small>Business Rule: Map</small>

## Resubmittal Items

Information/Document	# of Copies	Electronic Copy on USB Drive	Document Distribution <i>(For Admin Purposes Only)</i>
<b>Note: All PDF files have to be unlocked.</b>			
<b>Project Issue Checklist Response Letter</b>	16		Marisa Smith (1), Peter Eichar (1), LD (1), DEH (1), Dimitri Antoniou (1), Dave Kahler (1), Emmet Aquino (1), Maggie Loy (1), Don Kraft (1), Mike Johnson (1), Dan Brogadir (1), Everett Hauser (1), Donna Beddow (1), Jim Bennett (1), Pat Healy (1), Marcus Lubich (1)  <small>Business Rule: Project Issue Checklist Response Letter</small>

<b>Information/Document</b>	<b># of Copies</b>	<b>Electronic Copy on USB Drive</b>	<b>Document Distribution</b> <i>(For Admin Purposes Only)</i>
<b>Replacement Tentative Map, Number 5560</b>  Maps must be folded to 8-1/2 x 11 maximum with the lower right hand corner exposed	11	PDF	PPCC for Distribution  Business Rule: Tentative-Map
<b>Revised Project Description</b>	2	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), Peter Eichar (1)  Business Rule: Project Description
<b>Letter describing how project complies with GP 1.4 and Guiding Principle #2</b>	1	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), Peter Eichar (1)  Business Rule: General Plan
<a href="#"><u>Revised Specific Plan</u></a>	2	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), Peter Eichar (1)  Business Rule: Specific Plan
<a href="#"><u>Revised Conceptual Landscape Plan</u></a>	2	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), Landscape Architect (1) Business Rule: Landscape Plans
<a href="#"><u>Preliminary Grading Plan (with Supporting Information )</u></a>	5	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), LD (2), DEH (1), Planning/ Sponsor Group (1)  Business Rule: Grading Plan
<b>Updated Water Availability Form (post April 1, 2015)</b>	1	PDF	Marisa Smith (1) Business Rule: Potable Water
<b>Revised RPO Steep Slopes Encroachment Map</b>	2	PDF	Marisa Smith (2)  Business Rule: RPO Encroachment Map
<a href="#"><u>Updated Land Use Consistency Analysis</u></a>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Peter Eichar (1)  Business Rule: Land Use Analysis
<b>Resource Protection Study (Waiver Request)</b>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Peter Eichar (1) Business Rule: Resource-Protection-Study
<a href="#"><u>Revised Visual Impact Analysis</u></a>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (2)  Business Rule: Visual-Impact-Report

<b>Information/Document</b>	<b># of Copies</b>	<b>Electronic Copy on USB Drive</b>	<b>Document Distribution</b> <i>(For Admin Purposes Only)</i>
<a href="#"><u>Updated Air Quality Study</u></a>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Air Quality Specialist (1)  Business Rule: Air Quality Report
<a href="#"><u>Updated GHG Study</u></a>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Dimitri Antoniou (1)  Business Rule: GHG Report
<a href="#"><u>Updated Biological Resources Study</u></a>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Maggie Loy (1)  Business Rule: Biological-Resource-Report
<a href="#"><u>Updated Cultural Resource Report</u></a>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Cultural Resources Specialist (1)  Business Rule: Cultural-Resource-Report
<a href="#"><u>Updated Cultural Resource Report Confidential Appendix</u></a>	1	PDF and Word	Cultural Resources Specialist (1)  Business Rule: Arch Survey Confidential
<a href="#"><u>Geologic Investigation/ Reconnaissance Report</u></a>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Groundwater Geologist (1)  Business Rule: Geology Report
<b>Copy of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Geocon, Inc., dated February 5, 2009</b>	2	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), Don Kraft (1)  Business Rule: Hazardous Materials Environmental Site Assessment
<a href="#"><u>Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment</u></a>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Don Kraft (1)  Business Rule: Hazardous Materials Environmental Site Assessment
<a href="#"><u>Updated Fire Protection Plan</u></a>	3	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), LD (1), James Pine (1)  Business Rule: Fire Protection Plan
<a href="#"><u>Stormwater Management Plan for Priority Development Projects</u></a>	3	PDF	Marisa Smith(1),LD (2)  Business Rule: Major -SWMP
<a href="#"><u>Updated Drainage Study</u></a>	3	PDF	Marisa Smith(1),LD (2)  Business Rule: Hydrology

Information/Document	# of Copies	Electronic Copy on USB Drive	Document Distribution <i>(For Admin Purposes Only)</i>
Updated HMP Study	3	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), LD (2)  Business Rule: Hydrology
Updated Sewer Master Plan	3	PDF	Marisa Smith (1), Daniel Brogadir (1), LD (1)  Business Rule: Sewer
<a href="#">Mineral Resources Investigation</a>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Jim Bennett (1)  Business Rule: Mineral-Resources
<a href="#">Revised Noise Analysis</a>	2	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Emmet Aquino (1)  Business Rule: Noise Report
<a href="#">Revised Traffic Impact Analysis</a>	3	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Everett Hauser (2)  Business Rule: Traffic-Impact
<a href="#">Sight Distance Study</a>	3	PDF and Word	Marisa Smith (1), Everett Hauser (2)  Business Rule: Sight Distance
Overlay map of Village GP over the Steep Slopes Map	2	PDF	Marisa Smith (2)  Business Rule: Steep Slopes Map
MOU (Mineral Resources Report)	1		Marisa Smith (1)  Business Rule: MOU
The staff turnaround goal for review of the requested information/document is 30 days.			

\*Please contact me in advance for a Special Handling Form if you wish to submit other documents not specifically listed above.

e. Deposits:

TRUST ACCOUNT ID#: <a href="#">2030691-D-02756</a>	
DEPARTMENT	DEPOSIT AMOUNT
PDS	\$75,000
<b>TOTAL DEPOSITS &amp; FEES:</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>

\* Refer to the attached "Estimate of Discretionary Processing Time and Cost" for a complete estimate of project costs through hearing /decision.

**SUBMITTAL DUE DATE: PDS recommends that all of the information requested for the Notice of Preparation (NOP) be submitted in July.**

**SUBMITTAL DUE DATE:** In order to maintain adequate progress and be consistent with the Estimate of Discretionary Processing Time and Cost (attached), PDS recommends that all of the information requested in this letter be submitted by **December 25, 2015**. If you are unable to submit the requested information by the above date, please contact your PDS Project Manager to submit a due date extension notification. Notification must be submitted in writing and be signed and dated by the project applicant. The notification must include a revised submittal date and a brief rationale for the extension.

The Department's goal is to help facilitate the efficient and timely processing of each application. If, however, a project becomes delayed due to excessive project inactivity or account deficit, Board Policy I-137 will apply; please refer to the Board Policy I-137 at <http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us/cob/docs/policy/I-137.pdf> and the FAQ sheet at <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/docs/907.pdf> for the Processing of Inactive and Deficit Projects.

If you have any questions regarding this letter or other aspects of your project, please contact me at (858) 694-2621.

Sincerely,

Marisa Smith, Project Manager  
Project Planning Division

  
- FOR -

cc: Debby Reece, PDC, 701 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101  
Camille Passon, PDC, 701 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101  
Norton Moore & Adams, attn.: Ann Moore, 525 B Street, Ste. 1500, San Diego, CA 92101

email cc:

Ken Brazell, Land Development, Team Leader, PDS  
Marcus Lubic, Department of Parks and Recreation  
David Sibbet, Planning Manager, PDS  
San Dieguito Community Planning Group  
Tim McCormick, North County Transit District

**SCOPING LETTER MATRIX**

<b>Attachment</b>	<b>Item</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Project Issue Checklist</b>
<b>B</b>	<a href="#"><u>Estimate of Discretionary Processing Time and Cost</u></a>
<b>C</b>	<b>Scope for Mineral Resources</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>California Water Code SB 610</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>MOU (Minerals)</b>

Comments from the San Dieguito Community Planning Group have not yet been received. Comments will be forwarded to you if any issues are identified.

**ATTACHMENT A**  
***PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST***

The Project Issue Checklist that follows details the specific changes and comments that are required to proceed with your project application. This checklist will be used throughout the process to track requests for information and satisfaction of project requirements.

Please note that the resubmittal of requested information must be accompanied by a separate letter addressing each item in the Project Issue Checklist. The letter must explain in detail how the comment was addressed and where (e.g. in what documents, where on the map/plot plan, etc.). County staff will use this letter to verify whether each comment in the checklist has been adequately addressed. If you have any questions about any of the comments in the checklist, please contact your project manager.

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME:</b> Harmony Grove Village South		<b>Project Number(s):</b> PDS2015-SP-15-002		
<b>Summary of Document Requests and Reviews</b>				
<i>Purpose: To track requests for technical studies, maps/plot plans, and other requested information</i>				Last Updated: 6/2/2015
<b>Plan/Study Request</b>	<b>Status of Review</b>	<b>Date Requested</b>	<b>Date of Study</b>	<b>Date Accepted</b>
Tentative Map	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/27/2015	
Preliminary Grading Plan	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/27/2015	
RPO Slope Analysis	Accepted	3/27/2015	3/27/2015	5/14/2015
RPO Open Space/Encroachment Map	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/27/2015	
Ownership Verification	Accepted	3/27/2015	3/27/2015	5/14/2015
Agriculture Technical Report	N/A - reviewed in-house	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biological Resources Report	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/1/2015	
Conceptual Landscape Plan	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/27/2015	
Cultural Resource Report	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	2/1/2015	
Fire Protection Plan (FPP)	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/1/2015	
Geotechnical Report	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	2/3/2015	
Noise Analysis	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/1/2015	
Memorandum(s) of Understanding	Accepted	3/27/2015	3/27/2015	5/14/2015
Sewer Master Study	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/1/2015	
HMP/Drainage Study	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	2/23/2015	
Traffic Impact Study	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	1/30/2015	
Stormwater Management Plan	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	2/17/2015	
Specific Plan	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	(no date) 3/27/2015	
Visual Analysis	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/1/2015	
Phase I Site Assessment	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	9/5/2014	
Air Quality	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/1/2015	
Land Use Compatability	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	3/27/2015	
GHG	Revisions Required	3/27/2015	2/1/2015	
General Plan Comformance Study	To be completed by staff	3/27/2015	ongoing	
EIR	Pending Review	3/27/2015	2/1/2015	
Potable Water Study	Requested Study	5/28/2015		
Mineral Report	Requested Study	5/28/2015		
Airport Hazards	There are no Airport Hazards	3/27/2015		5/28/2015

