

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

Date: March 29, 2013
Project Title: Bongiovanni Montana Serena TPM, PDS2007-3200-21080(TPM),
PDS2007-3910-0714008(ER)
Plan Area: Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills
GP Designation: (SR-2 and SR-4) Semi-Rural Residential
Density: 1 du/2, 4, or 8 acres; 1du/4, 8, or 16 acres
Zoning: A70 Limited Agriculture
Min. Lot Size: 2 acres
Special Area Reg.: None
Lot Size: 4.01 to 4.61 acre
Applicant: Frank Bongiovanni, 9216 Abraham Way, Santee, CA 92071
(619) 499-7323
Staff Contact: Robert Hingtgen - (858) 694-3712
robert.hingtgen@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The project is a minor subdivision to divide a 16.76 acre property into four residential lots. The site is located at 15030 Montana Serena Road, north of Harbison Canyon, in the Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills Community Planning Group, within unincorporated San Diego County. The site is subject to the Semi-Rural Regional Category and Semi Rural Residential (SR-2 and SR-4) Land Use Designations. Zoning for the site is A70, Limited Agricultural Use, with a minimum lot size of 2 acres. The site contains one existing home that would be retained. Access would be provided by private roads connecting to Gibson Highlands Road. The project would be served by on-site septic systems and imported water from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District. No extension of water utilities will be required by the project. The San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District will serve the project and they have approved the Fire Protection Plan and secondary access with concurrence from the San Diego County Fire Authority. Earthwork will consist of grading of 11,000 cubic yards of material, with a net export of 2,000 cubic yards. Off-site improvements will be made to the secondary access road connecting the site to Dunbar Lane near Interstate 8. The scheduling of grading and construction on each parcel will depend on the future parcel owners and may not occur as one phase.

The project proposes lots ranging from 4.01 to 4.13 acres for a density of 0.24 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, 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 Bongiovanni Montana Serena TPM project (PDS2007-3200-21080(TPM), PDS2007-3910-0714008(ER)), is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures. See http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the

development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

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

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

The applicant would subdivide over 16 acres into four residential lots, which is consistent with the SR-2 and SR-4 Semi-Rural Residential development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.

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

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, semi-rural 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 and Paleontological Resources; however, all impacts were previously analyzed by the GPU EIR. 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. This project's significant effects were anticipated in the GPU EIR analysis and the County is implementing mitigation specified in the GPU EIR.

5. The project has implemented the applicable GPU EIR mitigation measures.

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



Signature

March 29, 2013

Date

Robert Hingtgen

Printed Name

Project Manager

Title

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

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

- Items checked “Significant Project Impact” indicates that the project could result in a significant effect which either requires mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level or which has a significant, unmitigated impact.
- Items checked “Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR” indicates that the project would result in a project specific significant impact in a manner which is considered unusual or uncommon and 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 also provided. The complete list of GPU EIR mitigation measures is attached.

AESTHETIC RESOURCES

The GPU EIR determined there was a potential to result in impacts to aesthetic resources from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU, including the potential for direct and cumulative impacts and significant impacts to visual character, scenic resources, and light and glare from future development. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to aesthetic resources but not to below a level of significance. These impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Aesthetic Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
1. Aesthetics – Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Discussion

- 1(a) No. Based on a site visit completed by Beth Ehsan on August 1, 2007 the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. The project site is located north of Harbison Canyon, not near any scenic highways. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- 1(b) No. Based on a site visit completed by Beth Ehsan on August 1, 2007 the proposed project is not located near or visible within the same composite viewshed as a State scenic highway and will not change the visual composition of an existing scenic resource within a State scenic highway. The project site is not near a scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.
- 1(c) No. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment’s visual character and quality because homes would be placed on the flatter portions of the site leaving steeper slopes undeveloped and maintaining natural slopes between homes.
- 1(d) No. 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 significant aesthetic impacts; therefore, the project would not result in any impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

AGRICULTURAL/FORESTRY RESOURCES

The project site contains one existing residence with associated disturbed areas for yard, driveway, and pathways/roadways. The site also contains areas of native vegetation and has not been used for agriculture as defined by the County of San Diego Zoning regulations. The GPU EIR determined there was a potential to result in impacts to agricultural resources from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU, including the potential for direct and cumulative impacts and significant impacts from conversion of agricultural resources and land use conflicts from future development. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to agricultural resources but not to below a level of significance. These impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Agricultural Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources			
– Would the Project:			
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 2(a) No. The project site does not contain any agricultural resources, lands designated as 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. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.
- 2(b) No. The project site is zoned A70, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because residential use is a permitted use in A70 zones and will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.
- 2(c) No. The project's offsite improvement area contains forest lands. Specifically, the secondary access road would impact 0.42 acre of Engelmann oak woodland and 0.95 acre of eucalyptus woodland. However the project is consistent with existing zoning because and does not propose a rezone of the property. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for or cause the rezoning of forest land, timberland or Timberland Production Zones.

- 2(d) No. The project site including any offsite improvements contain forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g). Specifically, the secondary access road would impact 0.42 acre of Engelmann oak woodland and 0.95 acre of eucalyptus woodland.

Forest lands are carbon sinks, or a “reservoir “that accumulates and stores carbon-containing chemical compounds for an indefinite period. Clearing forests causes carbon in vegetation biomass to be converted to CO₂ and emitted to the atmosphere. Maintaining and enhancing forest lands is one way to avoid carbon emissions and sequester carbon containing compounds which can play a role in managing climate change (see VII. Greenhouse Gases for a more comprehensive discussion of greenhouse gases and climate change).

However, the project will mitigate for impacts to Engelmann oak woodland at a 2:1 ratio through off-site preservation of 0.84 acre of Engelmann oak woodland or Tier I habitat within the MSCP. Impacts to eucalyptus woodland do not require mitigation because eucalyptus is an easily established and quick-growing species that is common and widespread throughout the County. Therefore, project implementation would not result in the disturbance, loss or conversion of forest resources to a non-forest use.

- 2(e) No. The project site and surrounding area within a radius of 1/4 mile does not contain any active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. A portion of the nearby Crestridge Ecological Reserve is designated as Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance; however, this area will never be used for farming because it is an established biological habitat mitigation bank. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

Conclusion

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

AIR QUALITY

Air quality emissions generated by the project would be from traffic (852 ADT) and from construction. Grading for the project is 120,000 cubic yards over 32.0 acres and approximately 3,750 cubic yards per acre; the project description estimates grading of 1,100 cubic yards per day. The GPU EIR determined there was a potential to result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to air quality from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU, including the potential for air quality violations, an increase in non-attainment criteria pollutants, and impacts to sensitive receptors from future development. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to aesthetic resources but not to below a level of significance. These impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Air Quality Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

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

Discussion

3(a) No. The project proposes development that was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the project is consistent the SANDAG growth projections used in the RAQS and SIP, therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

3(b) No. In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the San Diego Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in SDAPCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since SDAPCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the screening levels for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

The project proposes a four-lot split which would add three homes and require grading 11,000 cubic yards of material, with a net export of 2,000 cubic yards. However, grading

operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in an additional 36 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 SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- 3(c) No. San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively) for ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) and Particulate Matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also as the result of increase of traffic from project implementation. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. As discussed under question 3(b) above, emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The project's operational phase emissions would be below LUEG's operational air quality trigger criterion (see question 3(b) above).

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, or any O₃ precursors.

- 3(d) No. Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in

air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

Based a site visit conducted by Beth Ehsan on August 1, 2007, sensitive receptors have not been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project. Furthermore, no point-source emissions of air pollutants (other than vehicle emissions) are associated with the project. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

- 3(e) No. The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction and operational phases. However, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m³). Subsequently, no significant air quality – odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Moreover, the affects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor.

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.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources Report prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc. dated February 12, 2013. The site contains 13.78 acres of Mafic Southern Mixed Chaparral. The remainder of the site is disturbed habitat and urban/developed. The project would impact all of the onsite Mafic Southern Mixed Chaparral and would also result in offsite impacts for the secondary access. Offsite impacts are to Emergent Wetland (0.05 acres), Southern Willow Scrub (0.05 acres), Open and Dense Engelmann Oak Woodland (0.11 and 0.31 acres, respectively), Coastal Sage Scrub (1.3 acres), Southern Mixed Chaparral (4.6 acres), Scrub Oak Chaparral (0.17 acres), and Non-native Grassland (0.4 acres). Mitigation for these impacts is as described below at the end of the Biological Resources section.

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and/or indirect impacts to biological resources from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to special status species, riparian habitats and other sensitive communities, and wildlife movement corridors but not to below a level of significance. These impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Biological Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:			
Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

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

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

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

Discussion

4(a) **Yes. Significant Project Impact to Special Status Species.** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit on August 1, 2007, and a Biological Resources Report dated February 12, 2013 prepared by R. Mitchel Beauchamp and reviewed by County staff biologist Beth Ehsan, the site supports native vegetation, namely, mafic southern mixed chaparral. One County group 2 sensitive species was observed on-site: the San Diego desert woodrat, and there are several other group 2 sensitive animal species with a moderate potential to occur on-site: San Diego horned lizard, Belding's orange-throated whiptail, Coastal whiptail, Coastal rosy boa, and Northern red diamond rattlesnake. In addition, two sensitive plant species (Gander's Ragwort and Palmer's Tetracoccus) have a moderate probability of occurrence because of the mafic soils affinity, but do not occur on-site based on surveys conducted for this project. The project site was assessed and determined not likely to support Hermes copper or Quino Checkerspot butterfly, and thus will not impact those species. The mafic chaparral habitat supporting the San Diego desert woodrat and potentially supporting other group 2 species will be mitigated off-site at a 1:1 ratio through purchase of mafic southern mixed chaparral or other Tier I habitat within the South County MSCP. In addition, off-site secondary access road impacts will be mitigated as described below. Projects impacting chaparral within the cumulative impact study area will also mitigate for impacted habitats in accordance with CEQA and the

BMO. Therefore, staff has determined that removal of this habitat will not result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, to any candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

- 4(b) **Yes. Significant Project Impact to Sensitive Natural Communities.** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit on August 1, 2007, and a Biological Resources Report dated February 12, 2013 prepared by R. Mitchel Beauchamp and reviewed by County staff biologist Beth Ehsan, the site supports native vegetation, namely, mafic southern mixed chaparral. All 13.78 acres of mafic southern mixed chaparral on-site would be impacted by the proposed project, although portions of the site would be placed in open space easements for steep slope protection. In addition, the off-site secondary access road needed for this project, the Davison project (TPM 21172), and the Crestlake Estates project (TM 5082) would have additional habitat impacts that must be mitigated by the first project that completes the improvements. Assuming the Bongiovanni project goes first, the off-site secondary access road will impact 4.6 acres of Southern Mixed Chaparral, 0.05 acre of Emergent Wetland, 0.05 acre of Southern Willow Scrub, 0.11 acre of open Engelmann Oak Woodland, 0.31 acre of dense Engelmann Oak Woodland, 1.3 acre of Coastal Sage Scrub, 0.17 acre of Scrub Oak Chaparral, and 0.4 acre of Non-native Grassland. These habitat impacts would be considered significant.

