



County of San Diego

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

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

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

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

Date: April 22, 2016
Project Title: Hagerty Tentative Parcel Map
Record ID: PDS2008-3200-21144, LOG NO. PDS2008-3910-08-012-015
Plan Area: Fallbrook Community Plan Area
GP Designation: Village Residential (VR-7.3)
Density: NA
Zoning: RS (Single Family Residential)
Min. Lot Size: 6,000 Square Feet
Special Area Reg.: C – Airport Land Use Compatibility Area
Lot Size: 2.69 Acres
Applicant: Mark Thompson, TRS Consultant (619)299-2525
Staff Contact: Michelle Chan - (858) 495-5428
Michelle.Chan@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The project is a minor subdivision of a 2.69-acre property into four new parcels and one remainder parcel that will retain an existing residence. The project site is located at 1065 East Fallbrook Street in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area within unincorporated San Diego County. Access to the site would be provided by a private road connecting to McDonald Road. Water and sewer would be provided by Fallbrook Public Utility District. Earthwork will consist of approximately 250 cubic yards of excavation and 1,200 cubic yards of fill, requiring approximately 950 cubic yards of soil import.

The project site is subject to the Village General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation Village Residential (VR-7.3). Zoning for the site is Single-Family Residential (RS). The project is consistent with density and lot size requirements of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Overview

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to

those effects that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

General Plan Update Program EIR

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

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

Summary of Findings

The Hagerty Tentative Parcel Map TPM-21144 is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures (see [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00 -
_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf) for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

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

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

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

The project would subdivide a 2.69-acre property into five total parcels, consisting of four new parcels and one existing parcel to remain, which is consistent with the Village-Residential (VR-7.3) development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signature

Date

Michelle Chan

Project Manager

Printed Name

Title

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion

- 1(a) The project would be visible from public roads and trails; however, the site is not located within a viewshed of a scenic vista.
- 1(b) The property is not within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property.
- 1(c) The project would be consistent with existing community character. The project is located within the Fallbrook Community Planning Area, in an area characterized by residential and active-recreational uses. The addition of four new residential lots, plus one existing lot, would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings.
- 1(d) Residential lighting would be required to conform with the County’s Light Pollution Code to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties and minimize impacts to dark skies.

Conclusion

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

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

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

Discussion

- 2(a) The project site and surrounding properties do not support any Farmland of Local Importance, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as designated in the California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
- 2(b) The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract or agriculturally zoned land. Therefore, the project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract
- 2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the property. As such, the project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.
- 2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands. As such, the project would not result a loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses.
- 2(e) The project site is not located near any important farmlands or active agricultural production areas.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
3. Air Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Discussion

- 3(a) The project proposes development that was anticipated and considered by SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below screening levels, and will not violate any ambient air quality standards.
- 3(b) The project would subdivide the site into five total parcels, consisting of four new parcels and one existing parcel to remain. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening level criteria established by County air quality guidelines for determining significance. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 48 new Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants.
- 3(c) The project would contribute PM10, NOx, and VOCs emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening thresholds (see question 3(b) above)).
- 3(d) The project will introduce additional residential homes which are considered new sensitive receptors; however, the project site is not located within a quarter-mile of any identified point source of significant emissions. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near any carbon monoxide hotspots.
- 3(e) The project could produce objectionable odors during construction and operation; however, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m3).

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

4(a) Biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources Report prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt, dated March 20, 2015. The site contains urban/developed and disturbed habitat, non-native vegetation, southern willow scrub, eucalyptus woodland, and disturbed wetlands. Both southern willow scrub and disturbed wetland are considered sensitive habitat types in San Diego County, as defined in the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources. No sensitive plant species were identified onsite due to the developed non-native nature of the property. Red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*) was the only locally-sensitive wildlife species observed on site, which is identified as a Group 1 species on the San Diego County Sensitive Bird List. This species is not included in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s list of Birds of Conservation Concern for the Southern California Bird Conservation Region (USFWS 2002). Surrounding land uses would preclude the occurrence of any highly sensitive plant or wildlife species, and no state or federally listed rare, threatened, or endangered

plant or wildlife species are anticipated to be present onsite. However, removal of existing vegetation onsite and development of the proposed project could result in potential direct impacts on nesting raptors or migratory songbirds associated with the displacement of suitable nesting habitat.