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
1- 1	Major Project Issue - Consistency with the General Plan	<p>The proposed General Plan Amendment is “reviewed to ensure that the change is in the public interest and would not be detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare” (Page 1-15, County’s General Plan). Additionally, a final determination of consistency with the General Plan will be made after completion of the environmental review process and prior to public hearings on the project.</p> <p>Staff received and reviewed the General Plan Consistency supplied with the application. Upon completion of this review, staff classifies the project as an expansion of an existing Village and therefore will apply General Plan policy 1.4 Village Expansion.</p> <p>Based on the review of the General Plan Consistency, Staff requests that additional information be provided to demonstrate compatibility with the community character and its changing conditions; provide evidence of compatibility with environmental constraints and demonstrate conformance with the following policies: LU-1.4, LU-6.9, LU-9.2, LU-9.8, LU-9.10, and 9.11, COS-2.1, COS-2.2, COS-3.1, COS-5.1, COS-11.1, and COS-12.1.</p>		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
1- 2	Major Project Issue - RPO/Steep Slopes/Development Conformance with Topography	<p>The project site contains RPO steep slopes. In designing lot configurations on lands that contain steep slopes, lots shall be designed in a manner which minimizes encroachment into steep slopes.</p> <p>Staff received and reviewed the RPO Waiver Request supplied with the application. Upon completion of this review and the review of the RPO Slope Maps, staff finds that additional evidence is required from the applicant. Staff will determine support for the waiver based on evidence that the required waiver findings are met. Specifically finding number one requires additional information from the applicant to demonstrate that the steep slope is considered “an insignificant visual feature and isolated from other landforms or surrounding properties, or that surrounding properties have been developed on steep slopes such that this project would be considered infill.”</p>		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
1- 3	Major Project Issue - Secondary Acces/ Dead-End Road Length	<p>Section 503.1.3 of The County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code, and Section 1273.09 of the California Code of Regulations requires a second means of access when the maximum dead-end road length of 800 feet is exceeded. Therefore based on staff's review a second means of access is required.</p> <p>PDS Staff has noted that the applicant will need to request a modification to the County Consolidated Fire Code. Where modifications are proffered to meet and/or exceed the secondary access requirement, or where additional mitigation measures are to be proposed, supporting evidence of such measures shall be provided in a Fire Protection Plan. The Fire Protection Plan must demonstrate evidence as to how such mitigation measures or modifications conform to or exceed the applicable Fire Code and shall ultimately be accepted by the San Diego County Fire Marshal.</p>		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
1- 4	Major Project Issue - MSCP Consistency	<p>Staff has received and reviewed the Biological Report supplied with the application. Upon completion of this review and the request for waivers of applicable guidelines, staff requires that additional evidence be supplied to demonstrate the appropriate level of mitigation. The Biological Report shall demonstrate conformance with applicable ordinances, guidelines, and policies and must be accepted by the PDS staff, and should be vetted through consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.</p> <p>PDS staff suggests that the applicant begin the batching process in order for PDS staff, the applicant, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services and California Department of Fish and Wildlife to begin discussing, reviewing and working toward the appropriate level of mitigation for this site and the PAMA and NC MSCP requirements. Please note that additional information throughout this process may result in and require a decrease in density and/or a change in design.</p>		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
1- 5	Major Project Issue - Sewer/Waste Water Treatment Facility	<p>The applicant is proposing a new on-site wastewater treatment facility (WWTF). An EIR project alternative, is also proposed to include the potential for the project to rely on a portion of the Harmony Grove Village wastewater facility.</p> <p>As noted in the Major Pre Application Letter, the Harmony Grove Village EIR specifically states that the wastewater treatment facility is sized only for their project and would not include equipment or capacity to treat other areas or future growth (Page 1-25, Section 1.7.3 of the Harmony Grove Village Final EIR dated December 4, 2006). All options for sewer must be explored and reviewed by the County of San Diego through the EIR process.</p>		7/6/15	
2 - 1	Specific Plan	Page 1, part B (second paragraph) states that the project is a "rural residential community." Please demonstrate in more detail how this project is an expansion of the Village General Plan.		7/6/15	
2- 2	Specific Plan	Page 1 discusses how the project is a public benefit - but more emphasis should be placed on how it is a benefit outside of HGVS. Would the development provide permanent jobs? Would the improved road/intersection benefit the residents to the south or east? Would the trails provide connection to other areas?		7/6/15	
2- 3	Specific Plan	Pages 2&3 - Please provide more information as to how the grading would appear post construction (graphics, simulations, etc).		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
2- 4	Specific Plan	Page 2, third paragraph, the housing type is said to be reflective of the agricultural character of the community. Earlier it was stated the housing reflected rural residential (see item 2-5). It was discussed that the reader could be confused with the two different characters described. It was concluded that perhaps including both rural and agricultural in the same paragraph, and how the design of the buildings meets both aspects.		7/6/15	
2- 5	Specific Plan	Page 2, third paragraph discusses how the project reflects a rural charm. The clustered design could be viewed as urban. Therefore, expand more on how the rural design fits with the community and the expansion of HGV.		7/6/15	
2- 6	Specific Plan	Page 3, first paragraph - remove the word "literally" from how the bridge enhances the connection.		7/6/15	
2- 7	Specific Plan	Page 4, third paragraph, discuss what public facilities are required.		7/6/15	
2- 8	Specific Plan	Page 5, Regional and Local Setting - add additional information regarding the surrounding cities (Escondido, San Marcos). Discuss the difference between the urban cities and rural setting of the project, and how the conditions change as one moves from the cities to unincorporated.		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
2- 9	Specific Plan	Page 12, third paragraph, states that there are isolated areas of steep slopes in the central western portion of the site, which are RPO. The fourth paragraph notes that the project would fit in with the natural landform. This is potentially contradictory to the request for a waiver of RPO steep slopes. Please further explain the grading approach and provide additional information to support the waiver, or redesign the project to avoid steep slopes.		7/6/15	
2 - 10	Specific Plan	Page 13 - the 3rd paragraph describes the importance of improving upon the existing "hubs" of activity and strengthening the connection between HGV and the proposed project. Expand upon this more. Describe in detail the proeject features that would strengthen the connection between HGV and the project.		7/6/15	
2 - 11	Specific Plan	Page 24, Policy 1.2 - Avoid encroachment of significant steep slopes. Staff requests additional information to support encroachment into what is being defined as "insignificant" steep slopes.		7/6/15	
2 - 12	Specific Plan	Page 24, Policy 3.3 - Utilize architectural styles which represent rural residential character. This conflicts page 2 which states the homes are agricultural in character. Adding a sentence earlier in the report which discusses how the project is both rural and mimics agricultural architectural types would clarify the overall design goal.		7/6/15	
2 - 13	Specific Plan	Page 24, Policy 4.1 - This goal should add "equestrian" as well.		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
2 - 14	Specific Plan	Page 27 - Development Plan, Part 1 (Residential). Within each building design, call out the assumed typical setbacks, maximum heights, and general square footage. This will be a general understanding of the intent of each section of the project. Due to the early stage of the project, it can be listed as a footnote or generalized (heights ranging from xxx to xxx feet; average square footage of xxx feet). This would help the reader to better understand the overall design.		7/6/15	
2 - 15	Specific Plan	Page 27 - The discussion of maximum flexibility does not provide certainty in achieving goals of the Specific Plan which are to provide a variety of housing types.		7/6/15	
2 - 16	Specific Plan	It is recommended that the zone boxes be removed from the Specific Plan to avoid future need to process an SPA if changes to the zoning occur. Instead, submit a separate zoning exhibit which would show the boundaries of the zones on a map and the zone box for each area. This exhibit would be incorporated within the Rezone application. The Specific Plan should discuss the details about each building type, placement within the community, design, approved colors, etc.		7/6/15	
2 - 17	Specific Plan	Page 32, Institutional - The last sentence reads "residential uses may also be considered." This should not be included, as this area is within the floodway/floodplain, and residential uses should not be allowed, for CEQA, GP, or health and safety reasons.		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
2 - 18	Specific Plan	Page 34 - B. 2. - Onsite Vehicular Circulation - The paragraph reads that there will be 3 lanes, but later describes "one through lane, one dedicated right turn lane, one dedicated left turn lane in addition to the one inbound lane." The thought is that there are 4 lanes at the intersection, which narrows to 3 lanes farther south. But this is confusing. Please explain in further detail, and provide a graphic within the Specific Plan.		7/6/15	
2 - 19	Specific Plan	Page 36 - Naturalized Open Space - Is this the same as a Limited Building Zone? In addition, is an HOA established to maintain areas that do not qualify as parks/trails?		7/6/15	
2- 20	Specific Plan	Page 37, discusses sensitive siting of homes and minimizing impacts on land, that homes are discretely placed within the landform and the project's grading has been designed to fit into the existing topography. Please further describe your intent and demonstrate through visuals.		7/6/15	
2 - 21	Specific Plan	Page 38-39 - Landscape Design - The project discusses keeping similar designs/themes to have a seamless transition between HGV and HGVS. The description goes on to discuss the landscaping. However, will there be similar lighting designs (i.e., 18'-20' height at major streets)? Signage appears to read the same as the HGV SP with understated, natural features. Color schemes (HGV states there will be a strong use of color to create variety, authenticity and individuality)? The intersection is critical for the transition to flow between the two projects, and have the person traveling along Harmony Grove Road or Country Club Lane to feel as if they are within one setting.		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
2- 22	Specific Plan	For ease of reading, it would be beneficial to change the coloring of each building type. The wastewater treatment facility is blue and commercial is pink. But as currently designed, it is difficult to determine which building footprint is which design.		7/6/15	
2- 23	Specific Plan	Figure IV.1 - Separate out the Park/Rec/Open Space for ease of reading.		7/6/15	
2- 24	Specific Plan	Figure IV.12 & 13 do not match each other. Please revise.		7/6/15	
2- 25	Specific Plan	Page 88 - The last bullet item should state "if approved by the Department of Public Works and/or PDS."		7/6/15	
3- 1	Tentative Map	As noted in the Specific Plan, remove the footnotes and superscript numbers from the zone boxes.		7/6/15	
3- 2	Tentative Map	Page 1 - complete the Condominium Statement.		7/6/15	
3- 3	Tentative Map	Show the location of all existing structures (chimney, cistern, etc), and label "to be removed", "to remain," or "to be relocated."		7/6/15	
3- 4	Tentative Map	In the Open Space box on the cover sheet, list what type of Open Space Easement (biology, steep slopes, etc).		7/6/15	
3- 5	Tentative Map	Add "TM 5560" to the header.		7/6/15	
4- 1	Specific Plan Landscape	Within Section IV.E.1 of the Specific Plan (Landscape Design), add a category to discuss fuel modification requirements as outlined in Section 5.4 of the Fire Protection Plan. Include discussion about alternative fire protection measures 9, 10, 20, and 21 within Section 5.2.1.2.		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
4- 2	Specific Plan Landscape	Provide a category within Section E.1 about irrigation. Discuss the use of potable water until such time as reclaimed water may become available. Include language about type's of irrigation techniques for various landscape types, the use of weather based controllers, backflow prevention, rain sensing override devices, drip irrigation, tree bubblers, rotary spray heads, etc. Anticipate strict mandates by the State Water Resources Control Board to enforce reductions in outdoor water use. Executive Order B-29-15, dated April 1, 2015 prohibits irrigation with potable water outside of newly constructed homes and building that is not delivered by drip or microspray systems. This may affect the Community House and proposed parks.		7/6/15	
4- 3	Specific Plan Landscape	Consider adding a category that will help direct future residential lots to adhere to these design guidelines as it relates to water conservation, drought tolerant vegetation, and minimizing the use of turf. Include discussion about drip and microspray systems outside of newly constructed houses.		7/6/15	
4- 4	Specific Plan Landscape	Figure IV.6 - add required trees per the County's Parking Design Manual and Section 6792 of the Zoning Ordinance. If adjoining sidewalk is less than 6' in width, add wheel stops to parking stalls as outlined in the Parking Design Manual.		7/6/15	
4- 5	Specific Plan Landscape	Coordinate the potential annual Fuel Modification Zone inspection discussed in alternative fire protection measure no. 21 in Section 5.2.1.2 of the Fire Protection Plan with the Construction and Maintenance Responsibilities (Section D) in the Specific Plan under V. Implementation.		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
4- 6	Specific Plan Landscape	Either create a new landscape type category within the Specific Plan, including a plant palette, or discuss in various current landscape types how screening of the site will be coordinated with the Visual Impact Report. Container sizes and species shall be identified to ensure adequate screening within a five year period with potential off-site view points. Coordinate with Attachments A-1		7/6/15	
4- 7	Conceptual Landscape Plan	Update the conceptual landscape plan to be in conformance with the above comments.		7/6/15	
4- 8	Visual Impact Report Landscape	Coordinate with the conceptual landscape plan and Specific Plan, to show how proposed plantings will reach maturity in five years in order to screen the site as depicted in Figure's 19a thru 20k. Show planting at time of installation, 5 years from installation, and 10 years from installation. (also noted in Visual Section)		7/6/15	
5- 1	Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO):	The project is currently subject to the RPO, which regulates the development of wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, sensitive biological habitats, and prehistoric and historic sites. Based on staff's review, the project site and off-site improvement areas may contain these sensitive resources. A detailed analysis of the project's conformance with the RPO is required and should be addressed in each technical study.	completed	7/6/2015	7/6/2015
5- 2	RPO	A Comprehensive Resource Management and Protection Program could also be prepared along with an amendment to the RPO to add the proposed project to Section 86.605 which would exempt the project from compliance with the RPO. For more information on the specific requirements, please see PDS Form 374: <a href="http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/zoning/formfields/PDS-374.pdf">http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/zoning/formfields/PDS-374.pdf</a> .	Informational	7/6/2015	N/A