All habitat impacts would be fully mitigated off-site as follows: 13.78 acres of mafic southern mixed chaparral or Tier I habitat (1:1 ratio), 4.6 acres of southern mixed chaparral or Tier III habitat (1:1 ratio), 0.17 acre Scrub oak chaparral/Tier III habitat (1:1), 0.15 acre Emergent wetland including 0.05 acre creation, 0.15 acre southern willow scrub including 0.05 creation, 0.42 acre Englemann oak woodland/Tier I habitat (2:1), 1.95 acre coastal sage scrub/Tier II (1.5:1), 0.2 acre non-native grassland/Tier III (0.5:1). All mitigation shall occur within the South County MSCP through either the purchase of credits in an approved mitigation bank or the purchase and preservation of habitat, with a Resource Management Plan and funding for perpetual funding, in a BRCA area. In addition, all projects within the cumulative impact area will be mitigated in compliance with CEQA and the BMO. See appendix 5 of the Biological Letter Report for the cumulative project list considered for biological impacts. Therefore, project impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations, are considered mitigated to less than significant.

- 4(c) **Yes. Significant Project Impact to Federally Protected Wetlands.** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit on August 1, 2007, and a Biological Resources Report dated February 12, 2013 prepared by R. Mitchel Beauchamp and reviewed by County staff biologist Beth Ehsan, the project site itself does not support wetlands, defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. However, the off-site secondary access road needed for this project, the Davison project (TPM 21172), and the Crestlake Estates project (TM 5082) would have additional habitat impacts that must be mitigated by the first project that completes the improvements. Assuming the Bongiovanni project goes first, the off-site secondary access road will impact wetland habitats, namely 0.05 acre of Emergent Wetland and 0.05 acre of

Southern Willow Scrub. These habitat impacts would be considered significant; however, the project will be conditioned to mitigate off-site at a 3:1 total ratio with at least 1:1 wetland creation, meeting the no net loss standard for wetlands. In addition, all projects within the cumulative impact area will be conditioned to mitigate for wetland impacts in accordance with CEQA and the BMO. State and Federal agencies also have permitting requirements that apply to all jurisdictional wetlands, ensuring that State and Federal requirements are met. Therefore, no significant unmitigated impacts will occur to wetlands or waters of the U.S. as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

- 4(d) No. Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit on August 1, 2007, and a Biological Resources Report dated February 12, 2013 prepared by R. Mitchel Beauchamp and reviewed by County staff biologist Beth Ehsan, the project site has limited value as a wildlife corridor because there is an existing residence near the center of the site and the site does not include topographic or riparian features that would encourage wildlife movement between the undeveloped land to the southeast and the Crestridge Ecological Reserve to the Northwest. In addition, there is a large area of chaparral and rocky upland to the northeast of the site that provides a better route for wildlife movement. Finally, no native wildlife nursery sites were observed on the project site. In addition, the project will avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds and raptors by avoiding grading during the breeding season, February 1 through August 31. Therefore, the project is not expected to 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.
- 4(e) No. 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 (HMP), 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).

The GPU EIR imposed the following mitigation for impacts to Special Status Species, Sensitive Natural Communities, and Federally Protected Wetlands. The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project will implement measures consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures.

- Bio-1.1 is the preparation of a Conservation Subdivision Program that facilitates conservation-oriented project design through changes to the Subdivision Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, and Groundwater Ordinance. This program will promote conservation of natural resources and open space while improving mechanisms for flexibility in project design so that production of housing stock is not negatively impacted. Additionally, any such allowances of flexibility must be done with consideration of community character through planning group coordination and/or findings required for project approval.
- Bio-1.2 requires the County to implement and revise existing Habitat Conservation Plans/Policies to preserve sensitive resources within a cohesive system of open space; and to continue preparation of Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Plans for North County and East County. Implementation of the existing South County MSCP has

been very effective in preserving candidate species and their habitat as intended; and this measure will ensure that this success is continued and carried forward to future MSCP efforts.

- Bio-1.3 requires the County to implement conservation agreements through Board Policy I-123, as this will facilitate preservation of high-value habitat in the County's MSCP Subarea Plan. This measure will benefit sensitive species by preserving sizeable areas of habitat in the unincorporated County.
- Bio-1.4 requires the County to coordinate with nonprofit groups and other agencies to acquire preserve lands. This measure will help continue the County's success with acquiring large areas of open space that are utilized by resident and migratory special status species throughout the region.
- Bio-1.5 directs the County to utilize County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources to identify adverse impacts to biological resources, and to utilize the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records and the Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species to locate special status species populations on or near project sites. This information will be used to avoid or mitigate potential project impacts in the County as appropriate.
- Bio-1.6 is the implementation of the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO), and the Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance to protect wetlands, wetland buffers, sensitive habitat lands, biological resource core areas, linkages, corridors, high-value habitat areas, subregional coastal sage scrub focus areas, and populations of rare, or endangered plant or animal species. These ordinances are part of the County regulatory code and explicitly mandate preservation of sensitive biological resources.
- Bio-1.7 requires the County to minimize edge effects from development projects located near sensitive resources by implementing the County Noise Ordinance, the County Groundwater Ordinance, the County's Landscaping Regulations (currently part of the Zoning Ordinance), and the County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance. Implementation of these ordinances reduces potential indirect impacts to special status species and their habitats.
- Bio-2.1 requires the County to revise the Ordinance Relating to Water Conservation for Landscaping to incorporate appropriate plant types and regulations requiring planting of native or compatible non-native, non-invasive plant species in new development. For applicable project subject to this ordinance, this measure will prevent indirect impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities associated with invasive plant species.
- Bio-2.2 is the requirement that development projects obtain Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401/404 permits issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for all project-related disturbances of waters of the U.S. and/or associated wetlands. It further requires that projects obtain Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreements from the California Department of Fish and Game for all project-related disturbances of streambeds. By identifying the need for these permits, the County can ensure that applicable mitigating measures required or requested by these agencies can be included for such projects.

- Bio-2.3 is the requirement that wetlands and wetland buffer areas are adequately preserved whenever feasible to maintain biological functions and values. While this preservation requirement is applied to project permits subject to the Resource Protection Ordinance, this mitigation measure ensures that the same level of protection is applied whenever feasible to other projects. As such, potential impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities will be reduced.
- Bio-2.4 is the implementation of the Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance to protect wetlands. By applying these provisions to development projects, potential indirect impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities from stormwater runoff will be reduced.

General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce cumulative impacts to special status species and to sensitive natural communities and cumulative impacts associated with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites, but not to below a level of significance. The County has adopted an MSCP South County Subarea Plan for the southwestern portion of the County, but is still developing MSCP Plans for North County and East County areas. Therefore, until the County has adopted the North County and East County Plans with concurrence from State and federal agencies, the project's contribution, in combination with other cumulative projects, would be cumulatively considerable. The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project is located in the County's MSCP South County Subarea Plan and will mitigate according to the implementing Biological Mitigation Ordinance and CEQA.

The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Biological Letter Report utilized the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biology. Project impacts will be mitigated at offsite locations according to the following proposed mitigation measures:

MAFIC SOUTHERN MIXED CHAPARRAL MITIGATION: [PDS, PCC] [MA, GP, IP] [PDS, FEE X2] [DPR, GPM] INTENT: In order to mitigate for the impacts to 13.78 acres of mafic southern mixed chaparral, which is a sensitive biological resource pursuant to CEQA and the BMO, off-site mitigation shall be acquired. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The applicant shall purchase habitat credit, or provide for the conservation of 13.78 acres of mafic southern mixed chaparral or Tier I habitat, located within the South County MSCP as indicated below.

- a. **Option 1:** If purchasing Mitigation Credit the mitigation bank shall be approved by the California Department of Fish & Game. The following evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank:
 1. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased.
 2. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land.
 3. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land.

4. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project.
- b. **Option 2:** If habitat credit cannot be purchased in a mitigation bank, then the applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat of the same amount and type of land located in the South County MSCP in an area qualifying as a BRCA as indicated below:
1. The type of habitat and the location of the proposed mitigation, should be pre-approved by [PDS, PCC] before purchase or entering into any agreement for purchase.
 2. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned and/or managed by DPR, the RMP shall also be approved by the Director of DPR.
 3. An open space easement over the land shall be dedicated to the County of San Diego or like agency to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. The land shall be protected in perpetuity.
 4. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS: The land shall be purchased, the easements shall be dedicated, a Resource Manager shall be selected, and the RMP funding mechanism shall be in place.
 5. In lieu of providing a private habitat manager, the applicant may contract with a federal, state or local government agency with the primary mission of resource management to take fee title and manage the mitigation land. Evidence of satisfaction must include a copy of the contract with the agency, and a written statement from the agency that (1) the land contains the specified acreage and the specified habitat, or like functioning habitat, and (2) the land will be managed by the agency for conservation of natural resources in perpetuity.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall purchase the off-site mitigation credits and provide the evidence to the [PDS, PCC] for review and approval. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to the [PDS PCC] that [DPR, GPM] agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to the [PDS, PCC], for a pre-approval. For Option 2, the RMP shall be prepared and an application for the RMP shall be submitted to the [PDS, ZONING]. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map and prior to the approval of any plan and issuance of any permit, the mitigation shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the mitigation purchase for compliance with this condition. Upon request from the applicant [PDS, PCC] can preapprove the location and type of mitigation only. The credits shall be purchased before the requirement can be completed. If the applicant chooses option #2, then the [PDS, ZONING] shall accept an application for an RMP, and [PDS, PPD] shall review the RMP submittal for compliance with this condition and the RMP Guidelines.

