



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
(858) 694-2962 • Fax (858) 694-2555
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

December 14, 2017

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

Project Title: Tomlinson Tentative Map
Record ID: PDS2012-3100-5573, LOG NO. PDS2012-3910-1208007
Plan Area: North County Metro Subregional
GP Designation: Semi-Rural (SR-1)
Density: N/A
Zoning: Limited Agriculture (A70)
Min. Lot Size: 1 acre
Special Area Reg.: N/A
Lot Size: 14.8 acres
Applicant: Rod Bradley - (760) 931-8700
Staff Contact: Bronwyn Brown - (858) 495-5516
Bronwyn.Brown@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The proposed project is a major subdivision to subdivide a 14.8-acre property into 13 residential lots ranging from approximately 0.5 to 3.65 acres. The proposed project includes a 5.47 acre agricultural open space easement on the project site. The project site is located at the intersection of Hollyberry Drive and Buena Creek Road in the North County Metro Subregional Plan Area. Access to the site would be provided by a proposed new private road from Hollyberry Road. The project would be served by imported water from the Vista Irrigation District and sewer service would be provided by the Buena Sanitation District. Earthwork consists of 22,120 cubic yards of cut, 16,865 cubic yards of fill and 5,255 cubic yards of export.

Existing residential structures are located on the project site. The project includes demolition of an existing 1,103-square foot garage, 4,469-square foot single family unit, 1,009-square foot shed, and a 562-square foot single family unit.

The project site is subject to the Semi Rural General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation Semi-Rural (SR-1). Zoning for the site is A70, Limited Agriculture. The project is consistent with the SR-1 development density and the project includes an Administrative Permit to allow for Lot Area Averaging. (APNs 181-180-56, 84 & 86).

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 Tomlinson major subdivision Tentative Map (PDS2012-3100-5573) is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures (see http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

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

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

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

The project would subdivide a 14.8-acre property into 13 residential parcels, which is consistent with the Semi-Rural (SR-1) development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.
- 2. There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.**

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

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The project could result in potentially significant impacts to agricultural resources, cultural resources, and noise. However, applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.
- 3. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.**

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

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, no new information has been identified which would result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.
- 5. The project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR.**

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

Signature	December 14, 2017
	Date
Bronwyn Brown	Project Manager
Printed Name	Title

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion

- 1(a) Based on a site visit completed by County staff Bronwyn Brown, the 14.8-acre project site primarily features disturbed vegetation, and is located in an area with existing residential development. To the east beyond the project site, there are visually prominent hillsides featuring native vegetation. The project proposes 13 residential lots. A total of 5.47 acres of the project site would be placed in an agricultural open space easement. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality because, the surrounding area is comprised of single-family residences with lot sizes similar to the proposed project, the project includes an agricultural easement that would retain the character of the site, and the project includes a landscape plan that includes various types of trees and a number of large screen shrubs throughout the project site to help shield views of the proposed project. Therefore the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- 1(b) The property is not located within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property.
- 1(c) The project would be consistent with the existing community character. The project is located in an area characterized by mostly single family residential and agricultural uses. A lot area averaging discussion was prepared by BHA Inc. dated November 7, 2016 that indicated the lot area averaging proposed by the Administrative Permit was consistent with the surrounding area because the area contains lots of 0.5 acres or less in size, similar to the lot sizes of the proposed project. Additionally, the proposed project includes design measures that would shield some views of the project and ensure that the surrounding community character is maintained. The proposed project includes a landscape plan which features a variety of trees and a number of large screen shrubs throughout the project site to help shield views of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the visual character existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- 1(d) The proposed project requires the installation of a street light at the intersection of the proposed subdivision and Hollyberry Drive. Installation of the street light is a minimum safety requirement. The proposed street light would be shielded to minimize any

potential impacts of light pollution in the area. All 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. The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, and would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Conclusion

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

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

Discussion

- 2(a) The project site is designated as Unique Farmland, based on the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). The proposed project would convert 5.99 acres of Unique Farmland to residential use. GPU EIR mitigation measure Agr-1.2 requires the County to develop and implement programs and regulations that protect agricultural lands, which includes the County CEQA Guidelines. Under the County CEQA Guidelines, conversion of Unique Farmland will be mitigated at a ratio of a minimum of 1:1 acres. The project will mitigate conversion of Unique Farmland at a 1:1 ratio through a combination of on-site agricultural easement dedication and off-site mitigation through either the purchase of Purchase of Agricultural Conservation

Easement (PACE) credit or an off-site agricultural easement. GUP EIR mitigation measure Agr-1.4 requires the County to develop and implement the PACE program.