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
5- 3	RPO Steep Slopes	Based on meeting discussions and Major Issue Determination, it was determined that the applicant would need further information for staff to analyze the Steep Slope Waiver request.		7/6/2015	
6- 1	Design Guidelines	In all applicable studies, make sure to update the plan(s) which shows the different building types with different color coding or symbol to help differentiate between the types of housing.		7/6/2015	
6- 2	Design Guidelines	In order to conform with GP 1.4 and Guiding Principle 2, expansion of HGVS, ensure that the landscaping along the northern portion of the project continues to match or compliment HGVS. The intent is to have a seamless transition between HGVS and HGVS. This would be in terms of tree type and height, streetlights, signage, etc.	Informational	7/6/2015	N/A
7- 1	Air Quality	Section 4.2.2.2 paragraph preceding table 9 states that "even if project emissions were doubled for each pollutant, they would meet or exceed the screening level thresholds." This sentence is not fully accurate. In this scenario, the project would still be below the thresholds. Please revise this sentence. Also, the statement that better connects the emissions per residential unit rather than stating "if emissions were to be doubled"? Consider the percent increase from 450 to 453 units (i.e., less than 1%) which would result in a less than 1% increase in operational emissions. This makes a more clear connection between how much emissions would be associated with the actual project size. Further, the significance conclusion should be drawn after the comparison of emissions to the actual project size, 453 units.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
7- 2	Air Quality	Table 11- it appears that the emissions calculated in this table were not calculated based on any assumption that control technology would be used. Is this the case? The paragraph below this table states that it would be assumed that control technology would be used. this sentence makes it sound like this assumption was built into the emission calculations. the emissions calculation should represent the worst-case as specific information regarding the design is unknown. if emission controls are needed, then they should be included as mitigation. if they are not needed, it should be stated that emission estimates represent uncontrolled emissions and that it is likely (not assumed) that project emissions would be lower due to the potential use of common control technologies...		7/6/2015	
8- 1	GHG	Solid Waste GHG emissions- the mitigated scenario takes a 50% reduction in GHG attributed to AB75. We are no longer allowing this much reduction, as the baseline condition already accounts for some of this reduction, this level of credit would be double counting. Please revise to allow only 25% reduction associated with AB75 from solid waste. This change would not affect the overall conclusions. Going forward, please do the same on subsequent GHG analyses.		7/6/2015	
8- 2	GHG	The construction schedule shows that the project would be complete in late 2020. Typically, we would not require GHG emissions for 2030 and 2050 to be estimated for projects that were complete before 2020. However, as this project is fairly large, it is recommended that GHG emissions be projected for 2030 and 2050.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
9- 1	Cultural Resources	County staff will conduct Native American consultation (Sacred Lands, SB-18, AB-52) and will keep you informed as to future communications with local tribes.	Informational	7/6/2015	
9- 2	Cultural Resources	Please provide all changes in strikeout-underline format and submit electronically as a Microsoft Word document. Documents have been sent. Please contact staff if the items have not been received.		7/6/2015	
9- 3	Cultural Resources	Please address comments embedded in Word document.		7/6/2015	
10- 1	Fire	• Sec. 2.1.3.5 Fire History: The fire history for the area in which the proposed project is to be located is within Appendix C. Please revise.		7/6/2015	
10- 2	Fire	• Sec. 3.0 Determination of Project Effects, page 20, second paragraph: The project applicant is requesting a modification to the County Consolidated Fire Code, not an exception. The distance from the furthest parcel in the project to the intersection of Country Club Dr. and Harmony Grove Rd. is approximately 4,300 feet. A secondary access is required. Please submit an updated FPP.		7/6/2015	
10- 3	Fire	• Sec. 5.2.1.2 Secondary/Emergency Access, first paragraph and mitigation item #1: Please provide more discussion of existing and proposed improvements to the access road from the project to Johnson Road. It appears on the Tentative Map and the Preliminary Grading Plan that a biological open space (Open Space BB) is proposed where this access road is located. If the open space is not bisected by the easement, please make this more clear on all plans. If the easement route does cross open space, then revise the Tentative Map and the Preliminary Grading Plan to remove the proposed Open Space BB.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
10- 4	Fire	• Sec. 2.2.2 Fire Sprinklers: Please revise this section to include that the Community / Recreation Building will be equipped with an automatic fire sprinkler system designed and installed per NFPA 13 standards.		7/6/2015	
10- 5	Fire	• Sec. 5.3 Ignition Resistant Construction: Chapter 7A of the CBC does not require exterior walls to be 1-hour rated. Does the project propose to have all exterior walls of structures be 1-hour rated? If so, include this as a mitigation measure under sec. 5.2.1.2.		7/6/2015	
10- 6	Fire	• Appendix H Project Facility Water Service Letter: Please provide a copy of the water service letter from the Rincon Del Diablo MWD.		7/6/2015	
11- 1	Geologic Hazards	An updated geotechnical investigation is required in areas of planned development not covered by the 2005 geotechnical investigation work by GEOCON. The scope of work is outlined within Section 8 of the Update Geotechnical Report, Harmony Grow Village South, San Diego County, California dated February 3, 2015. It is recommended to complete the updated geotechnical investigation work once development plans are finalized.		7/6/2015	
12- 1	Hazardous Materials	County Staff has reviewed the Records Review Update, dated October 9, 2014, prepared by Geocon, Inc., and submitted to the County on March 27, 2015. The report references a 2009 Phase I ESA prepared by Geocon, Inc. <b>The referenced Phase I ESA shall be submitted as part of the record.</b>		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
12- 2	Hazardous Materials	The site was subject to historic agriculture as far back as the 1940's. Historic agriculture can present hazardous conditions that are not readily recognizable during a Phase I ESA as an REC. As such, a Limited Phase II ESA for the site shall be prepared and submitted.		7/6/2015	
13- 1	Noise	On page 2, Section 1.3, the 6 foot high wall for the WTWRF and features for blasting should be identified as noise mitigation measures. Please relocate these features and noise mitigation measures.		7/6/2015	
13- 2	Noise	On page 2, Section 1.3, please identify the blasting notification for horses as a project design feature.		7/6/2015	
13- 3	Noise	On page 18, Section 4.1, #2, please include an additional note stating: "Please refer to the biological report for more details".		7/6/2015	
13- 4	Noise	On page 19, Section 4.1, #8, first bullet, please strikeout the following:  "An increase of 10 dB (CNEL) over pre-existing noise levels. resulting in a combined exterior noise level of 60- dB CNEL or greater"		7/6/2015	
13- 5	Noise	On page 25, M-Noi-3, please have this noise as a design feature and not noise mitigation measure.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
13- 6	Noise	On page 25, M-Noi-3 should be revised as a noise mitigation measure to require a Blasting Management Plan for Noise Ordinance compliance. This would include a plan that evaluates all noise generating activities associated with blasting and would include references from the Blasting Permit requirements referenced within the County's Fire Consolidation Code, beginning on page 58: <a href="http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dplu/docs/cosd-fire-code.pdf">http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dplu/docs/cosd-fire-code.pdf</a>		7/6/2015	
13- 7	Noise	On page 27, section 4.2.5, noise mitigation associated with biological resources must be relocated and addressed within the bio report. The technical and quantitative noise calculations can remain, however, biological mitigation should be referenced within the bio report. Staff encourages the biological consultant to work with the noise consultant in regards to noise information needed to assess biological noise impacts.		7/6/2015	
13- 8	Noise	On page 27 and 28, please relocated M-Noi-4 &-5 to the bio report.		7/6/2015	
13- 9	Noise	On page 31, M-Noi-7 provides noise mitigation for a single family residential lot. Based on Figure 4, it appears that these lots may be considered multi-family? Please ensure that the appropriate title of the proposed residential use is clearly identified. If this is considered a "Multi-Family" proposal, then Noise Element thresholds of 65 CNEL would apply. If this is truly proposed single family lots, then the current assessment appears acceptable.		7/6/2015	
13- 10	Noise	On page 36, Section 5.0, this section is subject to change based on comments to mitigation measures made above. Please update and revise accordingly.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
14- 1	Steep Slopes Encroachment Map	Have the steep slope encroachment map stamped and signed by a licensed engineer.		7/6/2015	
14- 2	Steep Slopes Encroachment Map	Number the lots on the map in relation to the lots listed in the table. As mentioned in the meeting, the numbers did not print on staff's copies. Only solid black circles are shown.		7/6/2015	
14- 3	Steep Slopes Encroachment Map	Add the total percentage of encroachment allowed and the total percentage of encroachment for each lot within the table. See section Section 86.604(e)(2)(aa) of the San Diego County Code, Chapter 6 (RPO). <a href="http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dplu/docs/res_prot_ord.pdf">http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dplu/docs/res_prot_ord.pdf</a>		7/6/2015	
15- 1	Steep Slopes/Density Calulation	The map is adequate. No changes necessary.		7/6/2015	7/6/2015
16- 1	Biology	Staff has reviewed the Biological Technical Report dated March 2015 prepared by Helix and submitted to the County on March 27, 2015. The report must be signed by a county approved biologist. The report must state that it has been surveyed and prepared in compliance with the County Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Content and Format Requirements. All offsite impacts must be included in the survey and impact evaluation.	N/A	7/6/2015	N/A
16- 2	Biology	Please contact staff biologist Beth Ehsan at 858-694-3103 to schedule a field visit.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 3	Biology	The following comments are subject to revisions based on the updated surveys for sensitive plants under less severe drought conditions and in consideration of the gabbro loam soil affiliations found on the site. Please add to the Potential to Occur table and conduct focused surveys at the next opportunity for <i>Ambrosia pumila</i> , <i>Bloomeria clevelandii</i> , <i>Brodiaea filifolia</i> , <i>Centromadia pungens laevis</i> , <i>Convolvus simulans</i> , <i>Chorizanthe procumbens</i> , <i>Lepidium virginicum robinsonii</i> in the grassland area; and <i>Adolphia californica</i> , <i>Baccharis vanessae</i> , <i>Ericameria palmeri</i> var. <i>palmeri</i> , <i>Horkelia truncata</i> , <i>Quercus dumosa</i> , <i>Sibaropsis hammittii</i> , and <i>Tetracoccus dioicus</i> in the shrublands.		7/6/2015	
16- 4	Biology	Since the proposed project will impact coastal sage scrub habitat, staff will evaluate the project for conformance with the County Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance and write Findings required under Section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act. The County will schedule your project to be discussed with the wildlife regulatory agencies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife) in the August 20th batching meeting. You may have up to two representatives at the meeting. One of the attendees should be the biological consultant for the project. Revisions to the report, as discussed in this letter, are not necessary prior to the meeting.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 5	Biology	The proposed location of the off-site mitigation was not provided in the Biological Resources Report. As explained in the next comment, the project's best mitigation option is to mitigate impacts on the project site because the project is entirely within the proposed future MSCP PAMA. Additional discussions should be held with PDS staff, USFWS and CDFW to determine the best and most practical mitigation methods consistent with County guidelines, Interim Review Process, HLP Ordinance, and mitigation policies of the Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Community Plan. If the off-site mitigation will be obtained in a mitigation bank, please provide the name of the bank along with evidence that such credits can be allocated for this project. If off-site mitigation will be through the purchase and preservation of other off-site land, please provide sufficient information for staff to evaluate the off-site resources and the means to		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 6	Biology	The project should be analyzed to ensure project-level impacts would not preclude implementation of the draft NC MSCP, including preservation goals for non-native grassland. NNG provides habitat for proposed covered species and increase species diversity by providing habitat and ecotonal habitat for grasshopper sparrow, horned lark, loggerhead shrike, western bluebird, pocket mouse, kangaroo rat, grasshopper mouse, black-tailed jackrabbit, and mule deer. The NNG contributes to raptor foraging in the PAMA and in proximity to the Escondido Creek (for observed species including peregrine falcon and white-tailed kite and expected species including ferruginous hawk and northern harrier).		7/6/2015	
16- 7	Biology	The preserve design should be analyzed for minimizing impacts to CA gnatcatcher. CSS impacts, including CSS transitional habitat should be mitigated on site to protect the breeding population of birds.		7/6/2015	
16- 8	Biology	Based on the current open space design, all of the smaller proposed open space areas should be considered impacted unless there are valid reasons to expect such small areas to have long term viability.		7/6/2015	
16- 9	Biology	The report states on page 11 that chaparral was mapped as mafic based on soils mapping. Our soils mapping shows that the chaparral along the northeastern boundary is also mafic, not granitic. The characterization in the Regional Context (page 7) should be changed to state that the dominant habitat is mafic chaparral. Note that this will also change mitigation ratios.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 10	Biology	On page 15, include the names of the four high potential plants and the 12 high potential animals for the site.		7/6/2015	
16- 11	Biology	Page 18 paragraph 2 should indicate that the site is raptor foraging habitat because it "occupies more than 40 acres." Please reconsider the characterization of the habitat value for peregrine, kestrel and the white tailed kite. The rationale for the site having low value for raptor foraging does not have adequate factual support. Please provide additional evidence.		7/6/2015	
16- 12	Biology	The jurisdictional wetland sampling points were not shown for the oak riparian area in the south eastern portion of the site. The characterization on page 21 may be accurate for dry seasons, but please provide sampling to verify that there are no hydric soils in the area of the oak woodlands.		7/6/2015	
16- 13	Biology	Please include the 50-foot oak root protection zone, measured outward from the outside edge of the oak canopy on the map. This oak root protection zone typically consists of other habitat and is not part of the oak woodland but impacts from ground disturbance and compaction in the oak root protection zone will result in proportional impacts to the oak woodland.		7/6/2015	
16- 14	Biology	The discussion of the Habitat connectivity should include a figure with labels of the landmarks used in the discussion (West Ridge, etc.). Please revise Figure 14 to show the water in be a different color and show preserved lands surrounding Lake Hodges in green. Please depict corridor movement with arrows.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 15	Biology	The summary that there is not a direct connection from Escondido Creek through the project site to the south due to NNG may be correct for diurnal use but as stated the eastern portion of the project site (the West Ridge area) is likely used day and night by avian and terrestrial species. Please coordinate with staff on this analysis.		7/6/2015	