SOUTHERN MIXED CHAPARRAL MITIGATION: [PDS, PCC] [MA, GP, IP] [PDS, FEE X2] [DPR, GPM] INTENT: In order to mitigate for the secondary access road impacts to 4.6 acres

of southern mixed chaparral, which is a sensitive biological resource pursuant to CEQA and the BMO, off-site mitigation shall be acquired. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The applicant shall purchase habitat credit, or provide for the conservation of habitat of 4.6 acres of southern mixed chaparral or Tier III or higher habitat, located within the South County MSCP as indicated below.

- a. **Option 1:** If purchasing Mitigation Credit the mitigation bank shall be approved by the California Department of Fish & Game. The following evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank:
 1. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased.
 2. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land.
 3. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land.
 4. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project.
- b. **Option 2:** If habitat credit cannot be purchased in a mitigation bank, then the applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat of the same amount and type of land located in the South County MSCP in an area qualifying as a BRCA as indicated below:
 1. The type of habitat and the location of the proposed mitigation, should be pre-approved by [PDS, PCC] before purchase or entering into any agreement for purchase.
 2. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned and/or managed by DPR, the RMP shall also be approved by the Director of DPR.
 3. An open space easement over the land shall be dedicated to the County of San Diego or like agency to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. The land shall be protected in perpetuity.
 4. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS: The land shall be purchased, the easements shall be dedicated, a Resource Manager shall be selected, and the RMP funding mechanism shall be in place.
 5. In lieu of providing a private habitat manager, the applicant may contract with a federal, state or local government agency with the primary mission of resource management to take fee title and manage the mitigation land Evidence of satisfaction must include a copy of the contract with the agency, and a written statement from the agency that (1) the land contains the specified acreage and

the specified habitat, or like functioning habitat, and (2) the land will be managed by the agency for conservation of natural resources in perpetuity.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall purchase the off-site mitigation credits and provide the evidence to the [PDS, PCC] for review and approval. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to the [PDS PCC] that [DPR, GPM] agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to the [PDS, PCC], for a pre-approval. For Option 2, the RMP shall be prepared and an application for the RMP shall be submitted to the [PDS, ZONING]. In the event that mitigation requirements for the off-site access road are fulfilled by another project, the applicant may provide evidence that this mitigation measure has been previously fulfilled and no additional mitigation would be required. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map and prior to the approval of any plan and issuance of any permit, the mitigation shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the mitigation purchase for compliance with this condition. Upon request from the applicant [PDS, PCC] can preapprove the location and type of mitigation only. The credits shall be purchased before the requirement can be completed. If the applicant chooses option #2, then the [PDS, ZONING] shall accept an application for an RMP, and [PDS, PPD] shall review the RMP submittal for compliance with this condition and the RMP Guidelines.

SCRUB OAK CHAPARRAL MITIGATION: [PDS, PCC] [MA, GP, IP] [PDS, FEE X2] [DPR, GPM] INTENT: In order to mitigate for the secondary access road impacts to 0.17 acre of scrub oak chaparral, which is a sensitive biological resource pursuant to CEQA and the BMO, off-site mitigation shall be acquired. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The applicant shall purchase habitat credit, or provide for the conservation of habitat of 0.17 acre of scrub oak chaparral or Tier III or higher habitat, located within the South County MSCP as indicated below.

- a. **Option 1:** If purchasing Mitigation Credit the mitigation bank shall be approved by the California Department of Fish & Game. The following evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank:
 1. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased.
 2. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land.
 3. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land.
 4. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project.
- b. **Option 2:** If habitat credit cannot be purchased in a mitigation bank, then the applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat of the same amount and type of land located in the South County MSCP in an area qualifying as a BRCA as indicated below:
 1. The type of habitat and the location of the proposed mitigation, should be pre-approved by [PDS, PCC] before purchase or entering into any agreement for purchase.

2. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned and/or managed by DPR, the RMP shall also be approved by the Director of DPR.
3. An open space easement over the land shall be dedicated to the County of San Diego or like agency to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. The land shall be protected in perpetuity.
4. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS: The land shall be purchased, the easements shall be dedicated, a Resource Manager shall be selected, and the RMP funding mechanism shall be in place.
5. In lieu of providing a private habitat manager, the applicant may contract with a federal, state or local government agency with the primary mission of resource management to take fee title and manage the mitigation land. Evidence of satisfaction must include a copy of the contract with the agency, and a written statement from the agency that (1) the land contains the specified acreage and the specified habitat, or like functioning habitat, and (2) the land will be managed by the agency for conservation of natural resources in perpetuity.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall purchase the off-site mitigation credits and provide the evidence to the [PDS, PCC] for review and approval. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to the [PDS PCC] that [DPR, GPM] agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to the [PDS, PCC], for a pre-approval. For Option 2, the RMP shall be prepared and an application for the RMP shall be submitted to the [PDS, ZONING]. In the event that mitigation requirements for the off-site access road are fulfilled by another project, the applicant may provide evidence that this mitigation measure has been previously fulfilled and no additional mitigation would be required. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map and prior to the approval of any plan and issuance of any permit, the mitigation shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the mitigation purchase for compliance with this condition. Upon request from the applicant [PDS, PCC] can preapprove the location and type of mitigation only. The credits shall be purchased before the requirement can be completed. If the applicant chooses option #2, then the [PDS, ZONING] shall accept an application for an RMP, and [PDS, PPD] shall review the RMP submittal for compliance with this condition and the RMP Guidelines.

EMERGENT WETLAND MITIGATION: [PDS, PCC] [MA, GP, IP] [PDS, FEE X2] [DPR, GPM]
INTENT: In order to mitigate for the secondary access road impacts to 0.05 acre of emergent wetland, which is a sensitive biological resource pursuant to CEQA and the BMO, off-site mitigation shall be acquired. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The applicant shall purchase habitat credit, or provide for the conservation of habitat of 0.15 acre of wetland, of which at least 0.05 acre shall be wetland creation, located within the South County MSCP as indicated below.

- a. **Option 1:** If purchasing Mitigation Credit the mitigation bank shall be approved by the California Department of Fish & Game. The following evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank:
1. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased.
 2. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land.
 3. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land.
 4. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project.
- b. **Option 2:** If habitat credit cannot be purchased in a mitigation bank, then the applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat of the same amount and type of land located in the South County MSCP in an area qualifying as a BRCA as indicated below:
1. The type of habitat and the location of the proposed mitigation, should be pre-approved by [PDS, PCC] before purchase or entering into any agreement for purchase.
 2. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned and/or managed by DPR, the RMP shall also be approved by the Director of DPR.
 3. An open space easement over the land shall be dedicated to the County of San Diego or like agency to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. The land shall be protected in perpetuity.
 4. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS: The land shall be purchased, the easements shall be dedicated, a Resource Manager shall be selected, and the RMP funding mechanism shall be in place.
 5. In lieu of providing a private habitat manager, the applicant may contract with a federal, state or local government agency with the primary mission of resource management to take fee title and manage the mitigation land. Evidence of satisfaction must include a copy of the contract with the agency, and a written statement from the agency that (1) the land contains the specified acreage and the specified habitat, or like functioning habitat, and (2) the land will be managed by the agency for conservation of natural resources in perpetuity.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall purchase the off-site mitigation credits and provide the evidence to the [PDS, PCC] for review and approval. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to the [PDS PCC] that [DPR,

GPM] agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to the [PDS, PCC], for a pre-approval. For Option 2, the RMP shall be prepared and an application for the RMP shall be submitted to the [PDS, ZONING]. In the event that mitigation requirements for the off-site access road are fulfilled by another project, the applicant may provide evidence that this mitigation measure has been previously fulfilled and no additional mitigation would be required. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map and prior to the approval of any plan and issuance of any permit, the mitigation shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the mitigation purchase for compliance with this condition. Upon request from the applicant [PDS, PCC] can preapprove the location and type of mitigation only. The credits shall be purchased before the requirement can be completed. If the applicant chooses option #2, then the [PDS, ZONING] shall accept an application for an RMP, and [PDS, PPD] shall review the RMP submittal for compliance with this condition and the RMP Guidelines.

SOUTHERN WILLOW SCRUB MITIGATION: [PDS, PCC] [MA, GP, IP] [PDS, FEE X2] [DPR, GPM] INTENT: In order to mitigate for the secondary access road impacts to 0.05 acre of southern willow scrub, which is a sensitive biological resource pursuant to CEQA and the BMO, off-site mitigation shall be acquired. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The applicant shall purchase habitat credit, or provide for the conservation of habitat of 0.15 acre of riparian scrub, of which at least 0.05 shall be riparian scrub creation, located within the South County MSCP as indicated below.

- a. **Option 1:** If purchasing Mitigation Credit the mitigation bank shall be approved by the California Department of Fish & Game. The following evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank:
 1. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased.
 2. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land.
 3. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land.
 4. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project.
- b. **Option 2:** If habitat credit cannot be purchased in a mitigation bank, then the applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat of the same amount and type of land located in the South County MSCP in an area qualifying as a BRCA as indicated below:
 1. The type of habitat and the location of the proposed mitigation, should be pre-approved by [PDS, PCC] before purchase or entering into any agreement for purchase.
 2. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to

be owned and/or managed by DPR, the RMP shall also be approved by the Director of DPR.

3. An open space easement over the land shall be dedicated to the County of San Diego or like agency to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. The land shall be protected in perpetuity.
4. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS: The land shall be purchased, the easements shall be dedicated, a Resource Manager shall be selected, and the RMP funding mechanism shall be in place.
5. In lieu of providing a private habitat manager, the applicant may contract with a federal, state or local government agency with the primary mission of resource management to take fee title and manage the mitigation land. Evidence of satisfaction must include a copy of the contract with the agency, and a written statement from the agency that (1) the land contains the specified acreage and the specified habitat, or like functioning habitat, and (2) the land will be managed by the agency for conservation of natural resources in perpetuity.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall purchase the off-site mitigation credits and provide the evidence to the [PDS, PCC] for review and approval. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to the [PDS PCC] that [DPR, GPM] agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to the [PDS, PCC], for a pre-approval. For Option 2, the RMP shall be prepared and an application for the RMP shall be submitted to the [PDS, ZONING]. In the event that mitigation requirements for the off-site access road are fulfilled by another project, the applicant may provide evidence that this mitigation measure has been previously fulfilled and no additional mitigation would be required. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map and prior to the approval of any plan and issuance of any permit, the mitigation shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the mitigation purchase for compliance with this condition. Upon request from the applicant [PDS, PCC] can preapprove the location and type of mitigation only. The credits shall be purchased before the requirement can be completed. If the applicant chooses option #2, then the [PDS, ZONING] shall accept an application for an RMP, and [PDS, PPD] shall review the RMP submittal for compliance with this condition and the RMP Guidelines.