The proposed project includes a 5.47-acre agricultural open space easement within the project site. The remaining 0.52 acre of agricultural resources impact would be mitigated through either the purchase of PACE credit or an offsite agricultural easement.

- 2(b) The zoning designation for the project site is A70, Limited Agriculture. Residential use is permitted by the A70 Use Regulations. The proposed project would convert 5.99 acres of the project site to residential use. The project requires mitigation of converted agricultural land at a 1:1 ratio (see section 2(a) above). The residential lots have been designed to conserve 5.47 acres of the project site in an agricultural open space easement. The remaining 0.52 acre of impact to agricultural zoned land would be mitigated off-site.
- 2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the property.
- 2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands.
- 2(e) Active agricultural production is located to the east of the project site. The proposed 5.47-acre agricultural open space easement would be located along the eastern boundary of the project site and would remain available for agricultural resources. The proposed project would not result in conversion of off-site agricultural production.

Conclusion

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

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

☐☐☐

Discussion

3(a) The project site is zoned SR-1 which authorizes a density of one unit per acre. The project proposes 13 residential units within the 14.8-acre project site consistent with the County's General Plan. The project proposes development that was anticipated and considered by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth projections used in development of the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and the State Implementation Plan (SIP). As such, the proposed project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the proposed project are below screening levels, and would not violate any ambient air quality standards.

3(b) Short-term construction activities would result from fuel combustion and exhaust from construction equipment and vehicle traffic (i.e., worker commute and delivery truck trips), fugitive dust emissions from grading and site work, and evaporative emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from architectural coatings. The proposed project includes demolition of existing residential structures. The project would require 22,120 cubic yards of cut, 16,685 cubic yards of fill, and 5,255 cubic yards of exported material. Project construction includes asphalt paving of 43,413 square feet. Construction would commence in 2018 for a duration of 12 months. 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 and SDAPCD Rule 55. The project would be required to water the site three times daily and replace ground cover in disturbed areas when they become inactive. Emissions from the construction phase would be temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by County air quality guidelines for determining significance.

Additionally, the vehicle trips generated from operation of the project would result in 153 Average Daily Trips (ADT). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants.

Construction and operational emissions were estimated based on proposed activities using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.1 and are shown below in Table 1. It was assumed that the project would use architectural coatings that are compliance with SDAPCD Rule 67.0, which limits VOC content to 150 grams per liter (g/l) for exterior paints and 100 g/l for interior paints.

As discussed above and shown in Table 1, construction and operational emissions would not exceed the County's screening levels. As such, the project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Table 1 Tomlinson Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Year	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Construction (lb/day)						
2018	9.26	107.66	60.66	0.13	15.30	8.23
Operation (lb/day)						
2019	20.96	1.71	29.13	<0.10	4.25	3.68
Screening Level Thresholds	75	250	550	250	100	55
Exceeds Levels?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Operation (tons/year)						
2019	1.00	0.25	1.70	<0.10	0.28	0.18
Screening Level Thresholds	13.7	40	100	40	15	10
Exceeds Levels?	No	No	No	No	No	No
VOC = Volatile organic compounds; NO _x = Oxides of nitrogen; CO = Carbon monoxide; SO _x = Oxides of sulfur; PM ₁₀ = Respirable particulate matter; PM _{2.5} = Fine particulate matter; lb/day = Pounds per day; tons/year = Tons per year.						

- 3(c) San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) 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 nitrogen oxides (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.

Additionally, 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 and SDAPCD Rule 55. Emissions from the construction phase would be localized and temporary resulting in PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, NO_x and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The project operational emissions would not exceed the County's screening level thresholds.

The project would contribute PM₁₀, NO_x, and VOC emissions from construction and operational activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening levels (see question 3(b) above). Therefore the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

- 3(d) The project would introduce additional residential homes which are considered new sensitive receptors; however, the project site is not located within one quarter-mile of any identified point source of significant emissions. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near any carbon monoxide hotspots.