As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts to sensitive habitat and/or species will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of project-specific mitigation measures. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio-1.6 and Bio-1.7. Project impacts to sensitive habitat and species would be mitigated through ordinance compliance, in addition to creation and/or restoration/enhancement of 0.09 acre of wetland onsite. To reduce potential impacts to nesting birds, the project will be conditioned to avoid site brushing, grading, and/or removal of vegetation within 300 feet of any potential bird nesting location during the bird breeding season (January 1 through August 31), pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game code. Therefore, impacts to sensitive habitat and/or species would be mitigated to less than significant.

- 4(b) Based on the Biological Resources Report prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt dated March 20, 2015, the project site supports southern willow scrub and disturbed wetland, which are both considered sensitive habitat types in San Diego County. A tiny patch of southern willow scrub is found near the northwestern property corner in association with a large drainage onsite that flows across the site from north to south, generally following the western property boundary. This habitat-type is indicated by a dense thicket of Arroyo Willow (*Salix lasiolepis*) and Lance-leaf Willow (*Salix lasiandra*), the canopy of which extends out to the edge of East Fallbrook Street. The disturbed wetland vegetation is located in two places on the project site. The first is in association with a small drainage on the southeast corner off the property that parallels McDonald Road. This habitat type is located within the bead of the drainage and is indicated by Watercress (*Rorippa nasturtium aquaticum*), California Dock (*Rumex salicifolius*), and Orchard Grass (*Paspalum dilatatum*), and Sedge (*Cyperus aquaiticum*). The second occurrence of disturbed wetland is in association with the larger drainage, which is mostly unvegetated due to a solid, heavy canopy of non-native trees. The disturbed wetland onsite is of moderate to low biological resource value due to its small size and limited species diversity.

The project would completely avoid the southern willow scrub onsite, and therefore would not result in any impacts to this habitat-type. However, the project would result in a loss of approximately 0.03 acre of disturbed wetland. Based on the results of the biological survey, it has been determined that the disturbed wetland habitat onsite does not meet the County's definition of "RPO Wetlands" pursuant to Section 86.602(q)(bb) of the RPO. As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts to sensitive habitat and/or species will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of project-specific mitigation measures. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio-1.1 through Bio-1.7 and Bio-2.1 through Bio-2.4. In addition, as detailed in response 4(a) above, direct and indirect impacts to disturbed wetland will be mitigated through onsite creation and/or restoration/enhancement of 0.09 acre of wetland.

- 4(c) The Biological Resources Report prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt dated March 20, 2015, assessed the project site for the presence of state and federal jurisdictional wetlands. The project site is traversed by two existing drainages. It was determined that these features do not meet the County Resource Protection Ordinance definition. However, the drainages both meet the state and federal jurisdictional criteria, and are identified as

CDFW wetlands, waters of the State, and waters of the U.S. In addition, portions of the drainages may also qualify as federally jurisdictional wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project would result in impacts to approximately 0.03 acre of the disturbed wetland onsite through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion and/or obstruction by the proposed development.

As detailed in response 4(a) above, direct and indirect impacts to disturbed wetland will be mitigated through onsite creation and/or restoration/enhancement of 0.09 acre of wetland, which would result in a net gain of wetland habitat. As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts to federally protected wetlands will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of project-specific mitigation measures. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio-1.1, Bio-1.5 through Bio-1.7, and Bio-2.2 through Bio-2.4.

- 4(d) The Biological Resources Report prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt dated March 20, 2015, determined that the project site lacks unique features or other resources that would enhance its local or regional biological significance due to its location (completely surrounded by development), small size, and developed/non-native nature. The site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The site would not assist in local wildlife movement as it lacks connecting vegetation and visual continuity with other potential habitat areas in the general project vicinity. Existing residential development effectively precludes movement to, from, or through the project site. Although the onsite drainages may serve as local minor wildlife corridors, any potential impacts would be mitigated through onsite wetland creation and/or restoration/enhancement. No significant raptor habitat is present onsite, although locally-common raptors, including red-shouldered hawk, red-tailed hawk, and possibly others, may forage onsite on occasion.