16- 16	Biology	The RPO wetlands definition should be in section 1.4.7 rather than 1.5.3, and the duplicated text on page 30 (section 1.5.3) can be deleted since it is included in section 1.4.7. Section 1.5.3 should state what is allowed and not allowed within RPO wetlands, RPO buffers, and RPO sensitive habitat lands.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 17	Biology	<p>The report contains numerous references including Page 31, last paragraph of the section, which states, "...considering the County's Habitat Evaluation shows the study area as having no value to the species for nesting." This paragraph is not clear. First, if necessary to reference, please refer to it as the California Gnatcatcher Habitat Evaluation Model to distinguish it from the Habitat Evaluation Model for the NC plan (2008a) which is the primary model used by County staff and the Wildlife Agencies. The Habitat Evaluation Model shows the development area to be very high and high value for conservation, and this information should be reflected in the report.</p> <p>Secondly, while the gnatcatcher model may show no value, please note that it is intended as a preliminary evaluation tool for sites where detailed field work has not been done. The same model shows high value onsite for Stephens' kangaroo rat, but in practice it is not expected there. Once field work including a gnatcatcher survey has been conducted on a site, that field work provides more accurate and relevant data for that particular site. Regarding CA gnatcatcher, site-specific data should be used if necessary to support or refute whether the nesting pair is important. The model should not be used to determine the location is not important.</p>		7/6/2015	
16- 18	Biology	<p>Please verify that 100-foot wide LBZ easements are wide enough to include all required fuel management.</p>		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 19	Biology	Page 33, paragraph 1: 32% conservation does not achieve the NCMSCP conservation goals that the County and agencies have set. Adding open space away from the southeastern boundary (to include the gnatcatcher pair and adequate NNG) and setbacks from the oak woodland would greatly improve the preserve design for multiple species conservation.		7/6/2015	
16- 20	Biology	Page 33, last sentence of paragraph 1 indicates that access to Escondido Creek would still be provided via the eastern boundary. Please expand on this proposal. This area seems to be unprotected and existing lots have been developed with residences. Page 40 describes this area as patchy and constrained by existing developments, which would point towards requiring additional preservation on-site.		7/6/2015	
16- 22	Biology	Page 34, 2nd paragraph, remove reference to the gnatcatcher model. This is not a site specific tool. The impacts should assess the loss of the breeding potential for this area and what that means to the greater population dynamics.		7/6/2015	
16- 23	Biology	The offsite preservation mentioned as mitigation for LBV, RSH, green heron and GBH should be explicitly described, either here (top of page 35) or in the part of the report that discusses mitigation. Where will the mitigation occur? Please coordinate with PDS staff.		7/6/2015	
16- 24	Biology	Page 35, change the label from Special Status Animals Determined to Temporarily Use the Site (Non-Breeding) to Special Status Animals Observed on the Site (Non-Breeding). Do not use "temporarily foraging" or "temporary habitat" to describe animals' use of the site.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 25	Biology	The fact that a number of LBVs were foraging in the project impact area means that it may have potential to support breeding. Please update the LBV discussion with any new information obtained in subsequent years.		7/6/2015	
16- 26	Biology	Page 36, delete the heading Special Status Animals Observed Flying Over the Site. Species observed flying over the site are assumed to be foraging on-site, unless evidence is provided to the contrary. Please reassess the potential foraging value of the NNG for these species after additional surveys or after presenting additional evidence.		7/6/2015	
16- 27	Biology	Section 2.2: Habitat impacts should be mitigated on the project site or in close proximity. Also note that temporary impacts require the same mitigation as permanent impacts per the County's guidelines. Staff will coordinate with your biologist and revisit the analysis after additional input and surveys.		7/6/2015	
16- 28	Biology	Section 2.3: The wetland impacts are said to be unavoidable. Please revisit to see if there are other access routes that avoid crossing Escondido Creek. RPO requires specific findings for wetland crossings. These should be made in the RPO section of the report (section 7.2C).		7/6/2015	
16- 29	Biology	Section 2.3, page 39: The mention of a 10-foot trail connection conserving wildlife movement is unclear. Please clarify and/or show on a figure.		7/6/2015	
16- 30	Biology	Section 2.4, 2.5 and 3.0: Staff will revisit the analysis after additional input and surveys, in coordination with your biologist.		7/6/2015	
16- 31	Biology	In section 3.2B, first determine the significance of impacts prior to mitigation (on-site preservation).		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 32	Biology	Move discussion of yellow warbler from 3.2B to 3.2C since it is a Group 2 species.		7/6/2015	
16- 33	Biology	Section 3.2. G, H, and K will be revisited after additional input and surveys. Staff would like to coordinate with the biologist on these sections.		7/6/2015	
16- 34	Biology	Cumulative impact study areas should be based on biological reasons, not solely a radius. Staff would like to coordinate with the biologist on this section.		7/6/2015	
16- 35	Biology	Mitigation for Bio-1a takes credit for preservation of 1 acre of CSS on the site. The area of CSS to be isolated by the project on the eastern boundary would not count as mitigation.		7/6/2015	
16- 37	Biology	To adequately preserve the onsite mitigation area, a plan for long-term mitigation must be discussed in the report. Preparation of a Conceptual RMP is recommended. Staff will revisit the issue after additional input and surveys.		7/6/2015	
16- 38	Biology	Section 4: See previous comments. Staff will revisit the analysis after additional input and surveys. In section 4.1E, add a discussion of RPO wetland buffers. A minimum 100-foot buffer would be expected for Escondido Creek, especially with use by LBV. Staff will work with the biologist on Findings that could be made for abutments in the buffer.		7/6/2015	
16- 39	Biology	Section 5: The conditions of approval will require permitting. Coordination is recommended so that mitigation is consistent between the ACOE and the County.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 40	Biology	Section 6: Staff will revisit the analysis after additional input and surveys. Please provide an illustration of the bridge design. Please do not refer to the reach as "small" as it is a subjective adjective. See previous comment about movement to the east of the project property which is not guaranteed.		7/6/2015	
16- 41	Biology	Section 7: Staff will revisit the analysis after additional input and surveys. Further analysis and evidence would be required to conclude that grasslands do not contribute to conservation targets for the local area. The gnatcatcher model should not be used to dismiss the presence of a breeding pair of gnatcatchers. See previous comments regarding HGV		7/6/2015	
16- 42	Biology	In section 7.2B, third paragraph, state that the entire Project site has been identified as PAMA, not just portions of the site.		7/6/2015	
16- 43	Biology	In section 7.2C: Please add detail to the discussion of the bridge proposal, including graphics to show the span and the edge of the wetland habitat. Show the location of supports and other structures. Show the location of the detour during construction if needed.		7/6/2015	
16- 44	Biology	In section 7.2D, first demonstrate that the project minimizes loss of CSS, then how it mitigates.		7/6/2015	
16- 45	Biology	Appendices A and B should be modified with additional species as they are encountered.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
16- 46	Biology	Appendices C and D should be modified to include the species that require additional surveys as requested above. These are gabbro affiliates that have been researched through CALflora and have been determined to have a reasonable likelihood of occurring on the site. Stephens' kangaroo rat should also be added. Staff will revisit the list and potential to occur after additional input and surveys.		7/6/2015	
16- 47	Biology	All changes to the document must be in strikeout/underline format, and submitted in Word format as well as hard copy and pdf. All existing and proposed open space easements (biological resource & limited building zones) must be clearly shown on the plans/map and on the preliminary grading plan. The hard copy report must be signed by a County approved biologist.		7/6/2015	
16- 48	Biology	Please attach the Hermes copper survey report to the bio tech report, and include the habitat suitability map (spiny redberry in proximity to buckwheat) in the body of the bio tech report. Because 2014 was a drought year, staff recommends repeating the survey in a wetter year, unless additional evidence can be added to justify why Hermes copper would not occur on-site. Please coordinate with staff.		7/6/2015	
16- 49	Biology	Please attach the survey reports for California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, burrowing owl, and jurisdictional delineation, with data sheets.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
17- 1	Visual Resources	Include landscaping within the visual, and explain which landscaping is shown based on what is allowed. Show the landscaping at installation, and phases of 5 years up to 20 years in the future. The pictures should be from 50-100 feet away.		7/6/2015	
17- 2	Visual Resources	Page 4 describes the prior on site uses. Is it known what the land was used for previously? Ag? Grazing?		7/6/2015	
17- 3	Visual Resources	The Granary is described on page 7-8, and the tallest structure type. With the caveat for the architectural projections, this could lead to a 64-foot tall building, which is more than twice the height of most existing nearby buildings. It has been noted that the off-site views would be minimized due to distance, buffering of other buildings, and landscaping. Please provide additional information to determine if these buildings are consistent with the community character.		7/6/2015	
17- 4	Visual Resources	The footnote on page 11 discusses that the bridge specifics would be provided in the Second EIR screencheck. Staff will address how the EIR numbering/naming will be determined at a future meeting.	Informational	7/6/2015	N/A
17- 5	Visual Resources	The private roads may be changed with the updates to the FPP. Please revise as necessary in the VIA.		7/6/2015	
17- 6	Visual Resources	To be consistent with Parks Department, ensure that the trails are properly described (walkways vs. trails vs. pathway)		7/6/2015	
17- 7	Visual Resources	Ensure that the landscaping, lighting, and signage along the northern portion of the project is similar to HGV to ensure a sense of unity.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
17- 8	Visual Resources	The VIA has a figure for the noise wall, but there should be an additional figure for the retaining walls. Be sure to show the length and height of each.		7/6/2015	
17- 9	Visual Resources	Lighting is noted to be turned off at 11pm. Please note that this will be conditioned in the Specific Plan.		7/6/2015	
17- 10	Visual Resources	The street lighting is not shown as two curves within the property (between Lot 9 & 10 and at Lot 29). Has this been reviewed for safety purposes, since this is a change in direction of the road?		7/6/2015	
17- 11	Visual Resources	Wastewater specifications could change throughout the processing of the project.	ongoing	7/6/2015	
17- 12	Visual Resources	Based on the scope and design of the project, the timeline note should be removed. (Section 2.2.12)		7/6/2015	
17- 13	Visual Resources	Section 2.2.12 - note the typical tree height assumed for a Coast live oak in a 36-in box. An average in-ground height is between 8-10 feet.		7/6/2015	
17- 14	Visual Resources	This section also notes a ground breaking date assumed as the last quarter 2016. This should be removed, as it is too early to determine the exact timeline of the project.		7/6/2015	
17- 15	Visual Resources	Section 2.3 - The third paragraph lists that an MUP is required. The "P" is missing from MUP.		7/6/2015	
17- 16	Visual Resources	The picture in Figure 20c shows a large amount of vegetation blocking the view. Is this view true to the entire segment of the roadway? Is there a portion of the road which would yield a more direct view? If so, show this.		7/6/2015	
17- 17	Visual Resources	The access exemption, steep slope waiver, and steep slope encroachment section may change based on further analysis/discussion. Please edit after final determinations are made, as applicable.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
17- 18	Visual Resources	The conclusion discusses how the project would "visually merge into the village pattern provided by HGV, and feather into the existing scattered developement on both sides of the Project." Please provide additional evidence. Also, as mentioned during the May 14, 2015 meeting, this only applies to the southern portion of the project.		7/6/2015	
17- 19	Visual Resources	The last page states how the project would resepect and conform to the existing topography. Please address how the amount of grading shown on the Preliminary Grading Plan appears (e.g., photosims).		7/6/2015	
17- 20	Visual Resources	It is understood that the sound wall and retaining walls would not be visible from outside viewsheds. However, are there any plans for additional screening of these walls? Otherwise, it would be noted what type of material and colors would be used.		7/6/2015	
17- 21	Visual Resources	The applicant shall provide photosimulations with the next iteration.		7/6/2015	
18- 1	Zoning Exhibit	It is recommended to chose zoning designations which would allow some flexibilty within the area (pick a height designation which would allow the maximum height requested). Instead, the Specific Plan should discuss each building type and design, placement, and specifics about the area.		7/6/2015	
18- 2	Zoning Exhibit	Table 3 - Cottage - Remove the superscript 1 from the "H" height designator. Instead, pick a designator which will allow for the maximum allowed height.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
18- 3	Zoning Exhibit	Table 3 - Cottage - It is unclear why there is a 10 foot difference between the pathway and the alley. The height of the building would be measured from the grade of the home. In addition, the height of the building would be measured to the mid-point of the roof.		7/6/2015	
18- 4	Zoning Exhibit	Table 3 - Cottage (and this applies to all zone boxes). Instead of a footnote, any exceptions should be added to the Implementation Section (Part "D").		7/6/2015	
18- 5	Zoning Exhibit	Table 3 - Cottage - Remove the "S" Special Area Regulation. Instead, add a D1 designator. The D1 will need to be written up to describe all the requirements of the Site Plan once the Building Permits are requested. For example, the D1 could state (for example) "all Cottage homes shall not exceed xxx feet in height," or "any homes which would be visible from Harmony Grove Road shall file a visual analysis."		7/6/2015	
18- 6	Zoning Exhibit	Table 3 - Cottage - If the intent is to preclude all main buildings from exceeding 36 feet, this note can be made in the Implementation Section.		7/6/2015	
18- 7	Zoning Exhibit	Table 4 - Bungalow - Building Type "B" is for a Single Family Detached unit. The homes must be at least 10 feet apart, unless noted in the Specific Plan that they would be closer. In addition, no parts of the units can touch. It may be recommended to change the building type to "D" (Section 4819 of the Zoning Ordinance).		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
18- 8	Zoning Exhibit	Table 4 - Bungalow - Remove the superscript "1" from the height designator. Instead, uses a high conducive to the design. Remove the footnote. Add information within the Development Plan breakdown for each unit type, to describe these caveats.		7/6/2015	
18- 9	Zoning Exhibit	Table 5 - Harmony Court - See above comment 2-12. Add information within the Development Plan breakdown for each unit type, to describe these caveats.		7/6/2015	
18- 10	Zoning Exhibit	Table 6 - Farmhouse - Remove the superscript "1" from the "S" and remove the footnote. Add information within the Development Plan breakdown for each unit type, to describe these caveats.		7/6/2015	
18- 11	Zoning Exhibit	Table 7 - Grainary - It is recommended to change the height to "P" or "Q" to allow for a taller height. Or, if it is assured that a 50-foot height limit would not be exceeded by the main buildings, then add an exception to the Implementation Section to allow for "towers, gables, spires..." etc to exceed the height limit chosen in the zone box, and by how much. Please note that the chimney height may be limited in height and design by the Fire Marshal for safety purposes.		7/6/2015	
18- 12	Zoning Exhibit	Table 7 - Grainary - Remove the superscripts and footnotes. Add information within the Development Plan breakdown for each unit type, to describe these caveats.		7/6/2015	
18- 13	Zoning Exhibit	Table 8 - Limited Commercial - Change the height to a designator conducive of 36 feet. Please note as mentioned earlier, the total height is measured to the mid-point of the roof.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
18- 14	Zoning Exhibit	Table 8 - Limited Commercial - Remove the superscripts and footnotes. Add information within the Development Plan breakdown for each unit type, to describe these caveats.		7/6/2015	
18- 15	Zoning Exhibit	Table 9 - Institutional - Remove the superscripts and footnotes. Add information within the Development Plan breakdown for each unit type, to describe these caveats.		7/6/2015	
19- 0	General Plan Issues	The below General Plan Policies are considered major outstanding issues. All General Plan Policies are reviewed for the project, but emphasis is placed on resolving these issues in order to proceed with the project, as proposed.	Informational	N/A	N/A
19- 1	General Plan issues	The applications would allow for 453 residential units on 111 acres (approximately 4.08 units per acre) with clustering. When clustering, the units are proposed only within the buildable area of the site approximately 52.8 acres (yielding a density of 8.58 units per acre on the buildable area) with the remaining acreage of 58.3 acres proposed for SR-0.5. The southern portion of the site, designated SR-0.5 is proposed to be left undeveloped and preserved as open space.			