As discussed in 3(b) above, project implementation would not result in regional (e.g., VOC, NO_x) or local (e.g., CO, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}) emissions of criteria air pollutant or precursors from construction or operational-related activities that would exceed applicable levels of significance. Thus, project-generated criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

The project would result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from onsite construction equipment. The primary source of diesel PM from the proposed project would be from construction-related activities (e.g., exhaust from off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment) and operational mobile sources. Sensitive receptors surrounding the project site include residences located adjacent to the site boundary. Based on the emission modeling conducted, the highest level of construction-related, exhaust-based diesel PM₁₀ was estimated to be approximately 4.61 pounds per day (lb/day) and operation-related exhaust PM₁₀ was estimated to be approximately 3.47 lb/day. This level of exhaust emissions would not be considered substantial. Onsite emissions of exhaust PM₁₀ would be temporary and only occur for a limited amount of time. For comparison purposes, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District has established a separate threshold of significance for PM₁₀ exhaust emissions of 82 lb/day. The project's estimated diesel PM emissions of 4.61 lb/day for construction and 3.47 lb/day for operation would be considered minimal in comparison. The project would not be anticipated to result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project would have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the Land Use Environmental Group (LUEG) guidelines for determining significance.

- 3(e) 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 be in trace amounts (less than 1 microgram per cubic meter (µg/m³)). Subsequently, no significant air quality – odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Moreover, the effects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor impact.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:			
Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

☐☐☐

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

☐☐☐

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

☐☐☐

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

☐☐☐

Discussion

- 4(a) Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, historic aerial photos, and a site visit by County staff, the project site has been completely disturbed. The project site is primarily listed as developed and agriculture in the County's GIS records. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species and would not contribute to cumulative impacts to these designated species.
- 4(b) Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, historic aerial photos, and a site visit by County staff, no wetlands or jurisdictional waters were found on-site or in adjacent areas off-site. Also, the site does not support sensitive habitats as the entire site has been disturbed. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact sensitive habitats, jurisdictional wetlands or waters.
- 4(c) The project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, therefore, no impacts to wetlands would occur as a result of the proposed project
- 4(d) Based on a GIS analysis, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit by County staff, and a Biological Resources Report, it was determined that the project site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The project site would not assist in local wildlife movement as it lacks connecting vegetation and visual continuity with other potential habitat areas in the general project vicinity. Adjoining properties to the north, east, and south are already developed with residential and agricultural uses.

- 4(e) The project site is located within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) North County Plan area. The MSCP North County Plan preparation is currently in progress. The project site is located outside of the proposed Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA). The project site is disturbed and does not include sensitive biological resources. The project does not conflict with an adopted HCP or NCCP, or the County's Resource Protection Ordinance.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal resource	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 5(a) Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County approved archaeologist, Mark Becker, 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 the cultural resources report titled, *Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Tomlinson North Project, San Diego County, California* (February 2015).
- 5(b) No archaeological resources were found on the project site during the archaeological survey. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a listing of Native American Tribes whose ancestral lands may be impacted by the project. The NAHC response indicated that no Native American cultural resources, on record with the commission, were present on the project site. Regional coordination and consultation is identified in the GPU EIR as mitigation measures CUL-2.2, CUL-2.4, and CUL-2.6.

Cami Mojado of the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians was a part of the survey crew engaged as the Native American monitor.

Although no resources were identified during the site survey, the potential exists for subsurface deposits because of the poor visibility of the ground surface during the survey. As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through compliance with the Grading Ordinance and through conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The project will be conditioned with archaeological monitoring (Cul-2.5) that includes the following requirements:

- Pre-Construction
 - Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.
- Construction
 - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor are to be onsite during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor. Monitoring of previously disturbed soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor will evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources.
 - If cultural resources are identified:
 - Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
 - The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist.
 - The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
 - Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation.
 - Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Luiseno Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.
 - If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).
 - Fill Soils – On-Site and Imported

- All fill soils (on-site and imported) shall be evaluated to make the determination that they are clean of cultural resources.
- Human Remains.
 - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
 - Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin.
 - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
 - The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
 - Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.
- Rough Grading
 - Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
- Final Grading
 - A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center, the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
 - Disposition of Cultural Material.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 or have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated Native American Tribe.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.
- 5(c) The project site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.
- 5(d) A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on Pre-Cretaceous

Metasedimentary geological formations that have a marginal potential to contain unique paleontological resources. Proposed grading would include more than 2,500 cubic yards of excavation which has the potential to impact fossil deposits. Accordingly, paleontological grading monitoring will be a condition of project approval.