ENGELMANN OAK WOODLAND MITIGATION: [PDS, PCC] [MA, GP, IP] [PDS, FEE X2] [DPR, GPM] INTENT: In order to mitigate for the secondary access road impacts to 0.42 acre of Engelmann oak woodland, which is a sensitive biological resource pursuant to CEQA and the BMO, off-site mitigation shall be acquired. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The applicant shall purchase habitat credit, or provide for the conservation of habitat of 0.84 acre of Engelmann oak woodland or Tier I habitat, located within the South County MSCP as indicated below.

- a. **Option 1:** If purchasing Mitigation Credit the mitigation bank shall be approved by the California Department of Fish & Game. The following evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank:
 1. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased.

2. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land.
 3. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land.
 4. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project.
- b. **Option 2:** If habitat credit cannot be purchased in a mitigation bank, then the applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat of the same amount and type of land located in the South County MSCP in an area qualifying as a BRCA as indicated below:
1. The type of habitat and the location of the proposed mitigation, should be pre-approved by [PDS, PCC] before purchase or entering into any agreement for purchase.
 2. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned and/or managed by DPR, the RMP shall also be approved by the Director of DPR.
 3. An open space easement over the land shall be dedicated to the County of San Diego or like agency to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. The land shall be protected in perpetuity.
 4. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS: The land shall be purchased, the easements shall be dedicated, a Resource Manager shall be selected, and the RMP funding mechanism shall be in place.
 5. In lieu of providing a private habitat manager, the applicant may contract with a federal, state or local government agency with the primary mission of resource management to take fee title and manage the mitigation land. Evidence of satisfaction must include a copy of the contract with the agency, and a written statement from the agency that (1) the land contains the specified acreage and the specified habitat, or like functioning habitat, and (2) the land will be managed by the agency for conservation of natural resources in perpetuity.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall purchase the off-site mitigation credits and provide the evidence to the [PDS, PCC] for review and approval. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to the [PDS PCC] that [DPR, GPM] agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to the [PDS, PCC], for a pre-approval. For Option 2, the RMP shall be prepared and an application for the RMP shall be submitted to the [PDS, ZONING]. In the event that mitigation requirements for the off-site access road are fulfilled by another project, the applicant may provide evidence that this mitigation measure has been previously fulfilled and no additional mitigation would be required. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map and prior to the

approval of any plan and issuance of any permit, the mitigation shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the mitigation purchase for compliance with this condition. Upon request from the applicant [PDS, PCC] can preapprove the location and type of mitigation only. The credits shall be purchased before the requirement can be completed. If the applicant chooses option #2, then the [PDS, ZONING] shall accept an application for an RMP, and [PDS, PPD] shall review the RMP submittal for compliance with this condition and the RMP Guidelines.

COASTAL SAGE SCRUB MITIGATION: [PDS, PCC] [MA, GP, IP] [PDS, FEE X2] [DPR, GPM] INTENT: In order to mitigate for the secondary access road impacts to 1.3 acres of coastal sage scrub, which is a sensitive biological resource pursuant to CEQA and the BMO, off-site mitigation shall be acquired. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The applicant shall purchase habitat credit, or provide for the conservation of habitat of 1.95 acres of coastal sage scrub or Tier II or higher habitat, located within the South County MSCP as indicated below.

- a. **Option 1:** If purchasing Mitigation Credit the mitigation bank shall be approved by the California Department of Fish & Game. The following evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank:
 1. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased.
 2. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land.
 3. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land.
 4. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project.
- b. **Option 2:** If habitat credit cannot be purchased in a mitigation bank, then the applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat of the same amount and type of land located in the South County MSCP in an area qualifying as a BRCA as indicated below:
 1. The type of habitat and the location of the proposed mitigation, should be pre-approved by [PDS, PCC] before purchase or entering into any agreement for purchase.
 2. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned and/or managed by DPR, the RMP shall also be approved by the Director of DPR.
 3. An open space easement over the land shall be dedicated to the County of San Diego or like agency to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. The land shall be protected in perpetuity.

4. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS: The land shall be purchased, the easements shall be dedicated, a Resource Manager shall be selected, and the RMP funding mechanism shall be in place.
5. In lieu of providing a private habitat manager, the applicant may contract with a federal, state or local government agency with the primary mission of resource management to take fee title and manage the mitigation land. Evidence of satisfaction must include a copy of the contract with the agency, and a written statement from the agency that (1) the land contains the specified acreage and the specified habitat, or like functioning habitat, and (2) the land will be managed by the agency for conservation of natural resources in perpetuity.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall purchase the off-site mitigation credits and provide the evidence to the [PDS, PCC] for review and approval. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to the [PDS PCC] that [DPR, GPM] agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to the [PDS, PCC], for a pre-approval. For Option 2, the RMP shall be prepared and an application for the RMP shall be submitted to the [PDS, ZONING]. In the event that mitigation requirements for the off-site access road are fulfilled by another project, the applicant may provide evidence that this mitigation measure has been previously fulfilled and no additional mitigation would be required. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map and prior to the approval of any plan and issuance of any permit, the mitigation shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the mitigation purchase for compliance with this condition. Upon request from the applicant [PDS, PCC] can preapprove the location and type of mitigation only. The credits shall be purchased before the requirement can be completed. If the applicant chooses option #2, then the [PDS, ZONING] shall accept an application for an RMP, and [PDS, PPD] shall review the RMP submittal for compliance with this condition and the RMP Guidelines.

NON-NATIVE GRASSLAND MITIGATION: [PDS, PCC] [MA, GP, IP] [PDS, FEE X2] [DPR, GPM] INTENT: In order to mitigate for the secondary access road impacts to 0.4 acre of non-native grassland, which is a sensitive biological resource pursuant to CEQA and the BMO, off-site mitigation shall be acquired. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The applicant shall purchase habitat credit, or provide for the conservation of habitat of 0.2 acre of non-native grassland or Tier III or higher habitat, located within the South County MSCP as indicated below.

- a. **Option 1:** If purchasing Mitigation Credit the mitigation bank shall be approved by the California Department of Fish & Game. The following evidence of purchase shall include the following information to be provided by the mitigation bank:
 1. A copy of the purchase contract referencing the project name and numbers for which the habitat credits were purchased.
 2. If not stated explicitly in the purchase contract, a separate letter must be provided identifying the entity responsible for the long-term management and monitoring of the preserved land.
 3. To ensure the land will be protected in perpetuity, evidence must be provided that a dedicated conservation easement or similar land constraint has been placed over the mitigation land.

4. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by this project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project.
- b. **Option 2:** If habitat credit cannot be purchased in a mitigation bank, then the applicant shall provide for the conservation of habitat of the same amount and type of land located in the South County MSCP in an area qualifying as a BRCA as indicated below:
1. The type of habitat and the location of the proposed mitigation, should be pre-approved by [PDS, PCC] before purchase or entering into any agreement for purchase.
 2. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned and/or managed by DPR, the RMP shall also be approved by the Director of DPR.
 3. An open space easement over the land shall be dedicated to the County of San Diego or like agency to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. The land shall be protected in perpetuity.
 4. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS: The land shall be purchased, the easements shall be dedicated, a Resource Manager shall be selected, and the RMP funding mechanism shall be in place.
 5. In lieu of providing a private habitat manager, the applicant may contract with a federal, state or local government agency with the primary mission of resource management to take fee title and manage the mitigation land Evidence of satisfaction must include a copy of the contract with the agency, and a written statement from the agency that (1) the land contains the specified acreage and the specified habitat, or like functioning habitat, and (2) the land will be managed by the agency for conservation of natural resources in perpetuity.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall purchase the off-site mitigation credits and provide the evidence to the [PDS, PCC] for review and approval. If the offsite mitigation is proposed to be owned or managed by DPR, the applicant must provide evidence to the [PDS PCC] that [DPR, GPM] agrees to this proposal. It is recommended that the applicant submit the mitigation proposal to the [PDS, PCC], for a pre-approval. For Option 2, the RMP shall be prepared and an application for the RMP shall be submitted to the [PDS, ZONING]. In the event that mitigation requirements for the off-site access road are fulfilled by another project, the applicant may provide evidence that this mitigation measure has been previously fulfilled and no additional mitigation would be required. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map and prior to the approval of any plan and issuance of any permit, the mitigation shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the mitigation purchase for compliance with this condition. Upon request from the applicant [PDS, PCC] can preapprove the location and type of mitigation only. The credits shall be purchased before the requirement can be completed. If the applicant chooses option #2, then the [PDS, ZONING] shall accept an application for an RMP, and [PDS, PPD] shall review the RMP submittal for compliance with this condition and the RMP Guidelines.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN: [PDS, PPD] [DPR, GPM] [MA, GP, IP] INTENT: If any of the off-site mitigation conditions are met by purchasing and preserving land outside of a formal mitigation bank (Option 2), a Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared and implemented for each preserve area. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** Submit to and receive approval from the Director of Planning & Development Services, a Resource Management Plan (RMP). The RMP shall be for the perpetual management of the habitat. The plan shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the most current version of the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS and in cases where DPR has agreed to be the owner and/or manager, to the satisfaction of the Director of DPR.

- a. The plan shall be prepared and approved pursuant to the most current version of the County of San Diego Biological Report Format and Content Requirements.
- b. The habitat land to be managed shall be completely purchased.
- c. The easements shall be dedicated to ensure that the land is protected in perpetuity.
- d. A Resource Manager shall be selected and evidence provided by applicant as to the acceptance of this responsibility by the proposed Resource Manager
- e. The RMP funding mechanism shall be identified and approved by the County to fund annual costs for basic stewardship.
- f. A contract between applicant and County shall be executed for the implementation of the RMP.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall prepare the RMP(s) and submit it to the [PDS, ZONING] and pay all applicable review fees. If all of the off-site mitigation conditions are satisfied by purchasing mitigation bank credits (Option 1), or by another project completing the mitigation first, the signoff of those conditions shall satisfy this condition. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map and prior to the approval of any plan and issuance of any permit, the RMP(s) shall be approved. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PPD] shall review the RMP(s) for compliance with the content guidelines and this condition.