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
19- 2	General Plan Issues	<p>LU-1.4 Village Expansion. Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding</li> <li>■ Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network</li> <li>■ Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents</li> <li>■ The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area</li> </ul> <p><b>***More information is needed, see items 19-2 through 19-4.***</b></p>	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
19- 3		<p>To better address project consistency with LU-1.4, revise the Land Use analysis in terms of these suggested topics and questions: Need to address slope and how grading plans minimize cut/fill, use of natural topography. How do the structures, individually and collectively fit environmental setting – height, mass, bulk of structures in relation to layout of subdivision and topography. Discuss why/how WWTF is best suited at the proposed location, relation to Escondido creek, floodplain, etc. Values of open space in preserve; development located on previously disturbed.</p> <p>Bridge over Escondido – pedestrian amenity, public safety, restoration opportunity (wetlands, floods, fish, birds)</p> <p>Interject more specifics about road classification, improvements, design speed, ADT now vs. post project....</p>	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
19- 4	General Plan Issues	<p>(LU-1.4, cont) Demonstrate with facts and stats regarding the roads and traffic. Pull from the TIS.</p> <p>TIS says proposal is accommodate-able, but then discusses mitigation and payment of TIF. Elaborate on the mitigation and discuss any opportunities the mitigation may present the project to create a 'pedestrian oriented environment'</p> <p>Think beyond automobiles – what about the project (design, topo, street amenities) will creating an inviting layout and entice 'active outdoor living'.</p> <p>It is true that the EIR and project conditions will address the service impacts, however, a village is being proposed that may not be able to provide all services and facilities, but will provide some. Focus on what is provided at HGV and how HGVS resident's will/can/should access them and what is HGV is providing. Expansion of infrastructure is a given.</p> <p>How is the layout/design of the two villages be complimentary and provide access to services and facilities that will prevent the masses from overwhelming nearby public services and facilities.</p> <p>Beyond density (DU/AC) and use designations; how does mass, bulk, height lead to a sense of feathering development.</p>	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
19- 5	General Plan Issues	(LU-1.4, cont) What unique features regarding the connecting trails will induce their use and reflect the community's outdoor/equestrian lifestyle? Describe specifically how the proposed architectural styles are compatible (yet presumably distinct enough to separate itself from the main GHV); size, bulk and scale – how do these elements of structural design elicit a rural feel within a village, accounting for physical constraints, creating enticing connective routes via foot and bike (equestrian?). The development is surrounded by open space, but what about interior to the project? What about the structures design, building separation, colors, fenestration, articulation, materials, etc. create a feel of open space? How will the design capture vistas, and transition to the open space? How does a dense urban core contribute to a rural open space environment?	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 6	General Plan Issues	LU-6.9 - Development Conformance with Topography. Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 7	General Plan Issues	LU-9.2 Density Relationship to Environmental Setting. Assign Village land use designations in a manner consistent with community character, and environmental constraints. In general, areas that contain more steep slopes or other environmental constraints should receive lower density designations.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
19- 8	General Plan Issues	LU-9.4 Infrastructure Serving Villages and Community Cores. Prioritize infrastructure improvements and the provision of public facilities for Villages and community cores as sized for the intensity of development allowed by the Land Use Map.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 9	General Plan Issues	LU-9.7 Town Center Planning and Design. Plan and guide the development of Town Centers and transportation nodes as the major focal point and activity node for Village areas. Utilize design guidelines to be compatible with the unique character of a community. Roadways, streetscapes, building facades, landscaping, and signage within the town center should be pedestrian oriented. Wherever possible, locate public facilities, such as schools, libraries, community centers, and parks in Town Centers and Villages.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 10	General Plan Issues	LU-9.8 Village Connectivity and Compatibility with Adjoining Areas. Require new development within Villages to include road networks, pedestrian routes, and amenities that create or maintain connectivity; and site, building, and landscape design that is compatible with surrounding areas.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 11	General Plan Issues	LU-9.11 Integration of Natural Features in Villages. Require the protection and integration of natural features, such as unique topography or streambeds, into Village projects.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
19- 12	General Plan Issues	COS-2.1 "Protection, Restoration and Enhancement. Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands regional categories, as well as within Village lands where appropriate. The preservation of existing native plants and the planting of a variety of native (genetically locally adapted) or compatible non-native, non-invasive plant species enhance wildlife habitat areas."	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 13	General Plan Issues	COS-2.2 Habitat Protection Through Site Design. Require development to be sited in the least biologically sensitive areas and minimize the loss of natural habitat through site design.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 14	General Plan Issues	COS-3.1 Wetland Protection. Require development to preserve existing natural wetland areas and associated transitional riparian and upland buffers and retain opportunities for enhancement.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 15	General Plan Issues	COS-3.2 "Minimize Impacts of Development. Require development projects to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Mitigate any unavoidable losses of wetlands, including its habitat functions and values; and</li> <li>■ Protect wetlands, including vernal pools, from a variety of discharges and activities, such as dredging or adding fill material, exposure to pollutants such as nutrients, hydromodification, land and vegetation clearing, and the introduction of invasive species."</li> </ul>	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
19- 16	General Plan Issues	COS-5.1 "Impact to Floodways and Floodplains. Restrict development in floodways and floodplains in accordance with policies in the Flood Hazards section of the Safety Element. Development in floodways and floodplains has the potential to alter natural hydrologic flow and cause soil erosion and increased stormwater runoff—including loss of wetland and health issues related to surface and groundwater contamination."	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 17	General Plan Issues	COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources. Require the protection of scenic highways, corridors, regionally significant scenic vistas, and natural features, including prominent ridgelines, dominant landforms, reservoirs, and scenic landscapes. Please refer to staff comments on the Visual Resource Report.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 18	General Plan Issues	COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges. Require development to preserve the physical features by being located down and away from ridgelines so that structures are not silhouetted against the sky.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 19	General Plan Issues	S-1.1 Minimize Exposure to Hazards. Minimize the population exposed to hazards by assigning land use designations and density allowances that reflect site specific constraints and hazards.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 20	General Plan Issues	S-2.6 Effective Emergency Evacuation Programs. Develop, implement, and maintain an effective evacuation program for areas of risk in the event of a natural disaster.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Planning and CEQA Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
19- 21	General Plan Issues	S-3.2 Development in Hillsides and Canyons. Require development located near ridgelines, top of slopes, saddles, or other areas where the terrain or topography affect its susceptibility to wildfires to be located and designed to account for topography and reduce the increased risk from fires.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 22	General Plan Issues	S-3.5 Access Roads. Require development to provide additional access roads when necessary to provide for safe access of emergency equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 23	General Plan Issues	S-3.6, Fire Protection Measures. Ensure that development located within fire threat areas implement measures that reduce the risk of structural and human loss due to wildfire. Mitigation measures include, but are not limited to, the use of ignition resistant materials, multiple ingress and egress routes, and fire protection systems."	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 24	General Plan Issues	S-9.2 Development in Floodplains. Limit development in designated floodplains to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for engineered channels, channel improvements, and other flood control facilities. Require development to conform to federal flood proofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	
19- 25	General Plan Issues	S-10.6 Stormwater Hydrology. Ensure development avoids diverting drainages, increasing velocities, and altering flow rates to off-site areas to minimize adverse impacts to the area's existing hydrology. Increases in velocities and peak flow rates can result in flooding, erosion, and other problems downstream. Decreases can deprive biological resources of a needed water source.	Potentially Inconsistent. The applicant shall provide additional information how the project meets this General Plan Policy.	7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>			<b>Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>		
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Land Development Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
1 - 1	General	Comments have been provided to the extent possible with the information provided. These comments may be revised upon the submittal of additional project information, review of a project design, or input from other departments or agencies.	Comment for information only.	5/14/15	5/14/15
1 - 2	General	Comments/conditions will be provided after design changes within the next iteration.	Comment for information only.	5/14/15	5/14/15
2 - 1	PGP	Label all proposed storm drains as Private or Public. If Public, additional review will be necessary. Hydraulic sizing and analysis will be needed during the discretionary review.		7/6/15	
2- 1	PGP	Item #10 on the checklist states that the easement will be quit claimed. Please provide evidence of this.		7/6/2015	
3- 1	Stormwater Management Plan	Remove the word "Preliminary" from the cover sheet.		7/6/2015	
3- 2	Stormwater Management Plan	Insert project numbers; PDS2015-TM-5600, PDS2015-SP-15-002, PDS2015-GPA-15-002		7/6/2015	
3- 3	Stormwater Management Plan	Provide fact sheets and Maitenance Plan for the "Thirsty Duck" device.		7/6/2015	
4- 1	Drainage Study	Insert project numbers; PDS2015-TM-5600, PDS2015-SP-15-002, PDS2015-GPA-15-002		7/6/2015	
4- 2	Drainage Study	The Drainage Study will need to analyze and size detention facilities to attenuate the 100 year peak storm volumes.		7/6/2015	
4- 3	Drainage Study	Attenuation of the 100-year peak flowrates must be calculated and shown including system 200, noted in the report to have a significant increase in flowrate.		7/6/2015	
4- 4	Drainage Study	The hydraulic analysis of the private onsite storm drain system may be deferred at this time. However, if there are any facilities immediately downstream, hydraulic analysis needs to be provided to determine adequacy. Furthermore, if any of the system is proposed to be Public, the analysis needs to be completed at this time (see comment 2-1)		7/6/2015	
4- 5	Drainage Study	Additional analysis (including the HEC-RAS model for Escondido Creek) may be necessary in the future as project scope is finalized and other departments finish reviews.		7/6/2015	
5- 1	HMP	Page 7: Define "slow" infiltration rates give range for soil types (in/hr)		7/6/2015	
5- 2	HMP	Page 9: Second paragraph provide TM number		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Land Development Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
5- 3	HMP	Page 10: 5.1 Drawdown Calculations: "minimum drawdown time" should say "maximum drawdown time"		7/6/2015	
5- 4	HMP	Basin Water Quality Volume-based sizing. Why is 100-yr Detention Volume (Proposed AF) N/A for North basin? Why is Provided basin volume AF less than 1.5 for South basin? The provided basin volume appears to be smaller than the necessary detention volume. Please revise or explain.		7/6/2015	
5- 5	HMP	SDHM Project Report North page 2: Provide Site Name, Address, City		7/6/2015	
5- 6	HMP	SDHM Project Report North page 11: Water Quality Drawdown Time Results provided?		7/6/2015	
5- 7	HMP	SDHM Project Report North pages 27-35: Mitigated HSPF Message File contains multiple error/warning messages		7/6/2015	
5- 8	HMP	SDHM Project Report South page 2: Provide Site Name, Address, City		7/6/2015	
5 - 9	HMP	Insert project numbers; PDS2015-TM-5600, PDS2015-SP-15-002, PDS2015-GPA-15-002		7/6/2015	
6 - 1	Sight Distance	Please provide information that intersectional sight distance per County Public Road Standards 6.1.E can be met from all intersections with Public roads. The sight distance required will be based on the greater of two speeds (85th percentile or design speed). Additional project conditions may be added depending on the information provided.		7/6/2015	
Should you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Ernie Bartley at (858)694-3095 or email Ernest.Bartley@sdcounty.ca.gov.					
7- 1	Wastewater/ Sewer Master Plan	The Harmony Grove Water Reclamation Facility (HGWRf), including all process units, equipment, and storage basins, was sized to treat and dispose of wastewater flows generated exclusively within the Harmony Grove Village subdivision. Any sewage treatment options for Harmony Grove Village South that utilize the HGWRf, or components of the facility, would require re-rating of the HGWRf capacity.	Informational Only	7/6/15	7/6/15
7- 2	Wastewater/ Sewer Master Plan	Since utilization of the HGWRf, or components of the facility, would exceed the design basis of the HGWRf, sewage treatment options independent of the HGWRf, including the wet weather storage basin, should be identified and evaluated in the Sewer Master Plan.		7/6/2015	
7- 3	Wastewater/ Sewer Master Plan	The applicant has been working directly with DEH staff in regards to the WWTF. It is encouraged to continue to meet directly with DEH staff. For additional information regarding the WWTF and Sewer Master Plan, please contact Dan Brogadir at 858-694-2714 or Daniel.Brogadir@sdcounty.ca.gov		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Land Development Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
8- 1	TM/SP	The Harmony Grove Village South Specific Plan Map identifies trails and walkways. The TM identifies sidewalks and pathways but without typical sections. Details should be provided for the proposed trail and walkway improvements.		7/6/2015	
8- 3	TM/SP	The TM does not include all the trails that are referenced in the Specific Plan Map. Example Open Space EE trails.		7/6/2015	
8- 4	TM/SP	Additional trail connections should be proposed between every cul-de-sac and the nearest trail or walkway provision to create a system of loops and redundancy for greater circulation.		7/6/2015	
8- 5	TM/SP	The SP/TM appears to share the 10' trail easement (for pathway) on Country Club Drive. The project should clarify if HGV or HGVS is responsible for the construction of that pathway.		7/6/2015	
8- 6	TM/SP	The TM should propose a continuous network of DG pathways when connecting to trails. The system seems to jump between sidewalk and DG pathway.		7/6/2015	
8- 7	TM/SP	Any trail located within a private road will require a public access easement from a public road. The public non-motorized easement should be 1' wider on each side than the proposed tread.		7/6/2015	
8- 8	TM/SP	Any trail easement shall be kept free and clear of any above ground encroachment such as drainage features, utilities or other appurtenances.		7/6/2015	
8- 10	TM/SP	Only one trail on the plan is designated as 10' Multi-Use Trail (#4) and appears to be on the west side of Country Club. Will the applicant be improving this pathway or creating a trail easement of 10-feet (should be 12-feet if trail easement)? The east side of Country Club also shows a Pedestrian Walkway. What is the definition of a Pedestrian Walkway? Concrete sidewalk or DG pathway? To be consistent with the North County Metro Trails and Pathways Plan, this should be identified as a "pathway".		7/6/2015	
8- 11	TM/SP	One side of every main street should have a pathway designated (not a pedestrian walkway). If private streets, then a 12-foot trail easement should be granted to the County.		7/6/2015	
8- 12	TM/SP	The Trails and Walkways Plan shows a 6'-8' Rural Trail. The assumption is this refers to the Type B – Rural Trail in Community Trails Master Plan Design and Construction guidelines. The Plan (or within the Specific Plan text) should show the trail as a 20-foot public trail easement (to be granted to the County).		7/6/2015	
8- 13	TM/SP	The Off-Site Trails shown in the open space (#11, 12, 13) must be trail easements dedicated to the County. These trail easements will be required to be improved by the applicant (to the subdivision boundary) and must be included in their environmental analysis.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Land Development Comments</b>					
Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
8- 14	TM/SP	At the end of the cul-de-sacs on either side of #11, provide a connector trail easement (for residents to access the trail). Provide a trail connection from #11 to #12 and from #12 to #13 within the Natural/Transitional Landscape Zone.		7/6/2015	
8- 15	TM/SP	NOTE: If Country Club is required to be improved from the Harmony Grove Road south to the northerly boundary of the project, a pathway needs to be incorporated to the improvements.		7/6/2015	
8- 16	SP	Applicant's terminology, when discussing trails and pathways, should be consistent with the County's definitions:		7/6/2015	
8- 17	SP	<b>Trails</b> are non-motorized, multi-use (pedestrian, equestrian and mountain biking), soft-surfaced (native soil or decomposed granite) recreation and transportation facilities. When placed on private property, a public trail easement must be granted to the County.		7/6/2015	
8- 18	SP	<b>Pathways</b> are non-motorized transportation and recreational elements placed within the public road right of way and do not require additional easements. However, additional road right of way may required to accommodate all facilities. Pathways are also multi-use and soft-surfaced; typically constructed of decomposed granite (DG) or native soil.		7/6/2015	
<b>19</b>					
9- 1	Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA)	The TIA should note that this is a GPA project, and if approved, the project will be conditioned to provide a fair-share contribution towards the cost of updating the County's TIF program.	Informational Only	7/6/15	N/A
9- 2	TIA	A copy of the TIA should be provided to the City of Escondido for their review and comments.		7/6/2015	
9- 3	TIA	The TIA (Pg.29) should elaborate on how the project's trip distribution assumptions were derived specifically the percentage of project traffic that would distribute onto Country Club Drive and Harmony Grove Road.		7/6/2015	
9- 4	TIA	The TIA should explain how the future Citracado Parkway extension was accounted for in the project's trip distribution assumptions.		7/6/2015	
9- 5	TIA	The TIA should provide a post-mitigation LOS summary table to show that the proposed mitigation measures would fully mitigate the project's direct impacts.		7/6/2015	
9- 6	TIA	The TIA should provide conceptual striping plans for the project's proposed road improvements.		7/6/2015	
9- 7	TIA	The traffic consultant should confirm that the improvements identified in the TIA (Pg.58) for the south leg of the Country Club Drive/Harmony Grove Road intersection are consistent with the Tentative Map		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) Land Development Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
9- 8	TIA	The traffic consultant/engineer should identify if any of the project's proposed road improvements will require a design exception request. There is no guarantee that desing exception will be recommended for approval by staff.		7/6/2015	
9- 9	TIA	The TIA (Pg. 18) should note that the County's Significance criteria were updated on August 24, 2011.		7/6/2015	
9- 10	TIA	The TIA should edit section 11.5 to match the description included in the recently completed Valiano TIA.		7/6/2015	
9- 11	TIA	The TIA should identify improvements to Country Club Drive in the City of Escondido that increase the assumed capacity of the roadway.		7/6/2015	
9- 12	TIA	The TIA should describe the methodology of the fair share payment to Escondido for the Citricado Parkway extension, as it will need to be included in the project conditions.		7/6/2015	
9- 13	TIA	TRA-1 includes proposed widening where there appears to be full curb and sidewalk, the TIA should confirm the proposed improvements and the nexus between intersection improvements and segment impacts to mitigate TRA-5.		7/6/2015	
10- 1	Bridge Design	As noted in the Scoping Letter, the design of the bridge and logistics of coordination between the applicant and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) must be demonstrated. If the project is approved, building and grading permits cannot be granted until this condition is met. Please closely coordinate with DPW and CIP staff as the completion of this CIP project is scheduled for 2021.		7/6/2015	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

**PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South** **Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002**

<b>DEH (Department of Environmental Health) Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
1 - 1	DEH General Comments	DEH has reviewed the proposed Specific Plan/Subdivision that was received March 27, 2015. The project proposes 453 dwelling units within various configurations of single family and multi-unit development. The entire project is to be served by a public sewer system (San Diego County Sanitation District) that will comply with all local, state, and federal standards. The proposal for sewer has three options: utilize existing facilities, expand/improve existing facilities as needed, or develop a new wastewater treatment system. Potable water is to be provided by the Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District. Recycled water use is proposed throughout the development and must comply with all Title 17 and Title 22 standards.	comment only	7/6/15	N/A
2- 2	Sewer/Septic/Waste Disposal	The proposed grading east of Lots 21 and 22 create a 5:1 cut setback that appears to impact the existing leach field and reserve areas for APN: 238-011-20 (2820 Cordrey Lane). There is no indication that this property has been connected to sanitary sewer. The applicant must amend the grading to eliminate the impact, provide documentation of the property's connection or <u>proposed connection to sewer, or propose an alternate solution.</u>		7/6/15	
2- 1	Wells	Potable water is to be provided by the Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District. Recycled water use is proposed throughout the development and must comply with all Title 17 and Title 22 standards.	Condition	7/6/15	N/A
3 - 2	Water	Rincon is subject to a 35% reduction pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order B-29-15. The project has a Form 399W on file, however, it was dated prior to the Governor's order from April 1, 2015. The applicant will need to file an updated 399W form at a later date to ensure availability.	ongoing	7/6/15	N/A

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

**PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South** **Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002**

<b>DPR (Department of Parks and Recreation) Comments</b>					
Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1 - 1	General	The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has reviewed the project submittal received 3/27/15, and is providing the following comments as guidance in order to assist the project in meeting the many codes, regulations, and initiatives that apply such as the California Environmental Quality Act, the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance, DPR's Active Living Design Guidelines, the County General Plan, the County's Strategic Initiatives, and the County's Live Well San Diego Initiative. Comments may be revised based on plan changes or upon further review and input from <del>communities, other departments or agencies</del> .	Infomational	7/6/15	N/A
2- 1	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Based on requirements set forth in the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) for the Escondido LPPA, the project is required to provide 3.9 acres of public park land.  LPPA: Escondido Dwelling Unit (DU) Proposed: 453 Square Feet (s.f.) / DU Required by PLDO: 373.47 s.f. Total PLDO Acreage Required: 3.9 acres PLDO Fee Per DU: \$4,353	Infomational	7/6/15	N/A
2- 2	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Only private parks are proposed. Section 810.108 of the PLDO states that "where private areas for park and recreational purposes is provided in a development and such area is for active recreational uses and is to be privately owned and maintained by the future owner(s) of the development, such area, upon recommendation by the Parks and Recreation Department may be credited against up to 50% of the requirement of land dedication or fees payment, if the Director, determines that is in the public interest to do so and meets standards outlined in the PLDO. Additionally, Section 810.105(e) states that proposals to dedicate land in lieu of fees or to a combination of both shall be subject to review and approval by the Director of Parks and Recreation. The Director recommends that the remaining 50% of PLDO credit come from public park acreage. Some of the proposed private parks may be converted to public parks to satisfy this requirement.		7/6/15	
2- 3	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	In order for private parks to qualify for PLDO credit they must meet the standards outlined in PLDO Sections 810.808 (a through e) and the park amenities are encouraged meet the definition of "active recreational uses" defined in PLDO Section 810.102(a).	Infomational	7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

**PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South** **Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002**

<b>DPR (Department of Parks and Recreation) Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
2- 4	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	A Park Concept Plan is required for all developments containing more than 50 parcels. A Site Plan and/or Preliminary Grading Plan may serve as the Park Concept Plan for this project. Park concept plans are needed for DPR to determine PLDO acreage credit for this project.		7/6/15	
2- 5	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Outline/delineate "active recreational uses" areas as defined in PLDO Sec. 810.102 and provide acreage of the outlined areas. Clearly label the amenities, support facilities, and materials, and landscaped areas. Please note that parking lots, drainage and other easements, detention basins, and slopes in excess of 10% are not considered "active recreational uses" per PLDO and cannot be allocated toward PLDO credit calculations.		7/6/15	
2- 6	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Show proposed grading, spot elevations, drainage directions, slopes/contours, swales, catch basin, drains, drain pipes, all easements (existing and proposed), manholes, etc...		7/6/15	
2- 7	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Identify all existing and proposed easements. Park and recreational facilities encumbered by easements would not count toward meeting PLDO acreage requirements.		7/6/15	
3- 1	General Plan	Staff recommends the use of reclaimed/recycled water for all proposed parks (public or private) to reduce water consumption. The study currently only lists reclaimed water on common landscaped areas. Please identify what water conservation measures will be implemented in the parks to ensure compliance with General Plan Policies COS-4.1, COS-4.2, COS-4.5, COS-14.3, COS-19.1, and COS-19.2. Examples include, but are not limited to, use of synthetic turf fields, drought tolerant landscaping, or recycled water.		7/6/15	
4- 1	Specific Plan	Page 35 - Pedestrian Routes: Please identify the cumulative length of all proposed trails and pathways.		7/6/15	
4- 2	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Private Parks: Please identify the total acreage of the proposed private parks.		7/6/15	
4- 3	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Private Parks: Please incorporate a discussion regarding PLDO requirements and how the project will meet PLDO requirements. See comment 2-2.		7/6/15	
4- 4	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Private Parks: Please revise sixth sentence of section to read "These neighborhood facilities will be operated <u>and</u> maintained by a homeowner's association."		7/6/15	
4- 5	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Private Parks: The size of the parks on the Tentative Map differ from the size ranges stated in Specific Plan. Please correct inconsistency.		7/6/15	
4- 6	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Multi-Use Trails: Please identify who will be responsible for maintaining the multi-use trail system.		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

**PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South** **Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002**

**DPR (Department of Parks and Recreation) Comments**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4- 7	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Multi-Use Trails: Please identify identify the total length of the multi-use trails proposed.		7/6/15	
4- 8	Specific Plan	Page 57 - Parks and Recreation: Please clarify whether the 3.2 acres mentioned is gross or net.		7/6/15	
4- 9	Specific Plan	Page 57 - Parks and Recreation: Please delete "which may qualify for partial credit" from the first sentence of paragraph.		7/6/15	
4- 10	Specific Plan	Page 57- Parks and Recreation: Please add a statement stating that the net private park acreage may only contribute to 50% of the required PLDO acreage and that the remaining 50% will come from dedication of a public park.		7/6/15	
4- 11	Specific Plan	Figure IV.1: Please distinguish between park and recreational areas from open space areas. These land use types should be easily distinguishable to future readers.		7/6/15	
4- 12	Specific Plan	Table 11: Please remove "public" from "dedication of public parkland" since no public parks are proposed.		7/6/15	
4- 13	Specific Plan	Table 11: Please add Biological Open Space and the intended financing mechanism for maintaining open space areas.		7/6/15	
4- 14	Specific Plan	Page 87-88 - Construction and Maintenance Responsibilities: Section states that the "public" parks would be maintained by the County. However, there are no public parks proposed. Please remove reference to "public" parks and add statement that the private parks would be maintained by the Homeowner's Association.		7/6/15	
4- 15	Specific Plan	Page 87-88 - Construction and Maintenance Responsibilities: Section states that "natural open space" would be maintained by the County. However, these areas are identified as Homeowner's Association maintained areas in the Tentative Map. Please replace "natural" with "biological" open space.		7/6/15	
5- 1	Tentative Map	Sheet 1: Please delete "and/or payment of fee" in the Park Land Dedication Statement or provide additional justification. The Department of Parks and Recreation does not recommend the use of in-lieu fees to meet PLDO requirements.		7/6/15	
5- 2	Tentative Map	Sheet 1 : Please identify and label the two HOA areas located at intersection of Private Drives A, J, and T on the Key Map. Also, please make sure these areas are included in the HOA Lot Area Table.		7/6/15	
5- 3	Tentative Map	Sheet 1: In the HOA Lot Area Table, please identify those lots that are intended to rec areas or private parks.		7/6/15	
5- 4	Tentative Map	Sheet 4 : Please identify and label the two HOA areas located at intersection of Private Drives A, J, and T.		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>DPR (Department of Parks and Recreation) Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
5- 5	Tentative Map	Please indicated on the Tentative Map that use of the private parks (and any proposed public parks) would be restricted for parks and recreation purposes by an open space or recreational easement or other instrument.		7/6/15	
6- 1	Preliminary Grading Plan	Sheet 1 : Please identify and label the two HOA areas located at intersection of Private Drives A, J, and T on the Key Map. Also, please make sure these areas are included in the HOA Lot Area Table.		7/6/15	
6- 2	Preliminary Grading Plan	Sheet 4 : Please identify and label the two HOA areas located at intersection of Private Drives A, J, and T.		7/6/15	
7- 1	Project Conditions	<u>On-Going Funding Mechanism:</u> The project will be conditioned to establish a funding mechanism, prior to approval of the Final Map, to cover 100% of the on-going costs related to operations and maintenance (O&M) of the public and private parks. Depending on the proposed mechanism, the developer may be required to provide "interim funding" for the period between when the County assumes maintenance responsibility and when the funding mechanism generates adequate revenue and cash flow to support the park O&M. Project conditions will reflect the requirement for the developer to establish a funding mechanism prior to Final Map approval.	Condition	7/6/15	N/A
7- 2	Project Conditions	<u>Park Site Plans:</u> Park Site Plans, which include detailed construction plans and specifications, will be required prior to construction (typically in conjunction with grading and landscape plans) and/or prior to Final Map approval. Park layout and design must reflect DPR development standards. Final design and amenities will be subject to review and approval by the Director of DPR.	Condition	7/6/15	N/A
7- 3	Project Conditions	<u>Land Dedication for Public Parks and Private Park Easements:</u> Public park sites will be dedicated to the County prior to Final Map Approval (or after the construction of the facilities if a secured agreement to improve the park has been executed). Easements or other forms of use restriction for private park sites will be required prior to Final Map Approval.	Condition	7/6/15	N/A