To reduce potential impacts to migratory birds and/or raptors, the project will be conditioned to avoid site brushing, grading, and/or removal of vegetation within 300 feet of any potential bird nesting location during the bird breeding season (January 1 through August 31), pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game code. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.

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

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

Discussion

5(a) Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County staff archaeologist, Heather Kwiatkowski, it has been determined that there are one or more historical resources within the project site. These resources include a single-family residence dating to 1945 and a man-made waterfall/fountain. A historical resources survey was conducted to evaluate the significance of these historical resources. The results of the survey are provided in the cultural resources report titled, *Cultural Resources Survey Report for TPM 21144: Haggerty/Grajek Minor Subdivision* prepared by Heather Kwiatkowski. Based on the results of this survey, it has been determined that the historic resources are not significant pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, no impacts to historical resources would occur with the implementation of the proposed project.

5(b) Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County staff archaeologist, Heather Kwiatkowski, it has been determined that there are no impacts to archaeological resources because they do not occur within the project site. However, there are cultural resources within the surrounding area. As such, the project site is considered sensitive for the presence of subsurface resources.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through compliance with the Grading Ordinance and through conformance with the County’s Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. Although no resources were identified, there is the potential for the presence of subsurface deposits.

The project will be conditioned with archaeological monitoring (Cul-2.5) that includes the following requirements:

- Pre-Construction
 - Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.
- Construction
 - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor are to be onsite during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor will evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources
 - If cultural resources are identified:
 - Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
 - The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist.
 - The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
 - Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation.
 - Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Luiseno Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.
 - If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).
 - Human Remains.
 - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
 - Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin.
 - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.

- The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
- Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.
- Rough Grading
 - Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
- Final Grading
 - A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center, the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
 - Disposition of Cultural Material.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

5(c) The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

5(d) A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on Cretaceous Plutonic formations that have a no potential to contain unique paleontological resources. Because there is not potential for the presence of paleontological resources, a monitoring program is not required. With the implementation of the proposed project, there would be no impacts to paleontological resources.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul-3.1.

- 5(e) Based on an analysis of records and archaeological surveys of the property, it has been determined that the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.
- 5(f) Based on an analysis of records, cultural surveys of the property, and Native American consultation, it has been determined that tribal cultural resources are not present within the project site.

Native American consultation included a Sacred Lands check which was initiated with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on November 17, 2008. The Sacred Lands check conducted by the NAHC did not identify the presence of sites within the area of potential effect. The NAHC provided a list of five (5) tribes (La Jolla, Pala, Pauma, Rincon and San Luis Rey) who may have information related to the subject parcel. The five tribes were contacted on December 2, 2008, and Pala responded. Concerns raised by Pala include:

- 1. Notification of public review, hearings, and decision.

No information was received identifying any tribal cultural resources within the project site. All of the listed tribes above are included in the distribution list for notification of public disclosure, hearings and decision.

Conclusion

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

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

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

6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and

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

potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Discussion

6(a)

- The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault.
- To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.
- The project site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain.
- The site is not located within a “Landslide Susceptibility Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards.

6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Placentia sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes (PeC), and Visalia sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes (VaB), both of which have a soil erodibility rating of severe. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.

6(c) The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project.

6(d) The project is underlain by PeC, which is considered to be an expansive soil as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The VaB underlying the project site is not considered to be an expansive soil. However, the project will not result in a significant impact because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.

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

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the Project:			
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

7(a) The project would produce GHG emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion. However, the project falls below the screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that would have less than cumulatively considerable GHG emissions (i.e., the project would result in less than 50 single-family residential units).

The San Diego County Recommended Approach for Addressing Climate Change (2015) uses screening thresholds for determining the need for additional analysis. Screening thresholds are recommended based on various land use densities and project types. Projects that meet or fall below the screening thresholds are expected to result in 900 MT/year of GHG emissions or less and would not require additional analysis. The 50 unit standard for single-family residential land use would apply to the proposed project.