The GPU EIR imposed mitigation for these impacts to Biological Resources. The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project has imposed mitigation measures consistent with the GPU EIR that will be completed prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans or the Parcel Map.

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.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and/or indirect impacts to cultural resources from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU, including significant impacts to paleontological and archaeological resources from potential ground-disturbing activities associated with future development. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to historic, archaeological, unique geological, paleontological, and to human remains but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Cultural Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed:

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?	<input checked="" 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) No. Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates on November 1, 2007, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled, “A Cultural Resources Survey for the Bongiovanni Property Project,” dated November 15, 2007, prepared by Seth A. Rosenberg and Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates.
- 5(b) No. Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates on November 1, 2007, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled, “A Cultural Resources Survey for the Bongiovanni Property Project,”

dated November 15, 2007, prepared by Seth A. Rosenberg and Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates. However, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

In addition, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a listing of Native American Tribes whose ancestral lands may be impacted by the project. The tribes listed by the NAHC were received on November 2, 2007, and letters requesting tribal consultation were sent out March 3, 2008..

- 5(c) No. The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan (see Appendix G for a listing of unique geological features) or support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. Additionally, based on a site visit by Beth Ehsan on August 1, 2007, no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity.
- 5(d) **Yes. Significant Project Impact to Paleontological Resources.** A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological a formation (Upper Jurassic and Lower Cretaceous Marine and NonMarine) that has marginal potential to contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

Therefore, with the implementation of the above project requirements during project grading operations, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant. Furthermore, the project will not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that require grading in sensitive paleontological resource areas will be required to have the appropriate level of paleontological monitoring and resource recovery. In addition, other projects that propose any amount of significant grading would be subject to the requirements for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

- 5(e) No. Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates on November 1, 2007, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled, "*A Cultural Resources Survey for the Bongiovanni Property Project*," dated November 15, 2007, prepared by Seth A. Rosenberg and Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates. However, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety

Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

The GPU EIR imposed the following mitigation for impacts to Paleontological Resources. The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project will implement measures consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures.

- Cul-3.1 implements the County Grading Ordinance and CEQA guidelines which require a paleontological resources monitor during grading when appropriate, to avoid or minimize impacts to resources, and to apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant (e.g., salvage, curation, data collection, etc.). These measures would prevent significant losses of unique paleontological resources.
- Cul-3.2 requires the County to implement, and update as necessary, the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources to identify and minimize adverse impacts to paleontological resources. These guidelines apply to discretionary actions and development projects under the project and result in identification of resources and avoid or mitigate significant impacts.

County staff analyzed the project consistent with the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources (Cul-3.2) and will implement the following mitigation measure consistent with Cul-3.1:

DURING CONTRUCTION: *The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the grading construction:*

PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING: [DPW, PDCI] [PDS, PCC] [PC] [PDS, FEE X2]

INTENT: A Paleontological Resource Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented.

DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT: This project site is has marginal to low levels of sensitive Paleontological resources. All grading activities are subject to the [County of San Diego Grading Ordinance Section 87.430](#), if any significant resources (Fossils) are encountered during grading activities.

- a. The grading contractor is responsible to monitor for paleontological resources during all grading activities. If any fossils are found greater than 12 inches in any dimension, stop all grading activities and contact the [PDS, PCC] before continuing grading operations.
- b. If **any** paleontological resources are discovered and salvaged, the monitoring, recovery, and subsequent work determined necessary shall be completed by or under the supervision of a Qualified Paleontologist pursuant to the [San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources](#).

TIMING: The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the grading construction.

MONITORING: The [DPW, PDCI] shall make sure that the grading contractor is on-site performing the Monitoring duties of this condition. The [DPW, PDCI] shall contact the [PDS, PCC] if the grading contractor or applicant fails to comply with this condition.

ROUGH GRADING: *The following actions shall occur prior to rough grading approval and issuance of any building permit:*

PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING: [PDS, PCC] [RG, BP] [PDS, FEE]. INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Paleontological Resources, a Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** One of the following letters shall be performed upon completion of the grading activities that require monitoring:

- a. If **no** paleontological resources were discovered, submit a "No Fossils Found" letter from the grading contractor to the [PDS, PCC] stating that the monitoring has been completed and that no fossils were discovered, and including the names and signatures from the fossil monitors. The letter shall be in the format of Attachment E of the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources.
- b. If Paleontological **resources were encountered** during grading, a letter shall be prepared stating that the field grading monitoring activities have been completed, and that resources have been encountered. The letter shall detail the anticipated time schedule for completion of the curation phase of the monitoring.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall submit the letter report to the [PDS, PCC] for review and approval. **TIMING:** Upon completion of all grading activities, and prior to Rough Grading final Inspection (Grading Ordinance SEC 87.421.a.2), the letter report shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the final negative letter report or field monitoring memo for compliance with the project MMRP, and inform [DPW, PDCI] that the requirement is completed.

The GPU EIR imposed mitigation for these impacts to Paleontological Resources. The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project has imposed mitigation measures consistent with the GPU EIR that will be completed prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans or the Parcel Map.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to Paleontological 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.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The GPU EIR determined there was a potential to result in impacts from geology and soils during development of land uses proposed under the GPU, but direct and cumulative impacts were found to be less than significant. Future development under the General Plan Update

would be required to comply with State and local building standards and regulations, including the California Building Code and County-required geotechnical reconnaissance reports and investigations. Compliance with such regulations would reduce impacts associated with on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse to a less than significant level. This information was analyzed in the GPU EIR Geology and Soils Chapter and it is applicable to the Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

6(a)(i) No: 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. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known hazard zone as a result of this project.

6(a)(ii) No. 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. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

- 6(a)(iii) No: The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be there will be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.
- 6(a)(iv) No. The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. On average, the site's slopes are less than 25% in grade in the proposed house pad locations. The site is reportedly underlain by Cretaceous age granite and pre-Cretaceous metamorphic rocks. Based on the topography and geologic environment, the site has a low potential for landslides. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from landslides.
- 6(b) No. According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Las Posas fine sandy loam, which has a soil erodibility rating of "moderate," and Las Posas stony fine sandy loam, which has a soil erodibility rating of "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. 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) No. The proposed project involves 11,000 cubic yards of grading that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. In order to assure that any proposed buildings (including those proposed on the project site) are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to responses 6(a)(i)-(iv) above.

- 6(d) No. The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are Las Posas fine sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes, eroded and Las Posas stony fine sandy loam, 30 to 65 percent slopes. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.
- 6(e) No. The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves three new septic systems located by the new homes. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on October 4, 2011. Therefore, the project has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems as determined by the authorized, local public agency. In addition, the project will comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.

Conclusion

Consistent with the GPU EIR, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from geology/soils. The project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The project would produce GHG emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion; however, the project would not generate more than the 900 metric ton threshold established by the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) white paper. Climate change is a global phenomenon which is cumulative by nature, as it is the result of combined worldwide contributions of GHG to the atmosphere over many years. Therefore, significant direct impacts associated with the climate change also serve as the cumulative impact discussion.

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and/or cumulative impacts to global climate change from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU. The proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations such as the CAA, Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act, CARB standards, Title 24 standards, Executive Order S-3-05, AB 32, Executive Order S-01-07, SB 97,

SB 1368, SB 1078, APCD standards and existing County programs and policies, would mitigate the potential direct and cumulative impacts of global climate change to a level below significant. The GPU EIR identifies significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and the ability to meet the goals and strategies of AB 32. Potential impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Global Climate Change Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

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

Discussion

7(a) No. The project would produce GHG emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion; however, the project would not generate more than the 900 metric ton threshold established by the California Air Pollution Control Officer’s Association (CAPCOA) white paper. Furthermore, projects that generate less than 900 metric tons of GHG will also participate in emission reductions because air emissions including GHGs are regulated either by the California Air Resources Control Board (CARB) the Federal Government, or other entities.

7(b) No: For the reasons discussed in the response to question 7(a) above, the project would not impede the implementation of AB 32 reduction targets and it would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

The GPU EIR identified nineteen mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Of the nineteen, one applies to the Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project is CC-1.10 as stated below:

- CC-1.10 is the implementation of the County Groundwater Ordinance, Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO), Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), and Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), as well as preparation of the MSCP Plans for North and East County, in order to further preserve wildlife habitat and corridors, wetlands, watersheds, groundwater recharge areas and other open space that provide carbon sequestration benefits. The implementation of these regulations will also restrict the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and vehicles. The WPO also implements low-impact development practices that maintain the existing hydrologic character of the site to manage storm water and protect the environment. (Retaining storm water runoff on-site can drastically reduce the need for energy-intensive imported water at the site.) These regulations serve to minimize development footprint and maximize natural resource preservation, thereby resulting in less GHG emissions and better capture/storage of carbon.

The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project has demonstrated compliance with the above mentioned County ordinances and plans as described in the project's Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated March 21, 2013.

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.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative impacts to humans from hazards with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. However, future development under the General Plan Update would be required to comply with federal, State and local standards and regulations, and all potential impacts have been reduced to less than significant, consistent with the GP EIR.

General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts from hazardous materials and vectors to less than significant. These impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Hazards Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed. The mitigation resulted in a less than significant impact associated with existing hazardous materials.

The GP EIR identifies significant impacts associated with exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. The General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts from wildland fire but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Hazards and Hazardous Materials Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

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

Discussion

8(a) No: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, or emission of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. The project does require demolition of existing structures onsite which could produce a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials. Specific design measures have been incorporated to ensure compliance with health codes and regulations.

8(b) No. The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

8(c) No. 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) No. The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.
- 8(e) No. The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip.
- 8(f)(i) No. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.
- 8(f)(ii) No. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.
- 8(f)(iii) No. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project is not located in the coastal zone or along the coastline.
- 8f)(iv) No. 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.
- 8(f)(v) No. DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.
- 8(g) No: Less than Significant with incorporation of Design Measures. 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 Firewise 2000, Inc., (November 3, 2011 as amended December 8, 2012). Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated July 23, 2010 has been received from the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be four minutes which is adequate for Limited Agricultural zoning and within the 5 minute maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Safety Element.
- 8(h) No: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by Beth Ehsan on August 1, 2007 there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

The GPU EIR identified four mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts related to Wildland Fires. Of the four, the following mitigation measure applies to the Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project as stated below:

- Haz-4.3 requires the County to enforce and comply with Building and Fire Code to ensure there are adequate fire service levels; and require site and/or building designs that incorporate features that reduce fire hazards. It also includes implementation of General Plan Regional Category map and Land Use Maps, which typically show lower densities in wildland areas. This effort can substantially reduce potential losses in the event of wildland fire.