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

**PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South** **Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002**

**DPR (Department of Parks and Recreation) Comments**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1 - 1	General	The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has reviewed the project submittal received 3/27/15, and is providing the following comments as guidance in order to assist the project in meeting the many codes, regulations, and initiatives that apply such as the California Environmental Quality Act, the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance, DPR's Active Living Design Guidelines, the County General Plan, the County's Strategic Initiatives, and the County's Live Well San Diego Initiative. Comments may be revised based on plan changes or upon further review and input from <del>communities, other departments or agencies</del> .	Infomational	7/6/15	N/A
2- 1	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Based on requirements set forth in the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) for the Escondido LPPA, the project is required to provide 3.9 acres of public park land.  LPPA: Escondido Dwelling Unit (DU) Proposed: 453 Square Feet (s.f.) / DU Required by PLDO: 373.47 s.f. Total PLDO Acreage Required: 3.9 acres PLDO Fee Per DU: \$4,353	Infomational	7/6/15	N/A
2- 2	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Only private parks are proposed. Section 810.108 of the PLDO states that "where private areas for park and recreational purposes is provided in a development and such area is for active recreational uses and is to be privately owned and maintained by the future owner(s) of the development, such area, upon recommendation by the Parks and Recreation Department may be credited against up to 50% of the requirement of land dedication or fees payment, if the Director, determines that is in the public interest to do so and meets standards outlined in the PLDO. Additionally, Section 810.105(e) states that proposals to dedicate land in lieu of fees or to a combination of both shall be subject to review and approval by the Director of Parks and Recreation. The Director recommends that the remaining 50% of PLDO credit come from public park acreage. Some of the proposed private parks may be converted to public parks to satisfy this requirement.		7/6/15	
2- 3	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	In order for private parks to qualify for PLDO credit they must meet the standards outlined in PLDO Sections 810.808 (a through e) and the park amenities are encouraged meet the definition of "active recreational uses" defined in PLDO Section 810.102(a).	Infomational	7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

**PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South** **Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002**

<b>DPR (Department of Parks and Recreation) Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
2- 4	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	A Park Concept Plan is required for all developments containing more than 50 parcels. A Site Plan and/or Preliminary Grading Plan may serve as the Park Concept Plan for this project. Park concept plans are needed for DPR to determine PLDO acreage credit for this project.		7/6/15	
2- 5	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Outline/delineate "active recreational uses" areas as defined in PLDO Sec. 810.102 and provide acreage of the outlined areas. Clearly label the amenities, support facilities, and materials, and landscaped areas. Please note that parking lots, drainage and other easements, detention basins, and slopes in excess of 10% are not considered "active recreational uses" per PLDO and cannot be allocated toward PLDO credit calculations.		7/6/15	
2- 6	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Show proposed grading, spot elevations, drainage directions, slopes/contours, swales, catch basin, drains, drain pipes, all easements (existing and proposed), manholes, etc...		7/6/15	
2- 7	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Identify all existing and proposed easements. Park and recreational facilities encumbered by easements would not count toward meeting PLDO acreage requirements.		7/6/15	
3- 1	General Plan	Staff recommends the use of reclaimed/recycled water for all proposed parks (public or private) to reduce water consumption. The study currently only lists reclaimed water on common landscaped areas. Please identify what water conservation measures will be implemented in the parks to ensure compliance with General Plan Policies COS-4.1, COS-4.2, COS-4.5, COS-14.3, COS-19.1, and COS-19.2. Examples include, but are not limited to, use of synthetic turf fields, drought tolerant landscaping, or recycled water.		7/6/15	
4- 1	Specific Plan	Page 35 - Pedestrian Routes: Please identify the cumulative length of all proposed trails and pathways.		7/6/15	
4- 2	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Private Parks: Please identify the total acreage of the proposed private parks.		7/6/15	
4- 3	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Private Parks: Please incorporate a discussion regarding PLDO requirements and how the project will meet PLDO requirements. See comment 2-2.		7/6/15	
4- 4	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Private Parks: Please revise sixth sentence of section to read "These neighborhood facilities will be operated <u>and</u> maintained by a homeowner's association."		7/6/15	
4- 5	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Private Parks: The size of the parks on the Tentative Map differ from the size ranges stated in Specific Plan. Please correct inconsistency.		7/6/15	
4- 6	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Multi-Use Trails: Please identify who will be responsible for maintaining the multi-use trail system.		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

**PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South** **Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002**

<b>DPR (Department of Parks and Recreation) Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
4- 7	Specific Plan	Page 37 - Multi-Use Trails: Please identify identify the total length of the multi-use trails proposed.		7/6/15	
4- 8	Specific Plan	Page 57 - Parks and Recreation: Please clarify whether the 3.2 acres mentioned is gross or net.		7/6/15	
4- 9	Specific Plan	Page 57 - Parks and Recreation: Please delete "which may qualify for partial credit" from the first sentence of paragraph.		7/6/15	
4- 10	Specific Plan	Page 57- Parks and Recreation: Please add a statement stating that the net private park acreage may only contribute to 50% of the required PLDO acreage and that the remaining 50% will come from dedication of a public park.		7/6/15	
4- 11	Specific Plan	Figure IV.1: Please distinguish between park and recreational areas from open space areas. These land use types should be easily distinguishable to future readers.		7/6/15	
4- 12	Specific Plan	Table 11: Please remove "public" from "dedication of public parkland" since no public parks are proposed.		7/6/15	
4- 13	Specific Plan	Table 11: Please add Biological Open Space and the intended financing mechanism for maintaining open space areas.		7/6/15	
4- 14	Specific Plan	Page 87-88 - Construction and Maintenance Responsibilities: Section states that the "public" parks would be maintained by the County. However, there are no public parks proposed. Please remove reference to "public" parks and add statement that the private parks would be maintained by the Homeowner's Association.		7/6/15	
4- 15	Specific Plan	Page 87-88 - Construction and Maintenance Responsibilities: Section states that "natural open space" would be maintained by the County. However, these areas are identified as Homeowner's Association maintained areas in the Tentative Map. Please replace "natural" with "biological" open space.		7/6/15	
5- 1	Tentative Map	Sheet 1: Please delete "and/or payment of fee" in the Park Land Dedication Statement or provide additional justification. The Department of Parks and Recreation does not recommend the use of in-lieu fees to meet PLDO requirements.		7/6/15	
5- 2	Tentative Map	Sheet 1 : Please identify and label the two HOA areas located at intersection of Private Drives A, J, and T on the Key Map. Also, please make sure these areas are included in the HOA Lot Area Table.		7/6/15	
5- 3	Tentative Map	Sheet 1: In the HOA Lot Area Table, please identify those lots that are intended to rec areas or private parks.		7/6/15	
5- 4	Tentative Map	Sheet 4 : Please identify and label the two HOA areas located at intersection of Private Drives A, J, and T.		7/6/15	

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>DPR (Department of Parks and Recreation) Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
5- 5	Tentative Map	Please indicated on the Tentative Map that use of the private parks (and any proposed public parks) would be restricted for parks and recreation purposes by an open space or recreational easement or other instrument.		7/6/15	
6- 1	Preliminary Grading Plan	Sheet 1 : Please identify and label the two HOA areas located at intersection of Private Drives A, J, and T on the Key Map. Also, please make sure these areas are included in the HOA Lot Area Table.		7/6/15	
6- 2	Preliminary Grading Plan	Sheet 4 : Please identify and label the two HOA areas located at intersection of Private Drives A, J, and T.		7/6/15	
7- 1	Project Conditions	<u>On-Going Funding Mechanism:</u> The project will be conditioned to establish a funding mechanism, prior to approval of the Final Map, to cover 100% of the on-going costs related to operations and maintenance (O&M) of the public and private parks. Depending on the proposed mechanism, the developer may be required to provide "interim funding" for the period between when the County assumes maintenance responsibility and when the funding mechanism generates adequate revenue and cash flow to support the park O&M. Project conditions will reflect the requirement for the developer to establish a funding mechanism prior to Final Map approval.	Condition	7/6/15	N/A
7- 2	Project Conditions	<u>Park Site Plans:</u> Park Site Plans, which include detailed construction plans and specifications, will be required prior to construction (typically in conjunction with grading and landscape plans) and/or prior to Final Map approval. Park layout and design must reflect DPR development standards. Final design and amenities will be subject to review and approval by the Director of DPR.	Condition	7/6/15	N/A
7- 3	Project Conditions	<u>Land Dedication for Public Parks and Private Park Easements:</u> Public park sites will be dedicated to the County prior to Final Map Approval (or after the construction of the facilities if a secured agreement to improve the park has been executed). Easements or other forms of use restriction for private park sites will be required prior to Final Map Approval.	Condition	7/6/15	N/A

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>			<b>Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>		
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) EIR Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
9- 1	Agriculture	Staff has reviewed Section 3.2.1 of the Harmony Grove Village South Project First Screencheck Draft Environmental Impact Reprot submitted to the County on 3/27/15. The report requires revisions as detailed in the following comments.	Informational	4/29/2015	
9- 2	Agriculture	PDS has review the proposed project and determined that the site is considered an agricultural resource pursuant to the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements. This site is considered an agricultural resource since it has previously been used for an agricultural operation and a portion of the property is classified as Farmland of Local Importance as defined in the Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.	Informational	4/29/2015	
9- 3	Agriculture	Based on the information provided, the closest water line is an existing 12 inch potable water line in Harmony Grove Road (approximately 500 feet north of the site) and an existing 8-inch potable water line located in Country Club Drive (approximately 800 feet west of the project site near the Harmony Grove Spiritualist Association). In addition, the project site does not contain a well. Therefore, the project site will receive a low water rating and not be considered an important agricultural resource. This information can be documented in Section 3.2.1 (along with the other requested information in the Project Issue Checklist) and a LARA Model will not be required.		4/29/2015	6/1/2015

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

**PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South** **Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002**

**Planning & Development Services (PDS) EIR Comments**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
9- 4	Agriculture	Please remove all references to the previously completed LESA Model and update this section based upon the corrections above. Note: The guidelines state that in the past, the LESA model has been applied to various agricultural properties throughout the County of San Diego to assess agricultural importance in association with proposed discretionary land use permits. After several years of practical experience with application of the LESA model in San Diego County, the inadequacy of the model in capturing the unique and varied character of San Diego agriculture has become apparent. An alternative approach, referred to as the Local Agricultural Resource Assessment (LARA) model has been developed to assess the relative value of agricultural resources in San Diego County.		4/29/2015	
9- 5	Agriculture	The last two paragraphs of Section 3.2.1 cover indirect impacts. Please expand upon this section and specify if the future equestrian center is the only agricultural use with potential for indirect impacts. In addition, please expand upon how it was determined that 60 feet would be an adequate buffer from the future equestrian facility.		4/29/2015	
2 - 2	Air Quality				
2 - 3	Air Quality				
2 - 4	Air Quality				
3 - 1	Biological Resources				
3 - 2	Biological Resources				
3 - 3	Biological Resources				
3 - 4	Biological Resources				
3 - 5	Biological Resources				
3 - 6	Biological Resources				
3 - 7	Biological Resources				

**ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

<b>PROJECT NAME: Harmony Grove Village South</b>		<b>Project Number(s): PDS2015-SP-15-002</b>			
<b>Planning &amp; Development Services (PDS) EIR Comments</b>					
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Issue, Revision or Information Required</b>	<b>Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Date Resolved</b>
	Cultural Resources				
6	Cultural Resources - EIR	Please provide all changes in strikeout-underline format and submit electronically as a Microsoft Word document.		4/22/2015	
7	Cultural Resources - EIR	Please address comments embedded in Word document.		4/22/2015	

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**ESTIMATE OF DISCRETIONARY PROCESSING TIME AND COSTS**

The attached estimate of discretionary processing time and costs is an estimate of the deposits required to process the application through hearing/decision. Several assumptions were required to supply the cost estimate and schedule at this time in the process. If the assumptions listed on the bottom of the attached estimate prove to be incorrect, your cost estimate will be adjusted. Deposits will be requested in installments as funds are needed to continue processing. Be aware that Section 362 of Article XX of the San Diego County Administrative Code, Schedule B, 5 and 6 states:

*The Director of Planning & Development Services may discontinue permit processing and/or recommend denial of the said project based on non-payment of the estimated deposit and all actual processing costs that may not have been included in the estimate.*

Payment of Fish and Wildlife Fees

The initial review of your project indicates that there will be an effect on native biological resources. Therefore, State law requires the payment of a fee to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for their review of the project environmental document (Fish and Wildlife Code §711.4). If this fee is needed, it will be requested and collected at a later time during the process. Payment of the fee is required regardless of whether or not we consider the effect on native biological resources to be significant or clearly mitigated. The Project Manager will remind you to pay this fee immediately prior to public review of the project environmental document.