The project proposes the development of a five parcel subdivision, including four new parcels and one existing parcel to remain, and therefore would fall below the screening criteria of 50 units. For projects of this size, it is presumed that the construction and operational GHG emissions would not exceed 900 MT CO₂e per year, and there would be a less-than cumulatively considerable impact. This assumes that the project does not involve unusually extensive construction and does not involve operational characteristics that would generate unusually high GHG emissions.

7(b) As described above, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. As such, the project would be consistent with County goals and policies included in the County General Plan that address greenhouse gas reductions. Therefore, the project would be consistent with emissions reduction targets of Assembly Bill 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act. Thus, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gas emissions.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident’s exposure to vectors,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

Discussion

- 8(a) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite which could produce a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials.
- 8(b) The project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. However, the project does not propose any uses that would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite which could produce a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials.
- 8(c) Based on a site visit and a comprehensive review of regulatory databases (see attached Hazards/Hazardous Materials references), the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.
- 8(d) The project is located within the Airport Influence Area for Fallbrook Community Airport and Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Camp Pendleton. However, the proposed project will not result in hazards to airport safety or surrounding land uses for the following reasons:
- The project does not propose any distracting visual hazards including but not limited to distracting lights, glare, sources of smoke or other obstacles or an electronic hazard that would interfere with aircraft instruments or radio communications.
 - The project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 100 feet above ground level, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.
 - The project does not propose any artificial bird attractor, including but not limited to reservoirs, golf courses with water hazards, large detention and retention basins, landscaping with water features, wildlife refuges, or agriculture (especially cereal grains).

Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- 8(e) The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip.
- 8(f)
- Operational Area Emergency Plan and Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan: The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent

plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

- San Diego County nuclear power station emergency response plan: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.

8(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project is not located along the coastal zone.

8(f)(iv) EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN: The project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.

8f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

8(g) The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code, as described in the approved Fire Protection Plan prepared for the project by Lamont Landis Fire Consultant, (dated May 9, 2014). Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated July 10, 2014 has been received from the North County Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be less than 5 minutes which is within the maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element.

8(h) The project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses.

Conclusion

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

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

beneficial uses?

d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

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

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

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

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

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

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

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

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

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Discussion

9(a) The project will require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to

meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

- 9(b) The project lies in the Bonsall hydrologic sub basin (903.12), within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, this watershed is impaired for indicator bacteria, chloride, and total dissolved solids. Constituents of concern in the San Luis Rey watershed include coliform bacteria, nutrients, sediment, lowered dissolve oxygen, and trace metals. The project could contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) The project will obtain its water supply from the Fallbrook Public Utilities District, which obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- 9(e) As outlined in the project's SWMP, the project will implement source control and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.
- 9(f) Based on a CEQA-Level Drainage Study prepared by Lyle Engineering, Inc. dated April 2015, the project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff because drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities. An existing 48-inch storm drain pipe traverses the easterly portion of the site. This pipe conveys storm flows southerly from the north side of East Fallbrook Street to the southeast portion of the property before discharging into an existing drainage swale. This swale carries flows southerly and offsite of the property. In addition, Ostrich Farms Creek traverses the westerly portion of the property through the remainder parcel. The project does not propose any work in the existing drainage or Ostrich Farms Creek.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will not substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

- 9(g) The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.
- 9(h) The project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.

- 9(i) The project site contains FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains and drainages. Based on a CEQA-Level Drainage Study prepared by Lyle Engineering, Inc. dated April 2015, there are two existing floodplains that traverse the property. The Ostrich Creek Farms floodplain is located on the western side of the property and travels through the remainder parcel. The second floodplain is defined by the spill overflow from an existing 54-inch culvert crossing and an existing drainageway that traverses across one of the proposed parcels (Parcel 4). Both floodplains are contained within their respective main channels and do not spill into the overbank areas. In addition, no existing or proposed structures lie within the 100-year limits of inundation of either floodplain.
- 9(j) Based on a CEQA-Level Drainage Study prepared by Lyle Engineering, Inc. dated April 2015, 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site. However, no existing or proposed structures lie within the 100-year limits of inundation of the onsite floodplains because the updated analysis and design will move the inundation lines, as delineated per Parcel Map No. 3577, outside of the pad areas.
- 9(k) The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area.
- 9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(m)(i) SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.
- 9(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.
- 9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