The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project has demonstrated compliance with this mitigation by obtaining approval of the project Fire Protection Plan (FPP) as described above in response 8(g). The FPP will be implemented during construction and throughout the lifetime of the project.

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.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative impacts from hydrological changes and to water quality associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Hydrology and Water Quality Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed:

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

- 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?
- 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) No. The project will require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. As outlined in the Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) date signed October 30, 2011 prepared by Tait Consulting, Inc., the project will implement temporary construction BMPs, Low Impact Development (LID) and site design BMPs, and source control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants 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) No. The project lies in the Dehesa hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, the Sweetwater Reservoir located 15 miles from the project site is impaired for dissolved oxygen. Pollutants of concern for the proposed residential project include sediments, nutrients, and oxygen demanding substances. The project could contribute to release of these pollutants;

however, the project will comply with the County's Watershed Protection Ordinance by implementing temporary construction BMPs, Low Impact Development (LID) and site design BMPs, and source control BMPs in accordance with the project Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) to prevent a significant increase of pollutants leaving the site.

- 9(c) No. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project site lies in the Dehesa hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit and has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact and non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; and, wildlife habitat. The project will implement temporary construction BMPs, Low Impact Development (LID) and site design BMPs, and source control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, such that the project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

- 9(d) No. The project will obtain its water supply from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

- 9(e) No. A CEQA Drainage Study dated August 2011 prepared by Tait Consulting, Inc. and accepted as complete by County staff demonstrates that the project will have a negligible impact on the existing drainage system due to the low density of the project and proposed pervious pavements. The existing culverts under Montana Serena and the existing driveway will not be adversely impacted. The project does not propose to alter the course of any stream or river.

As outlined in the Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) date signed October 30, 2011 prepared by Tait Consulting, Inc., the project will implement temporary construction BMPs, Low Impact Development (LID) and site design BMPs, and source control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMP's that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Planning & Development Services will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed.

- 9(f) No. A CEQA Drainage Study dated August 2011 prepared by Tait Consulting, Inc. and accepted as complete by County staff demonstrates that the project will have a negligible impact on the existing drainage system due to the low density of the project and proposed pervious pavements. The existing culverts under Montana Serena and the existing driveway will not be adversely impacted.
- 9(g) No. A CEQA Drainage Study dated August 2011 prepared by Tait Consulting, Inc. and accepted as complete by County staff demonstrates that the project will have a negligible impact on the existing drainage system due to the low density of the project and proposed pervious pavements. The existing culverts under Montana Serena and the existing driveway will not be adversely impacted.
- 9(h) No. The project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs as identified in the project Stormwater Management Plan will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.
- 9(i) No. Drainage swales, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site. However, the project is not proposing to place structures with a potential for human occupation within these areas and will not place access roads or other improvements which will limit access during flood events or affect downstream properties. The inundation zone is shown in Exhibit 3 and 4 of the Drainage Study prepared by Tait Consulting, Inc. dated August 2011, and also on the Preliminary Grading Plan received September 13, 2011.
- 9(j) No. The project site contains drainage swales, which are identified as having a 100-year inundation zone. However, the project is not proposing to place structures, access roads or other improvements which will impede or redirect flood flows in these areas. The inundation zone is shown in Exhibit 3 and 4 of the Drainage Study prepared by Tait Consulting, Inc. dated August 2011, and also on the Preliminary Grading Plan received September 13, 2011.
- 9(k) No. See responses to 9(i) and 9(j) above
- 9(l) No. 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) No. The project is not subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir, or in a tsunami hazard zone. Mudflow is a type of landslide, please see response to question 6(a)(iv) above.

The GPU EIR identified 24 mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality. Of the 24, the following six mitigation measures apply to the Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project as stated below:

- Hyd-1.2 requires the County to implement, and revise as necessary, the Watershed Protection Ordinance. In addition, the County must encourage the removal of invasive species and restore natural drainage systems. This measure reduces potential adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters.

- Hyd-1.4 requires the County to implement, and revise as necessary, the Stormwater Standards Manual. This manual requires application of appropriate measures for land use with a high potential to contaminate surface water or groundwater resources. As such, this measure will reduce potential contribution to any violations of water quality standards from land use projects permitted by the County.
- Hyd-1.5 is the utilization of the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Surface Water Quality, Hydrology, and Groundwater Resources to identify adverse environmental effects. Application of these guidelines help County staff to identify and mitigate potential water quality impacts associated with public or private projects in the County.
- Hyd-1.9 requires the County to review septic system design, construction, and maintenance in cooperation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) through the Septic Tank Permit Process. This coordination will minimize potential violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements since the RWQCB oversees the County's permitting process.
- Hyd-3.2 requires the County to implement and revise as necessary the Resource Protection Ordinance to limit development on steep slopes. It also incorporates the Hillside Development Policy into the Resource Protection Ordinance to the extent that it will allow for one comprehensive approach to steep-slope protections. By minimizing development on steep slopes, erosion and siltation impacts will be avoided.
- Hyd-3.3 is the implementation the Grading, Clearing and Watercourses Ordinance to protect development sites against erosion and instability. This ordinance includes many requirements to avoid erosion and siltation, such as: removal of loose dirt; installation of erosion control or drainage devices; inclusion and maintenance of sedimentation basins; planting requirements; slope stabilization measures; provision of drainage calculations; proper irrigation systems; etc.

The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project has demonstrated compliance with these mitigation measures by obtaining approval of the CEQA Drainage Study, Stormwater Management Plan, septic system design, and preliminary grading plan. These plans/studies will be further refined during final engineering for the project and/or implemented during project construction and operation.

The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project will comply with the following conditions that will be completed prior to approval of the Parcel Map and will also be consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures:

DRAINAGE SWALES: [PDS, LDR] [MA]

INTENT: In order to indicate the drainage swales on the Parcel Map and to comply with County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (Title 8, Division 11), the drainage swales shall be shown on the map. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The drainage swale which flows through the property shall be shown and labeled "Drainage Swale" on the Parcel Map. The applicant's Civil Engineer will provide this information by annotating the copy of the Tentative Parcel Map. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall indicate the drainage swales on the Parcel Map as indicated above. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map, the drainage swales shall be indicated and labeled on the map. **MONITORING:** The

[PDS, LDR] shall verify that the drainage swales have been indicated pursuant to this condition.

LINES OF INUNDATION: [PDS, LDR] [MA]

INTENT: In order to prevent future development in the flood-prone areas the Lines of Inundation shall be shown on the map. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** Lines of inundation to the limits of the 100-year flood along the watercourse, which flows through the property, shall be shown and labeled "Subject To Inundation By The 100-Year Flood" on the Parcel Map.

- a. Each parcel shall have a flood free building site to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego, Director of Planning and Development Services. If any of the parcels are found to be devoid of a buildable, flood free site for a residence use, the subdivider shall take appropriate action so that each parcel does have a buildable flood free site. This pertains to watersheds having area of twenty five (25) or more acres.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall indicate the lines of inundation on the non-title sheet of the Parcel Map as indicated above. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map, the inundation lines shall be indicated and labeled on the map. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall verify that the inundation lines have been indicated pursuant to this condition.

STORMWATER FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AGREEMENTS: [PDS, LDR] [MA]

INTENT: In order to promote orderly development and to comply with the County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (Title 8, Division 11), County Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) No.10096, County Code Section 67.801 et. seq., the maintenance agreements shall be completed. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The private storm drain system shall be maintained by a maintenance mechanism such as a homeowners association or other private entity to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall process the agreement forms with [PDS, LDR] and pay the deposit and applicable review fees. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map, execution of the agreements and securities shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall review the agreements/mechanisms for consistency with the condition and County Standards.

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.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative impacts from land use and planning associated with development under the GP. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures reduce impacts to below a level of significance. The following impacts were analyzed in the GP EIR Land Use and Planning Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed.

Significant Peculiar Substantial

	Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	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) No. The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area.

10(b) No. 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 GP EIR. The project complies with the density and minimum lots sizes required by the GP and Zoning designation.

MINERAL RESOURCES

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative impacts to mineral resources from development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Mineral Resources Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed. However, the project does not have mineral resource impacts, and does not contribute to the GPU EIR determination that there is the potential to significantly impact mineral resources from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU.

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

Discussion

- 11(a) No. Although 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 undetermined mineral resources MRZ-3, staff geologist Jim Bennett has reviewed the site’s geologic environment and has determined that the site is not located within an alluvial river valley or underlain by coastal marine/non-marine granular deposits. Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state will occur as a result of this project. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant mineral deposits, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.
- 11(b) No. The project site is zoned A70, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S82).

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.

NOISE

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative impacts from noise associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. Impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Noise Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed. However, the project does not have noise impacts, and does not contribute to the GPU EIR determination that there is the potential to significantly impact the environment related to noise from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU.

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

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

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) No. The project is a 4-lot residential subdivision and will be occupied by residents. Based on a site visit completed by Beth Ehsan on August 1, 2007 the surrounding area supports single-family homes and open space and is occupied by residents. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas 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 the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise 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). Therefore, 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

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 A70 that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 dB. The adjacent properties are zoned A70 and have one-hour average sound limit of 50 dB. Based on review by staff the project’s noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards, which is 50 dB, because the project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line..

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

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. 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) No. The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, there are no public roads or transit Right-of-Way with projected noise contours of 65 dB or more, parcels zoned for industrial or extractive use, or any permitted extractive uses within 200 feet of the project site. A setback of 200 feet ensures that the operations do not have any chance of being impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 1995). In addition, the setback ensures that the project will not be affected by any past, present or future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise.

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) No. The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Three new residential homes. As indicated in response 12(a) above, 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 noise sensitive areas to direct noise impacts (doubling) existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels.