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

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

Cami Mojado of Saving Sacred Sites (San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians) served as the Native American monitor during the survey of the project site. No concerns were raised by the Ms. Mojado related to tribal cultural resources. Native American consultation included a Sacred Lands check which was initiated with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on May 22, 2015. The Sacred Lands check conducted by the NAHC "failed to identify the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area". The NAHC provided a list of 11 tribes (Inaja, La Jolla, Mesa Grande, Pala, Pauma, Pechanga, Rincon, San Luis Rey, San Pasqual, Santa Ysabel and Soboba) who may have information related to the subject parcel. The 11 tribes were contacted on July 8, 2015, and Pauma, Rincon, San Luis Rey and Soboba responded. Concerns raised by these tribes include:

1. Request for a copy of the cultural study.
2. Project is located within the Traditional Use Areas of both the Rincon and Soboba tribes.
3. Potential for resources to be present.
4. Archaeological monitoring to include a Luiseno Native American monitor.
5. Ongoing consultation.

The study has been provided to the tribes (Pauma and San Luis Rey) who requested a copy. All tribes who responded to the Sacred Lands check (Pauma, Rincon, San Luis Rey, and Soboba) have also been included in the distribution list for notification.

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.

3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:			
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?	<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) The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault.
- 6(a)(ii) To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.
- 6(a)(iii) The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain.
- 6(a)(iv) The project site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. However, the site

is not underlain by an unstable geologic unit and the proposed project would not result in a significant impact from seismic-related landslides.

- 6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Escondido very fine sandy loam (5 to 9 percent slopes), Huerhuero loam (2 to 9 percent slopes), and Escondido very fine sandy loam (15 to 30 percent slopes) that has a soil erodibility rating of severe. However, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.
- 6(c) The project site is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. Nonetheless, a geotechnical report will be prepared for the proposed project. Compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.
- 6(d) The project site is underlain by Escondido very fine sandy loam, Huerhuero loam, and Escondido very fine sandy loam, which is considered to be an expansive soil as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). However, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.
- 6(e) The proposed project would rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

Conclusion

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

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

Discussion

- 7(a) The proposed project would produce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, indirect emissions from water consumption, waste generation, and electricity demand associated with land use development, and residential fuel combustion. However, the project falls below the screening criteria that

were developed to identify project types and sizes that would have less than significant GHG emissions. Construction is anticipated to commence in 2018 for a duration of 12 months. Project operation is anticipated to commence after construction completion in 2019. The project includes demolition of an existing 1,103-square foot garage, 4,469-square foot single family unit, 1,009-square foot shed, and a 562-square foot single family unit. Earthwork consists of 22,120 cubic yards of cut, 16,865 cubic yards of fill and 5,255 cubic yards of export. The project includes subdividing 14.80-acre property into 13 residential units. Project construction includes asphalt paving of 43,413 square feet.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the 2016 Title 24 Standards for residential buildings. Screening thresholds have been published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) for determining the need for additional analysis and mitigation for GHG-related impacts under CEQA. The annual 900 metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO₂e) screening level referenced in the CAPCOA white paper (<http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/05/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf>) is being used by the County as a conservative criterion for determining the size of projects that would require further analysis and mitigation with regard to climate change. The CAPCOA white paper reports that the 900 metric ton screening level would capture more than 90% of development projects, allowing for mitigation towards achieving the State's GHG reduction goals. For example, a project including single family residential of 50 units or more or apartments and condominiums of 70 units or more would produce 900 metric tons. The project's proposed 13 single family residential lots would be below this screening threshold. In addition, construction emissions would be temporary and the overall project emissions would fall below the screening criteria.