Conclusion

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

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

Discussion

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

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

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
11. Mineral Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11(a) The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as MRZ-3. However, the project site is surrounded by residential uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
12. Noise – Would the Project:			
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Discussion

12(a) The project is the Hagerty Tentative Parcel Map application comprised of a four parcel subdivision with a remainder parcel. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by ISE dated March 7, 2014, the project would require noise mitigation to ensure potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan are reduced to less than significant. This is demonstrated through the following assessment:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by ISE dated March 7, 2015, proposed mitigation consisting of a seven foot high permanent noise wall is required. This would ensure proposed noise sensitive land uses on site are below the CNEL 60 dB(A). Additionally, a noise protection easement would be dedicated to Parcels 1 and 2 to ensure General Plan Noise Element conformance. Therefore, with noise mitigation incorporated, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by ISE dated March 7, 2014, non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned residential which has a nighttime one-hour average sound limit of 45 dBA. The Noise Analysis and staff's review has determined that the project subdivision would not exceed County Noise Standards.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by ISE dated March 7, 2014, the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations will occur only during

permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. The closest residential receptor is located approximately 150 feet away from any construction activity. No impulsive type of construction equipment is proposed and no processing on site is to occur. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404 and 36.409) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

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

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

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

- 12(c) The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Additional vehicular traffic on nearby roadways and activities typically associated with residential subdivisions. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned off-site noise sensitive areas to direct and cumulative noise impacts over existing ambient noise levels based on the review of the project by County staff and a Noise Analysis prepared by ISE dated March 7, 2015. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

12(d) The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

12(e) The proposed project is located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport for the Airport. However, the project implementation is not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff’s review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours) and review by County Noise Specialist. The location of the project is outside of the CNEL 60 dB(A) contours for the airport and/or the CLUP.

In addition, based on the list of past, present and future projects there are no new or expanded public airports projects in the vicinity that may extend the boundaries of the CNEL 60 dB noise contour or CLUP. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise on a project or cumulative level.

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

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
13. Population and Housing – Would the Project:			
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion

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

13(b) The project will not displace existing housing. The project does not propose to remove the existing residence on the site.

13(c) The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since a majority of the site is currently vacant and the project does not propose to remove the existing residence on the property.

Conclusion

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

Significant Project Impact **Impact not identified by GPU EIR** **Substantial New Information**

14. Public Services – Would the Project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

Discussion

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

Conclusion

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

Significant Project Impact **Impact not identified by GPU EIR** **Substantial New Information**

15. Recreation – Would the Project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the

facility would occur or be accelerated?

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

Discussion

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

15(b) The project does not include recreational facilities, including trails or pathways, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Conclusion

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

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

- f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Discussion

- 16(a) The project will result in an additional 48 ADT. However, the project will not conflict with any established performance measures because the project trips do not exceed the thresholds established by County guidelines. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.
- 16(b) The additional 48 ADTs from the project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region’s Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG.
- 16(c) Although the project falls within the Airport Influence Area for Fallbrook Community Airport and Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Camp Pendleton, the project is not within any safety or accident potential zones as identified in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for either of these airports. As such, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.
- 16(d) The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.
- 16(e) The North County Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project and its Fire Protection Plan and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.
- 16(f) The project will not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

Conclusion

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

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

17. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Discussion

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

Conclusion

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

Attachments:

Appendix A – References

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

Appendix A

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

Vincent N. Scheidt Biological Consultant, Vincent N. Scheidt (March 20, 2015). Biological Resources, Project Impacts, and Mitigation – The Hagerty TPM Project

Lamont Landis Fire Consulting LLC, Lamont Landis (May 9, 2014). Fire Protection Plan/Fuel Management Plan.

Lyle Engineering, Inc., Scott R. Lyle (April 2015). CEQA-Level Drainage Study.

Lyle Engineering, Inc., Scott R. Lyle, P.E. (April 2015). Major Stormwater Management Plan (Major SWMP) for Hagerty Property

Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc., Rick Tavares, Ph.D. (March 7, 2014). Acoustical Site Assessment Hagerty Tentative Parcel Map.

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

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

Appendix B

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

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