- 12(d) No. 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) No. The project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

12(f) No. 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 mineral resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be development and infrastructure proposed under the General Plan Update that would directly and indirectly induce population growth; however, this growth is consistent with forecasted growth for the unincorporated County. It indicated that the GP would not displace substantial numbers, but it would have the potential to result in displacement of people from the conversion of residential areas to other uses. These impacts were found to be less than significant and mitigation measures were not proposed.

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

Discussion

13(a) No. 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) No. The proposed project will not displace the existing onsite residence and will create three additional residential lots.

13(c) No. The proposed project will not displace the existing onsite residence and will create three additional residential lots.

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.

PUBLIC SERVICES

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative Public Service impacts associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Public Services Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed: However, the project does not have public services impacts, and does not contribute to the GPU EIR determination that there is the potential to significantly impact services from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU.

Significant Project Impact	Peculiar 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?

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

Discussion

14(a) Based on the project’s service availability forms, the project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. The project will obtain water service from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District and fire protection service from the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered service facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

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.

RECREATION

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative Recreational impacts associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant. The following impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Recreation Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed:

	Significant Project Impact	Peculiar 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 15(a) The project would incrementally increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities; however, the project will be required to pay fees for local parks pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO).
- 15(b) The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot 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. The project will be in compliance with GP EIR mitigation measure REC-1.5 which requires the County to obtain funding for land acquisition and construction of recreational facilities in part by implementing the PLDO.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative Transportation and Traffic impacts associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance. The following impacts were analyzed in the GPU EIR Transportation Chapter and 25 mitigation measures were proposed:

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

Discussion

16(a) No. The proposed project will result in an additional 36 ADT. However, the project will not have a direct impact related to a conflict with any performance measures establishing measures of effectiveness of the circulation system because the project trips do not exceed any of the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for direct impacts related to Traffic and Transportation. As identified in the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation, the project trips would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not have a direct impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

16(b) No. The project proposes an increase of 36 ADTs. The additional 36 ADTs from the proposed project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study

under the region's Congestion Management Program. Additionally, the project does not involve construction of any new buildings, nor does it propose a new primary use. The additional access or support structures will not generate ADTs on a daily basis. Therefore the project will not conflict with travel demand measures or other standards of the congestion management agency.

- 16(c) No. The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.
- 16(d) No. The proposed project will not significantly alter roadway geometry on Gibson Highlands Road. The engineer will provide evidence that there is a minimum unobstructed sight distance in both directions along Gibson Highlands Road from the Montana Serena private road, for the prevailing operating speed of traffic on Gibson Highlands Road, to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. All road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. Roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.
- 16(e) No. The San Miguel Consolidated 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) No. 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.

The GPU EIR imposed 25 mitigation measures for impacts to Traffic/transportation. Of the 24, the following five mitigation measures apply to the Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project as stated below:

- Tra-1.3 is the implementation of County Public Road Standards during review of new development projects. Tra-1.3 also includes revision of the Public Road Standards to include a range of road types according to Regional Category context. Application of this measure will ensure that LOS standards are met when feasible and that appropriate road types are assigned based the specifics of the development.
- Tra-1.4 is the implementation, and revision as necessary, of the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic to evaluate adverse environmental effects of projects and require mitigation when significant impacts are identified. This measure will ensure that appropriate site design and mitigating measures are applied to minimize traffic increases and road deficiencies associated with future development under the General Plan Update.
- Tra-1.7 is the implementation of the San Diego County Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Ordinance, which defrays the costs of constructing planned transportation facilities necessary to accommodate increased traffic generated by future development. This

measure will help reduce financial barriers associated with accommodating increased traffic and/or meeting LOS standards.

- Tra-4.2 is the implementation of Building and Fire Codes to ensure there are adequate service levels in place associated with the construction of structures and their accessibility and egress.
- Tra-4.4 requires the County to implement and revise as necessary the Subdivision Ordinance to ensure that proposed subdivisions meet current design and accessibility standards. This would ensure that new subdivision projects have adequate emergency access.

The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project will comply with the following conditions that will be completed prior to approval of the Parcel Map and will also be consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures:

PUBLIC ROAD CONNECTION: [PDS, LDR] [MA]

INTENT: In order to ensure that the subdivision is connected to a publicly maintained road and to comply with the County Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.702, recorded documentation shall be provided. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** Recorded documentation showing that the land division is connected to a publicly maintained road by an easement for road purposes shall be provided. The easement shall be forty feet (40') wide as specified in County Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.702, unless proof is furnished that a lesser width is applicable under Section 81.702.e of the County Code, and shall be for the benefit and use of the property being divided. Recordation data for said easement shall be shown on the Parcel Map. This requirement applies to off-site access to all proposed parcels. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall submit to the [PDS, LDR], proof that the subdivision is connected to a publicly maintained road, and indicate the access on the Parcel Map. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map, the connection shall be verified. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall verify that the evidence provided meets the requirement of this condition.

SIGHT DISTANCE: [PDS, LDR] [MA]

INTENT: In order to comply with the Design Standards of Section 6.1, Table 5 of the County of San Diego Public Road Standards, for an unobstructed view for safety while exiting the property and accessing a public road from the site, an unobstructed sight distance shall be verified. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** There shall physically be a minimum unobstructed sight distance based upon prevailing traffic speed in both directions along **Gibson Highlands** from **Montana Serena**. If the lines of sight fall within the existing public road right-of-way, the engineer or surveyor shall further certify that: Said lines of sight fall within the existing right-of-way and a clear space easement is not required." **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall have a Registered Civil Engineer, a Registered Traffic Engineer, or a Licensed Land Surveyor provide a signed statement that physically, there is a minimum unobstructed sight distance as detailed above, and submit it to the [PDS, LDR] for review. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map the sight distance shall be verified. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall verify the sight distance certifications.

FIRE TURNOUT EASEMENT: [PDS, LDR] [FIRE] [MA]

INTENT: In order to provide the appropriate fire turnarounds pursuant to the San Miguel Fire Protection District Standards and to comply with the County Subdivision Ordinance

Section 81.702, an easement shall be provided. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Parcel Map shall show a thirty eight foot (38') minimum radius cul-de-sac at the beginning of the driveway for **Parcel 4**, to the satisfaction of the San Miguel Fire Protection District Fire Department and the County of San Diego, Director of Planning and Development Services. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall show the easement on the Parcel Map. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of the Parcel Map, the easement shall be indicated on the Parcel Map. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall review the Parcel Map to ensure that the fire turnout easement is indicated pursuant to this condition.

PRIVATE ROAD EASEMENT: [PDS, LDR] [FIRE] [MA]

INTENT: In order to promote orderly development and to comply with the County Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.702 the easement shall be provided. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:**

- a. The Parcel Map shall show a minimum forty foot (40') wide existing private road easement for **Montana Serena**, along and within the boundary of the land division.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall show the easement on the Parcel Map. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of the Parcel Map, the easement shall be indicated on the Parcel Map. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall review the Parcel Map to ensure that the fire turnout easement is indicated pursuant to this condition.

ROAD STANDARDS [PDS, LDR] [MA]

INTENT: In order to promote orderly development, pursuant to the County Subdivision Ordinance Sec. 81.702, and to comply with the San Diego County Standards for Private Roads and Community Trails Master Plan, the centerline for the private easement road shall be shown. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:**

- a. The proposed private easement road shall intersect **Montana Serena** within twenty degrees (20°) of perpendicular.

The road shall also meet all other Sections of the San Diego County Standards for Private Roads and Community Trails Master Plan. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall show the centerline of the private easement road on the Parcel Map. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map, the condition shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] [DPR, TC, PP] shall review the plans in compliance with this condition.

PRIVATE ROAD CERTIFICATION: [PDS, LDR] [FIRE] [MA]

INTENT: In order to promote orderly development and to comply with the Subdivision Ordinance Sec. 81.702, and the requirements of the San Miguel Fire Protection District, the improved quality of **Montana Serena** shall be certified. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The private road easement (**Montana Serena**), from Gibson Highlands to the northern boundary of the to-be-named private easement road for Parcels 3 and 4, shall be certified to ensure that it is graded to a width of twenty eight feet (28') and to an improved width of twenty four feet (24') with asphalt concrete pavement over approved base or (six inches (6") of disintegrated granite), **except for the portion that crosses the Carroll property (APN 399-020-32)**, which will be improved to a width of 20 feet, and is to the satisfaction of the San Miguel Fire Protection District, and is constructed within the easement for the benefit of the land division. The road shall meet all other Sections of the San Diego County Standards for Private Roads. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall

have a Registered Civil Engineer or a Licensed Land Surveyor provide a signed statement that the private easement road meets the standards of this condition. The engineer shall further certify that the road meets all other Sections of the [San Diego County Standards for Private Roads](#). **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map, the road shall be certified. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall review the certification for consistency with the condition and County Standards..

PRIVATE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS: [PDS, LDR] [MA]

Intent: In order to promote orderly development, to provide for compliant access as required by Section 96.1.503 of the County Consolidated Fire Code and to comply with the [Subdivision Ordinance Sec. 81.707 through 81.708](#), **Montana Serena (Bullard Lane)** shall be improved. **Description of requirement:** The secondary access road, **Montana Serena (Bullard Lane)**, from the onsite to-be-named private easement road to Viewside Lane (Alpine Boulevard) shall be improved to provide an all-weather access surface to the satisfaction of the County Fire Marshal, the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District and the Director of Planning and Development Services. **Documentation:** The applicant shall process and obtain approval of the Improvement Plans to improve the secondary access road, **Montana Serena (Bullard Lane)**, and provide the cost estimate. All plans and improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District and the Director of Planning and Development Services. The improvements shall be completed and a secured agreement shall be executed pursuant to [Subdivision Ordinance Sections 81.706.1 through 81.707](#), for the required improvements and sign off by Private Development Construction Inspection (PDCI). The applicant shall have a Registered Civil Engineer or a Licensed Land Surveyor provide a signed statement that the secondary access road, **Montana Serena (Bullard Lane)**, from the onsite to-be-named private easement road to Viewside Lane (Alpine Boulevard) meets the standards of this condition. **Timing:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map, the road shall be improved or the applicant shall enter into a secured agreement for the improvements. **Monitoring:** The [PDS, LDR] shall review the improvement plans for constancy with the condition and County Standards.

NOTE: The above condition may be revised based on accepted project Fire Protection Plan by the County Fire Marshal, the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District and the Director of Planning and Development Service.