Construction and operational emissions were also estimated using CalEEMod. Based on the emissions modeling conducted, the project's estimated total construction-related GHG emissions are estimated to be 485.21 MT CO₂e per year and the project's estimated total operation-related GHG emissions are estimated to be 239.89 MT CO₂e per year. The construction and operation-related GHG emissions were quantified by County Staff using CalEEMod and are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Tomlinson Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Year	CO ₂ MT/year	CH ₄ MT/year	N ₂ O MT/year	CO ₂ e MT/year
Construction				
2018	482.82	0.10	0.00	485.21
Operation				
2019	237.88	0.05	<0.10	239.89
Significance Level				900
Exceed Level?				No
CO ₂ = Carbon dioxide; N ₂ O = Nitrous oxide; CO ₂ e = Carbon dioxide equivalent; MT = Metric tons. CalEEMod 2016.3.1 calculates GHG emissions using the global warming potentials from the 2007 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr_full_report.pdf				

As shown above, total GHG emissions associated with project construction and operation would be below the 900 MT CO₂e per year screening level, and there would be a less than cumulatively considerable impact. In addition, according to County Guidance, the operational emissions trigger the screening levels if the project produces more than 300 single family units or 370 apartments or condominiums. The proposed project is a 13 lot single family residential development, and would fall below the screening criteria of 300 units. Therefore, operational GHG emissions would not exceed the screening levels and there would be a less than cumulatively considerable impact.

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

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐
- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ☐ ☐ ☐
- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? ☐ ☐ ☐
- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances? ☐ ☐ ☐

Discussion

- 8(a) The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes. However, the project proposes to demolish an existing residential structure on the project site which was constructed prior to bans on asbestos and lead based paints. Due to the age of this structure and the potential for asbestos and/or lead to have been present in construction materials, the project has been conditioned to require completion of lead and asbestos surveys prior to demolition of the residential structure. In addition, seven 5-gallon buckets containing used oil are located in the covered parking area located on the south side of the project site. The project has been conditioned to remove and dispose of the seven buckets of used oil in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. Soil samples must also be collected and analyzed for hydrocarbon-affected soil contamination once the concrete slab has been removed. Therefore, with the addition of these conditions, the proposed project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- 8(b) The proposed project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- 8(c) A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and the Limited Phase II ESA (GeoSoils, Inc., December 30, 2014) were prepared for the project site. Land use on the project site historically consisted of agricultural and residential uses since at least 1946. The Phase I and Limited Phase II ESAs were completed for the subject property to determine the extent, if any, of hazardous materials contamination onsite as a result of the historic agricultural uses. The Phase II assessment included field sampling of surficial soils from nine locations, at depths of three and six inches, to one and three feet below ground surface (bgs) on the property. The locations of the soil sample borings were chosen to represent general application areas and one mixing area. All samples reported no concentrations above the Preliminary Remediation Goals established for residential properties by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The Phase II findings concluded that there is no human health exposure concern on the subject property. As discussed in 8(a) above, the project site contains a residential

structure with has the potential for asbestos/and or lead to have been present in construction materials. There are also seven 5-gallon buckets of used oil on the project site. As discussed in 8(a), the project has been conditioned to complete lead and asbestos surveys, removal of the used oil in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations, and soil sampling and analysis for hydrocarbon-affected soil contamination. Therefore, with the addition of these conditions, no significant hazard to the public or environment will be created.

Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.

- 8(d) The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.
- 8(e) The proposed project is not located within one mile of a private airstrip.
- 8(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The proposed project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.
- 8(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The project site is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.
- 8(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project site is not located along the coastal zone.
- 8(f)(iv) EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN: The proposed project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.
- 8f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The project site is not located within a dam inundation zone.
- 6(g) The project site is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the proposed project would 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 letter Report prepared for the project by Firewise 2000 Inc., Ronald Woychak (July 15, 2016). Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated February 18, 2016 has been received from the Vista Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be four minutes which is within the five maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element.
- 6(h) The proposed project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project

does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by County staff, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?	<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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 9(a) The project will require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQWMP) which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).
- 9(b) The project site lies in the 904.32/ Buena hydrologic subareas, within the Carlsbad hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of this watershed is impaired for pollutants/ stressors. Constituents of concern in the Buena Vista Creek and Buena Vista Lagoon watershed include Sediment Toxicity, Selenium, Indicator Bacteria, Nutrients, and Sedimentation. The proposed project could contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and structural BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) The proposed project is a Tentative Map for 13 residential lots which will involve temporary grading operations. The project would obtain its water supply from the Vista Irrigation District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The project does not propose to use any groundwater. In addition, the proposed project would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- 9(e) As outlined in the project's SQWMP, the project will implement source control and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.

- 9(f) A Drainage Study for the proposed project was prepared by BHA, INC. (dated February 22, 2017). Based on the Drainage Study, it has been determined that the proposed project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff because drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- 9(g) The proposed project has been designed to mitigate any increase in runoff volume by detaining any additional runoff due to development on site. Lot C on the proposed Tentative Map is identified as the main basin. The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.
- 9(h) The proposed project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.
- 9(i) No Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations.
- 9(j) No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site or offsite improvement locations.
- 9(k) The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area.
- 9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(m)(i) SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.
- 9(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.
- 9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
10. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project:			
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Discussion

- 10(a) The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area.
- 10(b) The proposed project would subdivide the 14.8 acre project site into 13 residential lots, which is consistent with the Semi-Rural (SR-1) development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR. . An Administrative Permit to allow lot area averaging under the Conservation Subdivision Program is proposed to allow flexibility in lot sizes, with a minimum lot size of 0.5 acre. The overall density would be one dwelling unit per one acre. Lot area averaging would allow for conservation of 5.47 acres in an agricultural open space easement. The project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
11. Mineral Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11(a) The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as Mineral Resource Category (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by residential uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.			
11(b) The project site is not located in an Extractive Use Zone (S-82), nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25).			

Conclusion

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

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

Discussion

12(a) The project is comprised of a Tentative Map subdivision (13 single family residential lots) located in the North County Metro Subregional Plan area immediately abutting Buena Creek Road between Hollyberry Drive and Bluebird Canyon Road. A Preliminary Noise Study was prepared for the project by Ldn Consulting, Inc., dated April 27, 2015. Based upon the Preliminary Noise Study, the project would be in conformance with 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 proposed project is subject to the County Noise Element which requires proposed exterior noise sensitive land uses not to exceed the 60 dBA CNEL noise requirement for single family residences. Noise levels from future traffic traveling on Buena Creek Road was evaluated and it was determined that future traffic noise levels would be as high as 62.6 dBA CNEL on the ground level elevation of Lot 2 and 61.5 dBA CNEL at Lot 3. Noise barriers would be required to reduce noise levels to 60 dBA CNEL and below at

Lots 2 and 3. An eight (8') foot high noise barrier would be required along the western and southern boundary of Lots 2 and 3 as shown on the Preliminary Noise Study prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc. Incorporation of the 8 foot high noise barriers would reduce noise levels to 60 dBA CNEL and below. A Noise Restriction Easement 250 feet from the Buena Creek Road centerline is required. This Noise Restriction Easement dedication would ensure exterior and interior noise levels pursuant to the County Noise Element are satisfied prior to building permits. The proposed project, with the incorporated noise barriers and Noise Restriction Easement, is consistent with the GPU EIR because it implements Noise Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1 as it relates to an acoustical analysis being prepared for this project. Off-site direct and cumulative noise impacts to off-site residences were also evaluated and it was determined that project related traffic on nearby roadways would not have a direct noise impact of 3 dBA or more and would not have significant contributions to the cumulative noise in the area. Direct and cumulative noise impacts to off-site existing residences are not anticipated.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A70 and has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA daytime and 45 dBA nighttime. The adjacent properties are zoned A70 and RR. 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 is also subject to temporary construction noise as it relates to the County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.409. Grading equipment operations would be spread out over the project site from varying distances in relation to occupied property lines. Grading operations would occur more than 100 feet from the property lines with the exception of activities to the west which may occur within 100 feet. These activities would be intermittent, limited to minor grading of the roadway, and would be temporary in nature. Grading activities are not anticipated to exceed the County 75 dBA eight-hour average requirement at the occupied property lines. Additionally, no blasting and no rock crushing are proposed.

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

In addition, 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 proposed project would not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

12(c) As indicated in the response to 12(a), the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

12(d) Operation of the proposed project would 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.

Grading equipment operations would be spread out over the project site from varying distances in relation to occupied property lines. Grading operations would occur more than 100 feet from the property lines with the exception of activities to the west which may occur within 100 feet. These activities would be intermittent, limited to minor grading of the roadway, and would be temporary in nature. Grading activities are not anticipated to exceed the County 75 dBA eight-hour average requirement at the occupied property lines. Additionally, no blasting and no rock crushing are proposed.

12(e) The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport. The nearest airport is McClellan-Palomar Airport, located approximately 7 miles to the southwest. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

12(f) The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive private airport-related noise levels.

Conclusion

As discussed above, traffic noise may exceed exterior and interior noise requirements for single-family residences. To reduce noise levels, an eight foot high noise barrier along Lots 2 and 3 would be required. A Noise Restriction Easement dedication would also be required to ensure exterior and interior noise levels pursuant to the County Noise Element are satisfied prior to building permits. This project is consistent with the GPU EIR because it implements Noise Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1 as it relates to an acoustical analysis being prepared for this project. No other significant impact would occur and the project would not result in an impact that was not adequately evaluated in the GPU EIR.

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

Discussion

13(a) The project proposes 13 residential lots and is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Designation of Semi-Rural 1 (SR-1). The project does not propose a through extension of roads or infrastructure. The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth within the area.

13(b) The project involves demolition of two single family units; however, the project proposes 13 residential lots. The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing.

13(c) The proposed project would not displace a substantial number of people.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
14. Public Services – Would the Project:			
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

14(a) A Fire Service Availability Letter dated February 18, 2016 has been received from the Vista Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be four minutes which is within the five minute maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element. The project site is located within the

Vista Unified School District. Based on the Fire Service and other service availability forms (see 17 – Utilities), the project would not result in the need for new or significantly altered governmental facilities.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
15. Recreation – Would the Project:			
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<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.

15(b) The project includes public trails and pathways. Impacts from these amenities have been considered as part of the overall environmental analysis contained elsewhere in this document.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
16. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

☐ ☐ ☐

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐ ☐ ☐

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

☐ ☐ ☐

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐ ☐ ☐

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

☐ ☐ ☐

Discussion

16(a) Construction trips would be minimal and temporary. Once operational, the proposed project would result in an additional 153 Average Daily Trips (ADT). However, the project would not conflict with any established performance measures because the project trips do not exceed the thresholds established by the County guidelines. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. The project proposes a public trails/pathways.

16(b) The additional 153 ADT that would result 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 as developed by SANDAG.

16(c) The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport.

16(d) The proposed project would not significantly alter roadway geometry on Hollyberry Drive or Bluebird Canyon Road. Safe and adequate sight distance shall be required at all driveways and intersections to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. The proposed project would not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.

- 16(e) The Vista Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project and its Fire Protection Plan and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.
- 16(f) The project involves improvements to Hollyberry Road along the project frontage in accordance with Public Road standards for a Residential Collector. These proposed improvements would not interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. The project proposes public pathways within the interior of the 13 residential lot development and trail connections to Buena Creek Road. A future trail along Buena Creek Road within land to be deeded to the Vista Irrigation District is also proposed.

Conclusion

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

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

Discussion

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

Conclusion

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

Attachments:

Appendix A – References

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

Appendix A

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

ASM Affiliates, Mark Becker, Ph.D. and Shelby Gunderman Castells, February 17, 2015, Negative Survey Cultural Resources for the Tomlinson North Project, Tomlinson Subdivision, PDS2012-3100-5573, PDS2012-3000-12-035. PDS2012-3910-1208007

LDN Consulting Inc., Jeremy Loudon, March 6, 2015, TM 5573 Tomlinson Air Quality Screening Letter

Firewise 2000, Inc., Ronald Woychak, July 15, 2016, Fire Protection Plan – Letter Report, Tomlinson Subdivision Project, February 22, 2017,

Geosoils, Inc., Jennifer Bauer Morton and John Franklin, December 30, 2014, Phase I and Limited Phase II Environmental Assessment

Geosoils, Inc., John P Franklin and David Skelly, Infiltration Testing Results, Proposed Residential Development County of San Diego Tract No. 5573

Geosoils, Inc., Ryan Boehmer, David Skelly, John Franklin, February 4, 2015, Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation, County of San Diego Tract No. 5573

LDN Consulting Inc., Jeremy Loudon, April 27, 2015, Preliminary Noise Study TM 5573 Residential Development

BHA Inc., Bruce Rice, September 11, 2017, Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Report, Tomlinson North Property, County of San Diego TM 5573

BHA Inc. Bruce Rice, September 11, 2017, County of San Diego Priority Development Project Tomlinson North Property

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

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00 -
References_2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00_-_References_2011.pdf)

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2015. *Air Toxics Hot Spots Program: Risk Assessment Guidelines*. Available at:
<https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/cnr/2015guidancemanual.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