## ESTIMATE OF DISCRETIONARY PROCESSING TIME AND COSTS

Project Name: Harmony Grove Village South  
 Project Number: PDS2015-SP-15-002  
 Staff Completing Schedule: Marisa Smith  
 Decision-Making Body: Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors  
 Date Schedule Produced/Revised: 7/17/2015

TASK/ACTIVITY	Estimated Duration (Days)	Estimated Completion Date	Actual Completion Date
<b>APPLICATION SUBMITTAL</b>			<b>3/27/2015</b>
<b>DETERMINATION THAT AN EIR IS REQUIRED</b>			<b>4/8/2015</b>
PDS reviews project application "completeness", completes planning and environmental scoping	30	5/8/2015	7/6/2015
PDS completes initial scope of EIR	14	7/13/2015	7/16/2015
<b>Applicant submits documents for Public Review of Notice of Preparation (NOP)</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7/23/2015</b>	
<i>PDS completes advertises and distributes NOP</i>	10	8/3/2015	
<i>Public review of NOP</i>	30	9/2/2015	
<i>PDS receives and distributes public comments on NOP to Applicant (180 period for resubmittal of DEIR begins here)</i>	3	9/7/2015	
PDS meets with applicant to discuss EIR scope, cost estimate and schedule	10	9/17/2015	
<b>Applicant submits 1st Draft EIR and Planning Documentation</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>1/5/2016</b>	
PDS reviews 1st Draft EIR, holds county counsel briefing, attends DRT	60	3/7/2016	
<i>Meeting with applicant</i>	7	3/14/2016	
<b>Applicant submits 2nd Draft EIR and Planning Documentation*</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>4/21/2016</b>	
PDS reviews 2nd Draft EIR, holds county counsel briefing*	45	6/6/2016	
<i>Meeting with applicant</i>	7	6/13/2016	
<b>Applicant submits 3rd Draft EIR and Planning Documentation*</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>7/6/2016</b>	
PDS reviews 3rd Draft EIR, holds county counsel briefing*	30	8/5/2016	
<i>Meeting with applicant</i>	7	8/12/2016	
<b>Applicant produces copies of documents, submits DEIR and copies of documents</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8/15/2016</b>	
PDS completes distribution paperwork, advertises and distributes Draft EIR	14	8/29/2016	
Public Review of Draft EIR	45	10/13/2016	
PDS transmits Public Comments to Applicant	3	10/17/2016	
PDS holds meeting with applicant to discuss approach to address public comments, discuss project schedule	10	10/24/2016	
<b>Applicant submits 1st Draft Responses to Public Comment (RTC) and EIR Errata</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>11/23/2016</b>	
PDS reviews 1st Draft Responses to Public Comments and EIR Errata	25	12/19/2016	
<b>Applicant submits 2nd Draft RTC and EIR Errata*</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1/9/2017</b>	
PDS reviews 2nd draft RTC & EIR Errata, meets with applicant / consultant to finalize responses for I-119 review*	14	1/23/2017	
PDS attends DRT prior to initiating I-119 review	5	1/30/2017	
<b>Applicant submits Draft RTC &amp; EIR Errata for I-119 review &amp; 1st draft EIR Findings for staff review</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2/6/2017</b>	
<i>Board Policy I-119 Review of Responses to Comments and DEIR</i>	40	3/13/2017	
PDS reviews I-119 comments, meets with Counsel, transmit comments to applicant, set meeting with applicant	7	3/20/2017	
<b>Applicant submits revised RTC, EIR Errata, and EIR Findings, meets with PDS to review changes</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4/3/2017</b>	
PDS reviews RTC, EIR Errata & Findings and sends to Counsel for review OR meet with Counsel if 2nd I-119 review not necessary	14	4/17/2017	
Second Board Policy I-119 Review of RTC, EIR Errata and Findings*	30	5/3/2017	
PDS meets with County Counsel to finalize RTC, EIR Errata, and Findings. Holds meeting with applicant / consultant*	10	5/15/2017	
<b>Applicant makes final revisions, produces copies of FEIR, CEQA Findings and RTCs and pays Fish and Wildlife Fees</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5/22/2017</b>	
<i>Department Finalizes Recommendation</i>	TBD		
<i>PDS finalizes project resolution/decision, completes findings, conditions, draft staff report and begins preparation of Board Letter</i>	TBD		
PDS management and County Counsel review staff report, obtain concurrences from other Departments	TBD		
PDS finalizes legal advertisement for hearing, newspaper advertises Planning Commission Hearing	TBD		
Planning Commission Hearing	TBD		
PDS Finalizes draft Board Letter, include Planning Commission Recommendation	TBD		
PDS management and County Counsel review Board Letter, obtain concurrences from other Departments	TBD		
PDS finalizes legal advertisement for hearing, Board Hearing advertised in newspaper	TBD	TBD	
Board of Supervisors Hearing	TBD	TBD	

### PROJECT SCHEDULE ASSUMPTIONS

Project description remains consistent throughout process  
 Applicant will submit information in accordance with schedule  
 All issues will be resolved concurrently.  
 Bolded tasks are under the control of applicant/consultant.  
 \* Task can be eliminated if earlier draft documents are adequate.  
 Hearing date is subject to decision making body availability and schedule  
 The project will not be continued by decision maker or appealed  
 Assumes public review comments are not exceptionally numerous or complex  
 Assumes deposit account balance remains positive. County work may not proceed without adequate funds.

### COST ESTIMATE ASSUMPTIONS

Estimate is based on relative cost of projects of similar complexity  
 Estimate does not include applicant's consultant/engineering costs  
 Does not include County costs for post discretionary review (e.g. final map)  
 Costs assume project schedule assumptions are maintained  
 Costs will be paid at installments throughout the process  
 If project is over budget, cost estimate will be revised  
 The State of CA adjusts Fish and Wildlife Fees annually for inflation  
 Project will be processed with an Environmental Impact Report  
 Cost estimate does not include additional deposits for Trails Review or DEH that may be required

COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY	
Total Discretionary Cost Estimate	<b>\$800,181</b>
Deposits Paid to Date	\$52,494
Account Balance	\$12,627
Estimated County Costs Remaining	\$747,687
Fish & Wildlife Fees/ County Clerk Fee	\$3,080
% Expended of Total Cost Estimate	4.98%

**ATTACHMENT C**  
**SCOPE FOR MINERAL RESOURCES**

The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3).

A Mineral Resource Investigation Report shall be prepared to investigate mineral resources on and within 1,300 feet of the site to determine if they are significant, if their access would be permanently lost, and whether the loss would be considered significant under CEQA. The report shall be prepared using the County’s approved Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Mineral Resources which can be found on the [World Wide Web](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/docs/Mineral_Resources_Guidelines.pdf) at [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/docs/Mineral\\_Resources\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/docs/Mineral_Resources_Guidelines.pdf) (Guidelines) and [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/docs/Mineral\\_Resources\\_Report\\_Formats.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/docs/Mineral_Resources_Report_Formats.pdf) (Report Formats).

The **Memorandum of Understanding** must be executed by the applicant and consultant and subsequently submitted with the first iteration review.

**ATTACHMENT D**  
***CALIFORNIA WATER CODE SB 610***

## SUMMARY OF SB610 AND SB221

**California Water Code (Senate Bill 610)** [California Water Code §10910-10915, <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/calaw.html>]

These sections of the Water Code discuss how “projects,” as defined by section 10912, are to prepare a WSA as a part of the CEQA documentation. Section 10912 defines “projects” as any of the following:

- A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units;
- A proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space;
- A proposed commercial building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space;
- A proposed hotel or motel, or both having more than 500 rooms;
- A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area;
- A mixed-use project that includes one or more of the projects specified above;
- A project that would demand an amount of water equivalent to, or greater than the amount of water required by a 500 dwelling-unit project; or
- If a public water system has fewer than 5,000 service connections, then “project” means any proposed residential, business, commercial, hotel and motel, or industrial development that would account for an increase of 10 percent or more in the number of the public water system’s existing service connections, or a mixed-use project that would demand an amount of water equivalent to or greater than, the amount of water required by residential development that would represent an increase of 10 percent or more in the number of the public water system’s existing service connections.

Section §10910(b) of the Water Code states that a city or county, at the time that it determines what type of environmental document will be needed to satisfy CEQA requirements, shall identify any public water system (PWS) that may supply water for the project. The identified PWS would subsequently be required to prepare a WSA. If the city or county is not able to identify any PWS that may supply water for the project, the city or county shall prepare the water assessment after consulting with any entity serving domestic water supplies whose service area includes the project site, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), and any public water system adjacent to the project site.

The law (Water Code § 10910(c)(2)) also states that if the projected water demand associated with the proposed project was accounted for in the most recently adopted UWMP, the water supplier may incorporate the requested information from the UWMP in preparing the assessment. The Urban Water Management Planning Act (Water Code § 10631) specifies the data necessary to document the existing and projected future water demand during a twenty-year projection, based on normal, single dry and multiple dry years. The code requires that the projected demands be presented in five-year increments for the twenty-year projection. While expected projects can be

included in the UWMP, this is not typical practice since projections are usually based on density, use and population, not specific projects. If the conclusion of the WSA (Water Code § 10911(a)) is that water supplies are insufficient, the PWS or local jurisdiction shall provide its plans for acquiring additional water supplies and set forth the measures being undertaken to acquire and develop those water supplies. The *Guidebook for Implementation of Senate Bill 610 and Senate Bill 221 of 2001*, which can be accessed on-line at [http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/use/sb\\_610\\_sb\\_221\\_guidebook/guidebook.pdf](http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/use/sb_610_sb_221_guidebook/guidebook.pdf), details when a WSA is required, the requirements of a WSA and the process by which the WSA is integrated with CEQA.

**California Government Code (Senate Bill 221)** [California Government Code § 66473.7; <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/calaw.html>]

Section § 66473.7 of the Government Code prohibits local jurisdictions from approving any tentative map, parcel map or development agreement for more than 500 residential units unless the approving land use agency includes a condition requiring verification that the project will have a “sufficient” water supply. Like a WSA, the water supply verification must be obtained from the agency that will supply to the project site, and this verification must state that “the total water supplies available during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years within a 20-year projection...will meet the projected demand associated with the proposed subdivision, in addition to existing and planned future uses, including but not limited to, agricultural and industrial uses.” Absent this finding, the conditions of a “subdivision” map have not been satisfied and the final map cannot be recorded. Proof of the availability of a sufficient water supply shall be requested by the subdivision applicant or local agency, at the discretion of the local agency, and shall be based on written verification from the applicable PWS within 90 days of request.

The water supply verification only applies to “subdivisions” as defined by Section § 66473.7 (a)(1) of this Code, which states the following: “Subdivision” means a proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units, except that for a PWS that has fewer than 5,000 service connections, “subdivision” means any proposed residential development that would account for an increase of 10 percent or more in the number of the public water system’s existing service connections. The Department of Public Works implements this requirement by implementing conditions upon Tentative Maps that verification must be received prior to final map approval. The *Guidebook for Implementation of Senate Bill 610 and Senate Bill 221 of 2001*, which can be accessed on-line at [http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/use/sb\\_610\\_sb\\_221\\_guidebook/guidebook.pdf](http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/use/sb_610_sb_221_guidebook/guidebook.pdf) provides more guidance and information on the process and requirements for a water supply verification.

**ATTACHMENT E**  
**MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING**

**CONSULTANT LIST & MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)**

The County of San Diego's CEQA guidelines require that environmental technical studies be prepared by a consultant from the County's CEQA Consultant List, which can be found on the County of San Diego's website at: <http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us/PDS/procguid.html> (item number 4 under "General Guidance"). No list is maintained for hydrology and stormwater management planning. With the exception of minor stormwater management plans, only registered engineers registered in the State of California shall be permitted to submit hydrology/drainage studies and only registered engineers or Certified Professionals in Storm Water Quality certified by CPESC, Inc., or an equivalent entity approved by the Director of Public Works, shall be permitted to submit stormwater management plans.

Applicants are responsible for selecting and direct contracting with specific consultants from the County's list to prepare CEQA documents for private projects. Prior to the first submittal of a CEQA document prepared by a listed consultant for a private project, the applicant, consultant, consultant's firm (if applicable) and County shall execute the attached Memorandum(s) of Understanding (MOU). The responsibilities of all parties involved in the preparation of environmental documents for the County (i.e. applicant, individual CEQA consultants/sub-consultants, consulting/sub-consultant firms, and County) are clearly established in the MOU for each requested applicable study. The clear identification of roles and responsibilities for all parties is intended to contribute to improved environmental document quality.

Copies must be made and signed by the applicant, consultant and firm (if applicable) for each of the following requested subject area technical studies:

- Mineral Resources