PRIVATE IMPROVEMENTS: *(The following Private Improvements shall be completed before the approval of the Parcel Map, or a covenant of improvements shall be executed and recorded).*

COVENANT OF IMPROVEMENTS: [PDS, LDR] [MA]

INTENT: In order to allow the deferment of the private improvements required by [County Subdivision Ordinance Sec. 81.707 and 81.708](#), a covenant of improvements shall be executed and recorded if the private improvements listed in this decision are not completed before approval of the Parcel Map. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The applicant shall complete all of the private improvements or execute a Covenant of improvements pursuant to the [County Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.708](#), which lists conditions 19 through 21 that remain to be completed. A grading or improvement plan and cost estimate shall be prepared for the private improvements and the estimated costs of the grading and

improvements shall be included in the Covenant. The Covenant shall be recorded and noted on the Parcel Map.

- a. Said Covenant shall be titled, "Covenant of Improvement Requirement, a Building Permit Prohibition." No Building permit or further grant of approval for the development can be issued until the applicant completes the required improvements and applies for and receives a release of improvements from the Director of Planning and Development Services pursuant to [County Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.708](#), except a grading or construction permit and/or permit to install utilities within a the private easement may be issued.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall prepare the improvement plans and provide a cost estimate as indicated below:

- a. Grading or improvement Plans with sufficient detail shall be prepared for the purposes of providing the required estimate of cost for the private improvements. The covenant shall note the estimate of cost to install and/or construct any deferred improvements. The estimate of costs shall be based upon the approved grading or improvement plans.
- b. The plans shall include a signed statement by the private engineer-of-work which states, "The plans are sufficient for the purpose of providing the required estimate of the cost for the private easement roads, private facilities, and any other private grading or improvements deemed necessary pursuant to the [County Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.707](#)."
- c. The estimate shall have the engineer's signature and stamp on the front page along with a statement that reads, "The estimate of the approximate costs as of the date the estimate was prepared for the private grading or improvements required by the final notice of approval and the [San Diego County Standards for Private Roads](#)."

If a covenant is recorded, the applicant shall show the covenant recordation information of the title sheet of the Parcel Map. **TIMING:** Prior to the approval of the Parcel Map, improvements shall be completed or the covenant recorded. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall verify that if the covenant is recorded, the recordation information is on the Parcel Map.

PRIVATE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS (COVENANT): [PDS, LDR] [MA]

INTENT: In order to promote orderly development necessary for public health and safety of the area, and to comply with the [County Subdivision Ordinance Sec. 81.707 and 81.708](#), the required private improvements shall be completed or deferred. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:**

- a. The to-be-named private easement road, from Montana Serena to the beginning of driveway on Parcel 4, shall be graded twenty-eight feet (28') wide and improved twenty-four feet (24') wide with asphalt concrete. The Improvement and Design Standards of Section 3.1(C) of the [San Diego County Standards for Private Roads](#) for one hundred (100) or less trips shall apply.
- b. The cul-de-sac shall be graded to a radius of thirty-eight feet (38') and improved

with asphalt to a radius of thirty-six feet (36') to the satisfaction of the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District and the County of San Diego, Director of Public Works. [FIRE]

- c. Asphalt concrete surfacing material shall be hand-raked and compacted to form smooth tapered connections along all edges including those edges adjacent to soil. The edges of asphalt concrete shall be hand-raked at 45 degrees or flatter, so as to provide a smooth transition next to existing soil, including those areas scheduled for shoulder backing.
- d. In the event these improvements are deferred, the subdivider shall execute such documents as deemed necessary by the County of San Diego, Director of Planning and Development Services, indemnifying the County from liability arising from the improvement of any off-site easement. This indemnification shall also be noted on the Parcel Map.
- e. The County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Development Services, shall be notified before any private road construction. Copies of the blue-line plans shall be submitted and an inspection deposit shall be posted.
- f. The structural section, both new and existing, for the private road shall be approved by the County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Development Services Materials Laboratory, before construction activities commence pursuant to Section 3.2/3.11 of the San Diego County Standards for Private Roads.
- g. The proposed to-be-named private easement road shall have an unobstructed vertical clearance of thirteen feet, six inches (13' 6") to the satisfaction of the San Miguel Fire Protection District. [FIRE]
- h. All gates shall be equipped with an emergency traffic control activating strobe light sensors which will activate the gate on approach of emergency vehicles. All of the foreword shall be to the satisfaction of the San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District and the County of San Diego, Director of Planning and Development Services. [FIRE]

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall complete the following:

- a. Process and obtain approval of the grading or Improvement Plans to improve the to-be-name private easement road, from Montana Serena to the beginning of the driveway for Parcel 4, and provide the cost estimate. All plans and improvements shall be completed pursuant to the [San Diego County Standards for Private Roads](#) and the PDS [Land Development Improvement Plan Checking Manual](#).
- b. The improvements shall be completed and a secured agreement shall be executed pursuant to [County Subdivision Ordinance Sec. 81.707 and 81.708](#), for the required improvements, or execute a covenant of improvements to defer the requirements until after the map is recorded.

MAP TIMING: Prior to approval and recordation of the Parcel Map, this requirement shall be completed or recorded in the covenant of improvements. **COVENANT TIMING:** No Building permit or further grant of approval for the development can be issued until the applicant

completes the required improvements and applies for and receives a release of improvements from the Director of Public Works and the Director of Planning and Development Services pursuant to [County Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.713](#), except a grading or construction permit and/or permit to install utilities within the private easement may be issued. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall verify that, if a covenant is recorded, the applicant has shown the covenant recordation information on the title sheet of the map.

FIRE LANES: (DEFERRED) [PDS, LDR] [DPW, PDCI] [FIRE] [MA]

INTENT: In order to provide proper clearance for fire apparatus on the private street, which is necessary for the health and safety of present and future residents the curbs shall be painted red and the signs shall be installed. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The proposed to-be-named private easement road shall either be posted with "NO PARKING" signs or improved with red-painted curbs marked "No Parking Fire Lane" to the satisfaction of the San Miguel Fire Protection District. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall indicate the fire lane requirement on the plans, and implement the requirements pursuant to the timing of this condition. **MAP TIMING:** Prior to approval and recordation of the Parcel Map, this requirement shall be completed or recorded in the covenant of improvements. **COVENANT TIMING:** No Building permit or further grant of approval for the development can be issued until the applicant completes the required improvements and applies for and receives a release of improvements from the Director of Planning & Development Services pursuant to [County Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.713](#), except a grading or construction permit and or permit to install utilities within a the private easement may be issued. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall verify that the Fire Protection District is satisfied with the implementation of the no-parking zones before final grading release of the grading plans and before release of the covenant.

IMPROVEMENT CERTIFICATION: (DEFERRED) [PDS, LDR] [MA]

INTENT: In order ensure that the proposed work on the private road easement stays within the private road easement, and to comply with County of San Diego Private Road Standards and Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.703, a letter of certification shall be provided. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The to-be-named private easement road, including all slopes and the cul-de-sac, from Montana Serena to the beginning of the driveway for Parcel 4, shall be constructed entirely within the easement, including drainage structures, for the benefit of the land division. If the slopes for the improvement fall outside of the easement, mitigating structures shall be utilized so the improvement is within the easement or a letter of permission shall be obtained and an engineer or surveyor shall further certify that letter(s) of permission have been obtained for work outside of the easement limits. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall have a Registered Civil Engineer or a Licensed Land Surveyor provide a signed statement, which certifies that the improvements were constructed entirely within the easement, including drainage structures, for the benefit of the land division pursuant to this condition. **MAP TIMING:** Prior to approval and recordation of the Parcel Map, this requirement shall be completed or recorded in the covenant of improvements. **COVENANT TIMING:** No Building permit or further grant of approval for the development can be issued until the applicant completes the required improvements and applies for and receives a release of improvements from the Director of Planning and Development Services pursuant to [County Subdivision Ordinance Section 81.713](#), except a grading or construction permit and or permit to install utilities within a the private easement may be issued. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, LDR] shall verify that this requirement has been placed in the Covenant of improvements for the Parcel Map. Upon completion of the improvements, the [PDS, LDR] shall verify the accuracy of the certification letter pursuant to this condition.

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. Furthermore, the project will comply with conditions that are consistent with the GPU EIR analyses and mitigation measures.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The GP EIR analysis indicated there would be the potential for direct and cumulative Utility and Service System impacts associated with development of land uses proposed under the GPU. General Plan Update policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts but not to below a level of significance related to adequate water supplies and sufficient landfill capacity. The following impacts were anticipated in the GPU EIR Utilities and Service Systems Chapter and mitigation measures were proposed. However, the project does not have service impacts, and the GPU EIR determination that there is the potential to significantly impact existing or planned services from the development of land uses proposed under the GPU is not applicable to the project.

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

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

Discussion

- 17(a) No. The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project includes a total of four residential lots with one existing residence and standard OSWS. Three additional standard OSWS will result from the project. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on October 4, 2011. Therefore, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency.

- 17(b) No. The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Based on the service availability forms received, the project will not require construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided by the Padre Dam Municipal Water District which indicate adequate water facilities are available to serve the project. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- 17 (c) No. The project involves new onsite storm water drainage facilities including grass-lined bio-filtration swales and rock energy dissipaters. However, these facilities will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.

- 17(d) No. A Service Availability Letter from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.

- 17(e) No. The proposed project will rely completely on OSWS (septic systems); therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- 17(f) No. Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are currently five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

17(g) No. Solid waste generated by the project will be deposited at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

The GPU EIR identified mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts related to Utilities and Service Systems. Only the following mitigation measure applies to the Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project as stated below:

- USS-4.3 is the implementation of Policy I-84 requiring that discretionary projects obtain water district commitment that water services are available. This will prevent future discretionary projects in water district areas that require imported water supply in exceedance of existing availability.

The Bongiovanni Montana Serena Project has demonstrated compliance with this mitigation measure by obtaining a service availability form from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District for water service.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to utilities and service systems; however, the project may contribute to potentially significant and unmitigable impacts related to adequate water supplies and sufficient landfill capacity identified in the GPU PEIR. 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:

Firewise 2000, Inc., Fire Protection Plan, November 3, 2011 and Amendment December 8, 2012.

Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc., Biological Letter Report, February 12, 2013.

Tait Consulting, Inc., Major Stormwater Management Plan, October 30, 2011.

Tait Consulting, Inc., CEQA Preliminary Drainage Study, August 2011.

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

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

Appendix B

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

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU FEIR Summary 15183 Reference.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf)