



**ROY SAPAU**  
DIRECTOR

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
505 South Vulcan Avenue, Encinitas, CA 92024  
www.encinitasca.gov

**ANNA COLAMUSSI**  
PLANNING MANAGER

June 30, 2022

**CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form  
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G)**

1. Title: La Costa Boutique Hotel Project  
Project Number(s): MULTI-002750-2018, CPP-003887-2020, DR-002670-2018,  
CDPNF-0026762-2018, USE-002671-2018
2. Lead agency name and address:  
City of Encinitas  
505 South Vulcan Avenue  
Encinitas, CA 92024
3. a. Contact: Andrew Maynard, Project Manager  
b. Phone number: (760) 633-2718  
c. E-mail: amaynard@encinitas.ca.gov
4. Project location:  
516 La Costa Avenue, Encinitas, CA 92024  
APN: 216-030-48
5. Project Applicant name and address:  
DM La Costa Avenue LLC, 1650 N Coast Highway Unit 101, Encinitas, CA 92024
6. General Plan: Visitor Serving Commercial  
Density: N/A  
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) 1.0
7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: Visitor Serving Commercial (VSC)  
Minimum Lot Size: 10,000 Square Feet  
Special Area Regulation: Coastal Appeal Zone, Special Study Area,  
Cultural/Natural Resources, Scenic/Visual Corridor

8. Description of project:

DM La Costa Avenue LLC (Applicant) proposes the La Costa Boutique Hotel Project (Project), which includes the processing of a Minor Use Permit, Design Review Permit, and Coastal Development Permit.

The existing 1.18-acre Project site is completely disturbed and consists of a parking area and a few shed structures previously used for a plant nursery that is no longer in business.

The Project includes the construction of a 12,434-square-foot boutique hotel consisting of 17 hotel rooms across nine detached bungalow structures, a full-service public restaurant, outdoor pool with pool deck, four outdoor spas, and 41 parking spaces, including 4 EV parking spaces. The site also includes 4 motorcycle parking spaces, 1 loading space and 2 bicycle parking spaces. A majority of the landscaping proposed will be native and require minimal water throughout the facility. Entry to and from the property will take place from La Costa Avenue and includes a 330-foot-long driveway within the property.

The Minor Use Permit would be placed over one parcel (APN: 216-030-48), while an adjacent parcel (APN: 216-030-10) would support an offsite 8-inch emergency overflow pipe to discharge to a drainage inlet. The Project will also include public road and infrastructure improvements such as undergrounding existing utility poles, striping on La Costa Avenue, and upgrading the existing water main from Sheridan Road to the Project frontage.

The Project would require the grading of 4,680 cubic yards, with 2,060 cubic yards of cut, 900 cubic yards of fill, 1,160 cubic yards of export, and 1,720 cubic yards of remediation.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

The parcels adjacent to the Project site on the west are designated for residential uses in the City's General Plan. A parcel adjacent to the Project site to the east is an existing gas station that is also designated for visitor serving commercial.

Surrounding lots on the west and south are designated for Residential (R-3) under the City's General Plan and are zoned Residential (R-3). A lot to the east is zoned as Visitor Serving Commercial (VSC). Existing development patterns include large lot residential-type land uses immediately to the west and south, a gas station to the east, and the area to the north is the Batiquitos Lagoon and open space.

Attachments:

Attachment 1: Plans

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<b>Permit Type/Action</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Landscape Plans	City of Encinitas
Grading Permit	City of Encinitas
Minor Use Permit	City of Encinitas
Design Review Permit	City of Encinitas
Coastal Development Permit	City of Encinitas
City Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	City of Encinitas
Grading/Improvement Plans	City of Encinitas
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Industrial Storm Water Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm Water Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	San Dieguito Water District
Sewer District Approval	Leucadia Wastewater District
Fire District Approval	Encinitas Fire Department

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

YES

NO

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, public lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and to reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code §21083.3.2). Information is also available from the Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code §5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code §21082.3(e) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or a “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Aesthetics</u>                    | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Agriculture and Forest Resources</u>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Air Quality</u>                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Biological Resources</u>                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Cultural Resources</u>        | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Energy</u>                                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Geology &amp; Soils</u>           | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u>             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Hazards &amp; Haz. Materials</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Land Use &amp; Planning</u>              | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mineral Resources</u>                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Noise</u>                         | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Population &amp; Housing</u>             | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Public Services</u>                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Recreation</u>                               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Transportation</u>            | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</u>         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Wildfire</u>                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Tribal Cultural Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mandatory Findings of Significance</u>      |

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)  
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

June 30, 2022

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Nicholas Koutoufidis  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

Senior Planner  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

## INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**I. AESTHETICS.** Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099 -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Background:** Pursuant to City General Plan Policy 4.5, the City will designate “Scenic/Visual Corridor Overlay” areas within which the character of development would be regulated to protect the integrity of the Vista Points according to the following criteria:

- Critical viewshed areas should meet the following requirements: – extend radially for 2,000 feet (610M) from the Vista Point; and – cover areas upon which development could potentially obstruct, limit, or degrade the view.
- Development within the critical viewshed area should be subject to Design Review based on the following: – building height, bulk, roof line and color and scale should not obstruct, limit or degrade the existing public views; – landscaping should be located to screen adjacent undesirable views (parking lot areas, mechanical equipment, etc).

Pursuant to City General Plan Policy 4.9, it is intended that development would be subject to the design review provisions of the Scenic/Visual Corridor Overlay Zone for those locations within Scenic View Corridors, along scenic highways and adjacent to significant viewsheds and vista points with the addition of the following design criteria:

- Road Design – Type and physical characteristics of roadway should be compatible with natural character of corridor, and with the scenic highway function.
- Development Design – Building and vegetation setbacks, scenic easements, and height and bulk restrictions should be used to maintain existing views and vistas from the roadway. – Off-site signage should be prohibited and existing billboards removed.
- Development should be minimized and regulated along any bluff silhouette line or on adjacent slopes within view of the lagoon areas and Escondido Creek.
- Where possible, development should be placed and set back from the bases of bluffs, and similarly, set back from bluff or ridge top silhouette lines; shall leave lagoon areas and floodplains open, and shall be sited to provide unobstructed view corridors from the nearest scenic highway.

- Development that is allowed within a viewshed area must respond in scale, roof line, materials, color, massing, and location on site to the topography, existing vegetation, and colors of the native environment. (Coastal Act/30251/30253)

**Less than Significant Impact:** A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

As described in the General Plan, the City of Encinitas contains visual resources affording opportunities for scenic vistas in the community. Scenic/Visual Corridor Overlay Areas (SVCOZA) are identified within the General Plan to ensure that existing views are not compromised by future development. New development can often have the potential to obstruct, interrupt, or detract from a scenic vista.

The Project site is located within the viewshed of one designated undeveloped vista point at the Northwest corner of Interstate 5 and La Costa Avenue. Pursuant to Policy 4.1 of the City General Plan Resource Management Element, this vista point would only be acquired and developed, as feasible. Additionally, adjacent projects such as a gas station and housing development have been established, hindering the view. This vista point has not been acquired or maintained. Therefore, views from this designated vista point would not be adversely affected by the Project.

The Project site is also located within the viewshed of a designated developed vista point at the Northeast corner of Interstate 5 and La Costa Avenue. The Project is approximately 600 feet away from this vista point. The project site is not visible from this designated vista point due to the generally level topography and elevation relative to surrounding lands, as well as intervening development and established vegetation. The site is highly disturbed and does not support any natural scenic resources of value, with the exception of the bluffs along the northern project boundaries and several Torrey Pines, which would not be disturbed by the development of the site as proposed.

Due to the aforementioned criteria, the Project would have a less than significant effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a state scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

The Project site is not located along or in proximity to a state scenic highway. The Project site is located approximately 200 feet west of I-5 and approximately 0.4 mile east of North Coast Highway 101. Both highways offer restricted, intermittent views to the site from varying locations along the roadways; however, neither of these highways are designated as a state scenic highway in the site vicinity.

The City's General Plan Resource Management Element (Policy 4.7) designates North Coast Highway 101 and La Costa Avenue as scenic highways. Because the site is situated on La Costa Avenue, it is visible within the immediate vicinity of La Costa Avenue to the east and west. The site is not visible from North Coast Highway 101 due to distance, intervening visual barriers, and other topographical conditions (curvature of the bluffs and location of the project site along the bluffs). The site is located in an urbanized setting in Encinitas and is highly disturbed due to former development and the subsequent lack of upkeep of the on-site structures. No rock outcroppings are present on-site.

Additionally, landscaping is proposed with the Project to enhance the visual appearance of the site once developed and to help screen views into the site from off-site public vantage points (i.e., La Costa Avenue); refer to Figure 5A, Conceptual Landscape Plan in the Visual Resources Analysis dated April 2022. As the newly planted landscaping matures over time, the visual appearance of the site would continue to be improved as it blends with the visual setting of mature trees in adjacent established neighborhoods.

The subject parcel and adjoining lands do not support designated landmarks or federally, state, or locally designated historic resources. Based on the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation prepared for the Project (ECORP 2019), one site (CA-SDI-603) was previously evaluated as eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). However, the portion of the resource that extends into the Project area does not retain integrity or convey such significance. Therefore, it was determined that the Project would not have a significant impact on site CA-SDI-603;

however, recommendations for worker awareness training, archaeological monitoring, and the management of unanticipated discoveries are proposed.

The Project does not propose any off-site improvements, other than to provide access to the site from La Costa Avenue. Therefore, the Project would not affect on-site or off-site features having scenic value that may contribute to the visual character or image of the neighborhood or community. Although the Project would result in construction and operation of the proposed hotel facilities within the existing landscape, no significant visual resources either on-site or off-site would be removed, substantially altered, or otherwise affected as the result of Project implementation.

Additionally, the proposed use is allowed under the existing General Plan land use and zoning designations and is therefore consistent with land uses intended for the property by the City. Although development of the site with the proposed boutique hotel would change the on-site use from an undeveloped/disturbed to a developed condition, as described above, the site is not considered to be of high scenic value. As such, the Project as proposed would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

- c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, potential aesthetic impacts are evaluated differently based on whether a project is located in a non-urbanized or urban area. Per this threshold, projects located in non-urbanized areas would result in a significant aesthetic impact if the project substantially degraded the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points).

Projects located in urbanized areas would result in a significant aesthetic impact if a project would conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Because the Project is located within an urbanized area of the City of Encinitas, the latter criteria is applied for analyzing potential effects of the proposed Project on aesthetic resources. Below is a discussion of the Project's consistency with key zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality of the subject site.

The Project site is situated adjacent to La Costa Avenue which is designated as a scenic roadway in the City's General Plan (City of Encinitas 1991). Although the Project would alter existing views of the subject site, such development would be consistent with the goals and policies defined in the General Plan; refer also to Table 4-1 in the Visual Resources Analysis dated April 2022. Additionally, the Project would be subject to City review for conformance with design requirements identified in the Municipal Code for the VSC zone (i.e., for height, lot coverage, maximum square footage, etc.). No exceptions (i.e., height variance) to such standards are required for development of the Project as proposed.

Additionally, as the Project would influence future views to the Project site along La Costa Avenue, visual simulations have been prepared to reflect the proposed improvements, including sensitive Project design that reflects the existing small-scale residential character of the surrounding neighborhood in terms of height, scale, building materials, lot coverage, and other such features, as well as landscaping enhancements. Refer to Figure 7, View Location Map, and Figures 9 to 15 in the Visual Resources Analysis dated April 2022, which show "before" and "after" views of the Project site. The visual simulations are intended to demonstrate Project consistency with applicable design and regulatory requirements aimed at maintaining the existing character of La Costa Avenue and providing for the long-term protection of the City's scenic resources and views.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project outdoor lighting would be minimal shielded in such a manner that the light is directed away from streets or adjoining properties. The Project would not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations because the Project's outdoor lighting fixtures shall be fully shielded so as to cause all emitted sustained light to be projected below an imaginary horizontal plane passing through the lowest point of the luminary, lamp or light source used in the fixture. The luminary, lamp, or light source shall not be directly visible from any adjoining residential property. Compliance with the Performance Standards outlined in Chapter 30.40 of the City of Encinitas's Municipal Code is required prior to issuance of a building permit. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

## **II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Portions of the Project site were used previously for agricultural nursery purposes; however, agricultural operations have ceased. Pursuant to the DOC maps, the Project is listed as Urban and Built-Up land. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** As illustrated on the City's E-Zoning application, the Project site is zoned for agricultural use. The nearest locations of Agricultural Preserve areas to the proposed project site per the map showing Williamson Act lands in San Diego County are three parcels over 1 mile away (DOC 2013). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with Williamson Act contract lands, nor would it conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. There would be no impact.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project site, including offsite improvements, does not contain forest land or timberland. The City of Encinitas does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the Project would be consistent with existing zoning and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project site is in an urbanized setting in Encinitas and is highly disturbed due to former development. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of forestland or the conversion of forestland to non-forest use.

- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** As described above in response II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources, a), the Project has been determined to not meet the definition of a significant agricultural resource pursuant to the Guidelines of Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources. In addition, the Project is not under a Williamson Act Contract or within an Agricultural Preserve, nor is the Project site located within the vicinity of a Williamson Act Contract, an Agricultural Preserve, existing agricultural operation, nor surrounded by agricultural-zoned land. Therefore, the Project would not have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, or Unique Farmland to a non-agricultural use

**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is located in the San Diego Air Basin and is regulated by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District. The SDAPCD monitors air pollution, implementation of the County’s portion of the State Implementation Plan, and application of the district’s rules and regulations. The SIP contains strategies and tactics to be applied in order to attain and maintain acceptable air quality in the county, called the Regional Air Quality Strategy.

The SDAPCD is responsible for developing the San Diego portion of the SIP and has developed an attainment plan for attaining the 8 hour NAAQS for ozone. The RAQS sets forth the plans and programs designed to meet the state air quality standards. Through the RAQS and SIP planning processes, the SDAPCD adopts rules, regulations, and programs designed to achieve attainment of the ambient air quality standards and maintain air quality in the San Diego Air Basin.

Conformance with the RAQS and SIP determines whether a project will conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans. The basis for the RAQS and SIP is the distribution of population in the San Diego region as projected by SANDAG. Growth forecasting is based in part on the land uses established in city and county general plans.

The RAQS rely on population and projected growth in the County, mobile, area and all other source emissions in order to project future emissions and determine from that the strategies necessary for the reduction of stationary source emissions through regulatory controls. Mobile source emission projections and growth projections are based on population and vehicle trends and land use plans developed by the cities and by the County. As such, projects that are consistent with the growth anticipated by the General Plan would be considered consistent with the RAQS. The project proposes to ultimately construct a boutique hotel on a site that is zoned for Visitor Serving Commercial. The project is consistent with the City’s zoning and General Plan land use designation for the site. The project’s anticipated emissions are therefore addressed in the RAQS and SIP, and the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the RAQS and SIP. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) 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?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated:** Currently, San Diego County is in “non-attainment” status for federal and state Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and state Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns and less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). O<sub>3</sub> is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) 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 PM<sub>10</sub> in both urban

and rural areas include the following: 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.

During construction of the proposed project, fugitive dust emissions will be expected during grading operations from heavy equipment usage and from construction workers commuting to and from the site. During short-term construction activities, the proposed project will generate less than significant impacts based on thresholds established by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SSDAPCD) and will not require mitigation. Also, based on the project size, emissions and relative location to nearby cumulative projects, the proposed project would generate less than significant cumulative construction impacts.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated:** Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality.

Guidance from the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (2003) Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis, suggests projects that should be evaluated for diesel particulate emissions include truck stops, distribution centers, warehouses, and transit centers. Residential projects such as the proposed project would not attract a disproportionate amount of diesel trucks and would not be considered a source of TAC emissions. Compliance with mitigation measures M-HAZ-1 and M-HAZ-2 would ensure that any potential hazardous exposure would not occur. Therefore, the Project would not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of identified sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Individual responses to odors are highly variable and can result in various effects, including psychological (i.e., irritation, anger, or anxiety) and physiological (i.e., circulatory and respiratory effects, nausea, vomiting, and headache). Generally, the impact of an odor results from a variety of interacting factors such as frequency, duration, offensiveness, location, and sensory perception.

The frequency is a measure of how often an individual is exposed to an odor in the ambient environment. The intensity refers to an individual's or group's perception of the odor strength or concentration. The duration of an odor refers to the elapsed time over which an odor is experienced. The offensiveness of the odor is the subjective rating of the pleasantness or unpleasantness of an odor. The location accounts for the type of area in which a potentially affected person lives, works, or visits; the type of activity they are engaged in; and the sensitivity of the impacted receptor.

CARB's (2005) Air Quality and Land Use Handbook identifies the sources of the most common odor complaints received by local air districts. Typical sources include facilities such as sewage treatment plants, landfills, recycling facilities, petroleum refineries, and livestock operations. The project does not contain any of the land uses identified as typically associated with emissions of objectionable odors. As such, project impacts would be less than significant.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** No sensitive species are located or were observed on the project site. Due to conditions on the project site and lack of suitable habitat, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is in an urban area in Encinitas and is disturbed from previous development. The Batiquitos Lagoon preserve, identified in the City of Carlsbad's HMP is located within the 100-foot wetland buffer extending from the wetland areas of the lagoon. The landward extent of the wetland buffer does not reach the subject property. There are no effects to riparian or other sensitive natural community. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project site does not contain any wetlands and will not impact through, discharging into, directly removing, filling, or hydrologically interrupting, any federally protected wetlands. Therefore, no significant impacts will occur to wetlands or waters of the U.S. as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of the City's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, it has been determined that the site has limited biological value and impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the Project due to the Project area being adjacent to development and busy roads. Breeding season avoidance will be implemented and if an active nest is observed, avoidance measures will be implemented. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, such as a tree prevention policy or ordinance?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances for biological resources. Policy 3.6 of the City General Plan states “Future development shall maintain significant mature trees to the extent possible and incorporate them into the design of development projects.” The Project does not contain any mature trees with community significance.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Project does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Breeding season avoidance will be implemented and if an active nest is observed, avoidance measures will be implemented. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** A cultural resources report titled, *Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation* (April 2019), prepared by ECORP Consulting evaluated the significance of the historical resources based on a review of historical records including site record forms, historic maps, historic addresses and an architectural evaluation. Based on the results of this study, it has been determined that the historic resource is not significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Because the resources are not considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5, the loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Background:** The following goal and policies are relevant in protecting cultural and paleontological resources in the City.

RM GOAL 7: The City will make every effort to ensure significant scientific and cultural resources in the Planning Area are preserved for future generations.

RM GOAL 7.1: Require that paleontological, historical and archaeological resources in the planning area are documented, preserved or salvaged if threatened by new development.

RM GOAL 7.2: Conduct a survey to identify historic structures and archaeological/cultural sites throughout the community and ensure that every action is taken to ensure their preservation.

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated:**

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by ECORP Consulting (2019), it has been determined that the Project site does contain potential archaeological resources. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation (April 2019), prepared by John T. O'Connor, Ph.D, RPA. An Archaeological Monitoring Program will be made a condition of approval for the potential discovery of buried resources as outlined below.

- Pre-Construction
  - Contract with an archaeologist to perform archaeological monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all earth-disturbing activities. The Project Archaeologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, during and after construction.
  - Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.
  - If on-site and/or off-site ground disturbing activities (e.g., exploratory trenching or excavations) are required for any informal or formal solicitation (written or spoken) of construction bids or similar requirements, all applicable requirements identified in mitigation measures
- Construction
  - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and 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

Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and 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 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 City of Encinitas Development Services at the time of discovery.
  - The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the City of Encinitas Development Services and the Native American monitor shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
  - Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the City of Encinitas Development Services 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 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 Native American monitor and approved by the Project Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).
- Human Remains.
  - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the City of Encinitas Development Services.
  - 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 human remains are to be taken offsite for evaluation, they shall be accompanied by the Luiseno Native American monitor.
  - 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

- Monitoring Report. 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 South Coastal Information Center and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
- Final Grading
  - Final. Report. 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 and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.

- Cultural Material Conveyance
  - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe.
  - The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (Assembly Bill [AB] 2641). The archaeologist shall notify the San Diego County Medical Examiner (as per § 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of § 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, § 5097.98 of the California PRC, and AB 2641 will be implemented. If the Medical Examiner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, the Medical Examiner will notify the NAHC, who then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for the Project (§ 5097.98 of the PRC). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC may mediate (§ 5097.94 of the PRC). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (§ 5097.98 of the PRC). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate information center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the City, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to its satisfaction. Therefore, the Project would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated for cultural monitoring.

**VI. ENERGY** -- Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Through the mobile source emission regulatory framework, Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, and RPS, emissions will be reduced further for the Proposed Project to a level that is consistent with the goals of AB 32.

Net emissions of GHGs were quantified for both construction and operation of the 516 La Costa Boutique Hotel Project. Both the project’s total GHG emissions of 291 metric tons of CO2e and would be below the CAPCOA screening threshold of 900 metric tons of CO2e. Through the mobile source emission regulatory framework, Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, and RPS, emissions will be reduced further for the Proposed Project to a level that is consistent with the goals of AB 32.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Through the mobile source emission regulatory framework, Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, and RPS, emissions will be reduced further for the Proposed Project to a level that is consistent with the goals of AB 32.

Net emissions of GHGs were quantified for both construction and operation of the 516 La Costa Boutique Hotel Project. Both the project’s total GHG emissions of 291 metric tons of CO2e and would be below the CAPCOA screening threshold of 900 metric tons of CO2e. Through the mobile source emission regulatory framework, Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, and RPS, emissions will be reduced further for the Proposed Project to a level that is consistent with the goals of AB 32.

**VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

A Geotechnical Investigation (Investigation) has been prepared by Engineering Design Group, dated February 27, 2018. The following responses has incorporated the analysis from the Investigation.

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Our review of geologic literature pertaining to the general site area indicates the subject site is not within a mapped fault zone. It is our opinion that the site could be subjected to moderate to severe ground shaking in the event of a major earthquake along any of the faults in the Southern California region. The seismic risk at this site is similar to that of the surrounding developed area.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** To ensure the structural integrity of all structures, the Proposed Project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the Project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Liquefaction of cohesionless soils can be caused by strong vibratory motion due to earthquakes. Research and historical data indicate that loose, granular soils underlain by a near-surface ground water table are most susceptible to liquefaction, while the stability of most silty sands and clays is not adversely affected by vibratory motion. Because of the dense nature of the soil materials underlying the site and the lack of near surface water, the potential for lateral spreading, liquefaction, subsidence or seismically induced dynamic settlement at the site is considered low. The effects of seismic shaking can be reduced by adhering to the most recent edition of the California Building Code and current design parameters of the Structural Engineers Association of California. Therefore, the impacts are less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** According to the Project's "Preliminary Geotech Investigation and Foundation Recommendations" (2018) by Engineering Design Group, as part of the preparation of this report they have reviewed geologic maps of the subject area. Their review of geologic maps does not indicate landslide deposits at the area in and around the subject site. Therefore, the impacts are less than significant.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The Project would not result in unprotected erodible soils. Topsoil, fill and weathered unsuitable materials were encountered to depths up to 18 feet below adjacent grade in our exploratory borings. These materials consist of brown to dark brown to dark brownish gray, dry to moist, very loose to medium dense, silty sands and sandy silts, with organics and debris. In general, these materials are not considered suitable for the support of structures and structural improvements in their present state, but may be utilized as re-compacted fill if necessary, provided the recommendations of this report are followed. Unsuitable soil materials classify as SW-SM per the Unified Soil Classification System, and based on visual observation, are considered to possess low to medium potential for expansion.
- A Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) and Drainage Study (July 2021) have been prepared by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates for the Project. Proposed new stormwater drainage facilities would include infiltration basins to capture runoff and protect downstream resources.
- The Project involves grading. However, the Project would be required to comply with the City's Grading Ordinance. Compliance with these regulations would minimize the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.

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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would require the grading of 4,680 cubic yards, with 2,060 cubic yards of cut, 900 cubic yards of fill, 1,160 cubic yards of export, and 1,720 cubic yards of remediation. In order to assure that Proposed Project components are adequately supported, a Geotechnical Investigation was prepared for the Project, in compliance with the City of Encinitas Building Permit process. The investigation found that excessive swelling or shrinkage of surficial soil/rock due to wetting and drying over time is not anticipated. The investigation evaluated the strength of underlying soils and provided recommendations on foundation design. The investigation demonstrated that the site would be suitable for development when constructed in accordance with structural stability standards required by the California Building Code, and in compliance with the Grading Ordinance. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to Section VI Geology and Soils, Question a), iii) through iv) listed above.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** According to the Project's "Preliminary Geotech Investigation and Foundation Recommendations" (2018) by Engineering Design Group, and Addendum #1 to the report (March 2020), the Project would be designed and constructed in compliance with the California Building Code design standards and incorporate geotechnical recommendations to ensure soil stability and proper engineering design of the battery storage footings, thus reducing potential impacts related to geologic units or soils to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Project would not create a substantial risk to life or property and impacts would be less than significant.

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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The Project will connect to the Leucadia Wastewater District. Therefore, the Project would have no impact related to the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Impacts on paleontological resources occur when excavation activities encounter fossiliferous geological deposits and cause physical destruction of fossil remains. Fossil remains, fossil sites, fossil-producing geologic formations, and geologic formations with the potential for containing fossil remains are all considered paleontological resources or have the potential to be paleontological resources. Fossil remains are considered important if they are well preserved, identifiable, type/topotypic specimens, age diagnostic, useful in environmental reconstruction, and/or represent new, rare, and/or endemic taxa. The potential for impacts on fossils depends on the sensitivity of the geologic unit and the amount and depth of grading and excavation.

Much of the project area is considered sensitive for paleontological resources. The project area is underlain by Torrey Sandstone and the Del Mar Formation, which are considered sensitive for paleontological resources. There is a possibility of the unanticipated discovery of paleontological resources during ground-disturbing activities as well as the potential to damage or destroy paleontological resources that may be present below the ground surface.

A Paleontological Data Recovery and Monitoring Plan will be made a condition of approval for the potential discovery of buried resources as outlined below:

1. Prior to grading permit issuance, during grading and excavation activities, and prior to building permit issuance, the project applicant shall implement a paleontological monitoring and recovery program consisting of the following measures, which shall be included on project grading plans to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department:
  - a. The project applicant shall retain the services of a qualified paleontologist to conduct a paleontological monitoring and recovery program. A qualified paleontologist is defined as an individual having an M.S. or Ph.D. degree in paleontology or geology, and who is a recognized expert in the identification of fossil materials and the application of paleontological recovery procedures and techniques. As part of the monitoring program, a paleontological monitor may work under the direction of a qualified paleontologist. A paleontological monitor is defined as an individual having experience in the collection and salvage of fossil materials.
  - b. The qualified paleontologist shall attend the project pre-construction meeting to consult with the grading and excavation contractors concerning the grading plan and paleontological field techniques.
  - c. The qualified paleontologist or paleontological monitor shall be on site on a full-time basis during the original cutting of previously undisturbed portions of the underlying very old paralic deposits. If the qualified paleontologist or paleontological monitor ascertains that the noted formations are not fossil-bearing, the qualified paleontologist shall have the authority to terminate the monitoring program.
  - d. If fossils are discovered, recovery shall be conducted by the qualified paleontologist or paleontological monitor. In most cases, fossil salvage can be completed in a short period of time, although some fossil specimens (such as a complete large mammal skeleton) may require an extended salvage period. In these instances, the paleontologist (or paleontological monitor) shall have the authority to temporarily direct, divert, or halt grading to allow recovery of fossil remains in a timely manner.
  - e. If subsurface bones or other potential fossils are found anywhere within the project site by construction personnel in the absence of a qualified paleontologist or paleontological monitor, the qualified paleontologist shall be notified immediately to assess their significance and make further recommendations.
  - f. Fossil remains collected during monitoring and salvage shall be cleaned, sorted, and catalogued. Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos, and maps, shall be deposited (as a donation) in a scientific institution with permanent paleontological collections such as the San Diego Natural History Museum.

2. Prior to building permit issuance, a final summary report outlining the results of the mitigation program shall be prepared by the qualified paleontologist and submitted to the Development Services Department for concurrence. This report shall include discussions of the methods used, stratigraphic section(s) exposed, fossils collected, and significance of recovered fossils, as well as appropriate maps.

**VIII. 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would produce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions during construction activities, as well as during the operation of the Project through vehicle trips and landscaping maintenance.

**GHG Overview**

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons, and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which set the GHG emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill (SB) 375, passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to set regional targets for the

purpose of reducing GHG emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing, and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has prepared a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which are elements of the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. The strategy identifies how regional GHG reduction targets, as established by the CARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible. The County of San Diego has also adopted various GHG related goals and policies in the General Plan.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions would generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature; however, an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) states that an environmental impact report (EIR) shall analyze GHG emissions resulting from a proposed project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

#### Background on Climate Action Plan

The City of Encinitas adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) in January 2018 and an interim revision on November 2020. The CAP outlines actions that the City of Encinitas will undertake to meet its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions targets. Implementation of the CAP requires that new development projects incorporate more sustainable design standards and implement applicable reduction measures consistent with the CAP.

#### Project Analysis

The City of Encinitas has not established a GHG significance threshold to date. Several lead agencies in California have adopted a screening threshold as recommended by the CAPCOA Report, CEQA and Climate Change – Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, which proposes a screening-level threshold of 900 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e to evaluate whether a project must conduct further analysis.

For the purpose of this analysis, the CAPCOA screening threshold of 900 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e has been used to evaluate the potential significance of GHG emissions associated with the project.

As shown in Table 4 of the Greenhouse Gas Study dated February 15, 2022, the total CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from the project would be 291 metric tons. The total GHG emissions are below the CAPCOA screening threshold of 900 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e. The project's contribution to GHG emissions would therefore be less than significant.

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the City of Encinitas CAP.

Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. Impacts would be less than significant.

**IX. 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact       Less than Significant Impact  
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated       No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment completed for the Project, in conformance with the scope and limitations of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E 1527-13 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process as referenced in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 312 (the All Appropriate Inquiries [AAI] Rule), the Project site contains known or suspected “recognized environmental conditions” (REC) as defined in the ASTM E 1527-13 Standard.

RECs are defined, according to ASTM E1527-13 as: the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. De minimis conditions are not RECs (ASTM 1527-13, 2013).

The results of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment completed for the Project indicate that organochlorine pesticides (OCPs) impacted soils are present generally at shallow depths within limited areas of the site.

The Project will be required to adhere to the Soil Management Plan (SMP) (2017), the Site Health & Safety Plan (SHSP), and the Community Health and Safety Plan (CHSP).

The SMP describes the scope of work for the segregation, reuse and disposal of soils to be excavated during a grading project for the construction of a future 2-story hotel on 1.18 acres of land with no underground parking. Based on the results of the December 2018 Environmental Site Characterization Report, approximately 1,680 cubic yards of soil is anticipated to be exported. If additional, previously unidentified odorous, stained or discolored soils are encountered, they will be segregated, sampled and managed per protocols. Clean soils will be reused per SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2014-0041. Confirmation samples will be taken at a frequency of one per 20 linear feet along sidewalls and excavation bottom. If Contaminants of Concern are detected in any sample above the relevant screening level, additional excavation and sampling can occur.

The CHSP addresses proposed safeguards for the community. Potential Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) vapors will be measured by a Photo Ionization Detector (PID). The report describes the proposed methods for the application of water, mist, other barriers, etc., to control dust, or VOC's if PID readings over 25 ppm are noted for 30 seconds or more.

On September 23, 2020 the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Site Assessment and Mitigation Program concurred on all of these studies. The SMP was approved by the County of San Diego with the following condition: Confirmation sample results should be compared to SF-RWQCB Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) versus RSLs.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** See Response to IX.a. Compliance with mitigation measures M-HAZ-1 and M-HAZ-2 will reduce to less than significant.

c) 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:**

The Project is approximately 1.4 miles from the nearest school, Capri Elementary School, which is located at 941 Capri Road. No schools or residences are located within a quarter mile, therefore the Project would have no impacts.

- d) 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated:** See Response to IX.a. Compliance with mitigation measures M-HAZ-1 and M-HAZ-2 will reduce to less than significant. Therefore, with the mitigation proposed, the impacts will be less than significant.

- 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 result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No impact:** There are no public or private airports within 2 miles of the project site, and the project site is outside of an airport land use plan. The closest (public) airport is McClellan-Palomar Airport, approximately 6.1 miles northeast of the project site, and there are no private airstrips in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the Project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The 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.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan would not be interfered with by the Project due to the location of the Project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the City of Encinitas and as such a project is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

**No Impact:** The Oil Spill Contingency Element would not be interfered with because the Project does not propose any use of oil onsite. In the event that an unauthorized release of oil were to occur, the California State Warning Center and the National Response Center would be notified.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan would not be interfered with because the Project does not include the alteration of a major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

**No Impact:** The Dam Evacuation Plan would not be interfered with because the Project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project is not listed as a very high fire hazard area in a Local Responsibility Area and has been reviewed and accepted by the Encinitas Fire Department. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** -- Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would be required to obtain a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. Minimum required construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) would include vegetation stabilization planting, fiber rolls (straw wattles), stabilized construction entrance, materials management, and waste management.

In addition, a Preliminary Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Stormwater Treatment Study (July 2021) and Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) (October 2020), have been prepared to demonstrate that the Project would comply with all operational requirements.

Potential water quality impacts associated with short-term grading and construction activities include discharge of construction-related sediment and hazardous materials (e.g., fuels). However, with implementation of best management practices during construction as required by a SWPPP (2020), such water quality impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Additional urban runoff pollutants within the project corridor would include litter, trash, and debris; bacteria and viruses from pet feces; oil, grease, metals, and toxic chemicals from vehicle hydrocarbons; and sediments, nutrients, pesticides, and fertilizers from landscaped areas. In the existing condition, a portion of the site drains to the west and north, discharging out the northwest corner of the site through an existing pipe down to the lagoon. The other portion of the site currently drains to the east and out an existing pipe to the bottom of the slope adjacent to the freeway.

A bioretention basin is proposed on the north end of the site. In general, the site will drain south to north either along proposed curb or will sheet flow into proposed storm drain that will discharge into the Bioretention Basin. The basin will be lined and has an overflow inlet to discharge out via a PVC pipe that outlets to two proposed MaxWell IV infiltration pits by Torrent where the water will infiltrate on site. In the instance of an emergency, where stormwater will not infiltrate, an emergency overflow pipe directly connected to the infiltration pit will gravity drain stormwater to the La Costa 48 project to the west.

The storm drainpipe will be connected to the La Costa 48 project's drainage inlet B, the emergency overflow inlet located on the easterly portion of the site.

The proposed development and proposed storm drain design will be capable of not only safely conveying the 100-year storm runoff flow, but has included many instruments into the storm drain system design to ensure that the discharge from the project site is of the best possible quality and will not pose any significant impact or threats to the water quality of the Pacific Ocean, or the public storm drain system. In addition, the proposed development and storm drain improvements will not significantly alter the existing drainage patterns. Any increase in storm water runoff will be detained and will not increase the potential for flooding or create an increase in erosion.

Therefore, the Project would have less than significant impacts on water quality standards and discharge requirements, as well as degradation of surface and groundwater quality in general.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** As identified by the San Diego Basin Plan, the Project site drains within Carlsbad Hydrologic Unit, specifically the San Marcos Hydrologic Sub Area

The PDP SWQMP prepared for the Project proposes the following design measures and source control BMPs such that potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of pollutants in receiving waters and reduce impacts on storm water quality and hydromodification to less than significant levels: vegetation stabilization planting, fiber rolls (straw wattles), stabilized construction entrance, materials and waste management, permeable surfaces, and a biofiltration basin.

Project implementation would not include development activities that could otherwise deplete groundwater supplies. Infiltration would be maintained through project design including detention basins and low impact design requirements of the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System

(MS4) permit. This includes management practices, control techniques, system design and engineering methods, and other measures as appropriate. The proposed project would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, and potential impacts to groundwater supplies would be less than significant.

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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** With implementation of best management practices (BMPs) during construction as required by a SWPPP, the Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Post construction BMPs described in the SWQMP. As indicated, with implementation of BMPs the project would not alter drainage patterns, but would instead maintain and improve the existing storm drainage. In addition, the project would not alter the course of a stream or river. Thus, no potential for substantial erosion or siltation would occur on- or off- site. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surface, in a manner which would:

(i) result in substantial erosion or siltration on- or offsite;

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** As outlined in the PDP SWQMP prepared for the Project, the Project would implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or permanent post construction pollutant and hydro-modification control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: permeable surfaces and biofiltration basins. Runoff would be directed to the proposed infiltration basins located at the northern end of the facility and along the access driveway. These measures would control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements. The PDP SWQMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that would address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation. The Development Services – Engineering Division would ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, the Project would not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and impacts

would be less than significant. For further information on soil erosion, refer to Section VII, Geology and Soils, Question b).

(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Preliminary Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Stormwater Study analyzes drainage before and after proposed development of the Project site, including BMPs required to control runoff rate and quality to ensure that no adverse effects would occur to downgradient neighboring properties, consistent with city and state requirements.

A bioretention basin is proposed on the north end of the site. In general, the site will drain south to north either along proposed curb or will sheet flow into proposed storm drain that will discharge into the Bioretention Basin. The basin will be lined and has an overflow inlet to discharge out via a PVC pipe that outlets to two proposed MaxWell IV infiltration pits by Torrent where the water will infiltrate on site. In the instance of an emergency, where stormwater will not infiltrate, an emergency overflow pipe directly connected to the infiltration pit will gravity drain stormwater to the La Costa 48 project to the west.

The storm drainpipe will be connected to the La Costa 48 project's drainage inlet B, the emergency overflow inlet located on the easterly portion of the site.

The proposed development and proposed storm drain design will be capable of not only safely conveying the 100-year storm runoff flow, but has included many instruments into the storm drain system design to ensure that the discharge from the project site is of the best possible quality and will not pose any significant impact or threats to the water quality of the Pacific Ocean, or the public storm drain system. In addition, the proposed development and storm drain improvements will not significantly alter the existing drainage patterns. Any increase in storm water runoff will be detained and will not increase the potential for flooding or create an increase in erosion.

Impacts would be less than significant.

(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed development and proposed storm drain design will be capable of not only safely conveying the 100-year storm runoff flow, but has included many instruments into the storm drain system design to ensure that the discharge from the project site is of the best possible quality and will not pose any significant impact or threats to the water quality of the Pacific Ocean, or the public storm drain system. In addition, the proposed development and storm drain improvements will not significantly alter the existing drainage patterns. Any increase in storm water runoff will be detained and will not increase the potential for flooding or create an increase in erosion.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** As discussed above in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, Question e)ii), flows would be controlled at the points where existing runoff leaves the property. Therefore, the Project would not impede or redirect flows. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project site is not located within Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), County Floodplain, County Floodway, or Dam Inundation flood zones. In addition, the Project site is not located within a tsunami or seiche inundation zone. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

f) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project site would be in compliance with the approved Stormwater Quality Management Plan and all applicable City of Encinitas Municipal Code sections. See responses to Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, Questions a) through d). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No impact:** The Project does not propose the introduction of new major infrastructure such as roadways, water supply systems or utilities to the area. The Project was accounted for in the City's General Plan and is consistent with the Visitor Serving Commercial General Plan category and zoning for the site. Therefore, the Project is considered consistent with surrounding land uses and would not significantly disrupt or physically divide an established community. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project complies with all land use plans, policies, and regulations. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

**XII. 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No impact:** No known mineral resource recovery sites occur or are designated within or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state. There would be no impact.

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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project site is not in an area designated by the State for locally important mineral resources and is not utilized for mineral resource production. As such, the proposed project would not 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. There would be no impact.

**XIII. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

- a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** The Project includes the construction of a 12,434-square-foot boutique hotel consisting of 17 hotel rooms across nine detached bungalow structures, a full-service public restaurant, outdoor pool with pool deck, four outdoor spas, and 41 parking spaces. A majority of the landscaping proposed will be native and require minimal water throughout the facility. Entry to and from the property will take place from La Costa Avenue and includes a 340-foot-long driveway within the property. A Noise Impact Analysis was prepared for the Project by Eilar Associates, Inc. in February 2021. According to the study, the Project is consistent with the City of Encinitas Plan, Noise Ordinance, and other applicable noise standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The City of Encinitas Noise Element to the General Plan states that noise levels at outdoor use areas of transient lodging (hotel/motel) uses should not exceed 70 CNEL in order to be considered “conditionally acceptable.” A noise analysis was performed to determine anticipated future noise impacts at proposed outdoor use areas on the project site. In order to mitigate noise impacts at outdoor use areas, several sound attenuation barriers are required. The sound attenuation barriers were input into the noise model in locations that would provide shielding from noise associated with traffic traveling on Interstate 5, which is the primary source of noise impacting these receivers. One of the proposed sound barriers should be located toward the north end of the project site and should extend a minimum of 5 feet in height above the finished floor elevation of the restaurant outdoor seating and spa deck areas to attenuate noise levels at these areas. Additionally, a six-foot-tall sound attenuation barrier should be installed along the eastern property line to mitigate noise impacts to the private outdoor use areas for hotel guests. The balcony barriers on the second floors of each bungalow should also be constructed as sound attenuation barriers, with a minimum height of 3.5 feet above the elevation of the balcony floor. Please refer to Section 5.1.1 of the Noise Study for more information.

Noise Ordinance

The City of Encinitas also requires an analysis to determine whether the proposed project will have an adverse noise impact on surrounding properties. Noise limits specified within Section 30.40 of the City of Encinitas Municipal Code must be met at neighboring property lines. The impact of project-generated traffic noise is anticipated to be insignificant at off-site noise sensitive properties.

Additionally, calculations show that noise levels generated by air conditioning units, background music, and persons gathered in proposed outdoor use areas of the project site are expected to be adequately controlled by distance attenuation at surrounding property lines and, therefore, should remain in compliance with the noise requirements of the City of Encinitas.

Section 9.32.410 of the City of Encinitas Municipal Code restricts the operation of construction equipment to the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., Mondays through Saturdays. The Municipal Code also states that it is unlawful to operate construction equipment that exceeds a noise level of 75 dBA for more than eight hours during any 24-hour period when measured at residential property lines.

Based on the currently proposed construction activities, noise levels are only expected to be 75 dBA or greater at residential property lines when activity is taking place within 35 to 65 feet of the nearest property line, and at all other times will be less than 75 dBA. Due to the large area of the site, this scenario is only expected to take place for very brief periods of time throughout the day, and for this reason, construction limited to the twelve allowable hours of operation established within the code will comply with City of Encinitas noise regulations. General good practice measures should also be followed, including reasonable maintenance of equipment, conservative planning of simultaneous equipment operation, and using equipment with effective mufflers. Compliance with mitigation measures M-NOI-1 and M-NOI-2 will reduce this to less than significant. Therefore, the Project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, Encinitas Municipal Code noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated:** Section 9.32.410 of the City of Encinitas Municipal Code restricts the operation of construction equipment to the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., Mondays through Saturdays. The Municipal Code also states that it is unlawful to operate construction equipment that exceeds a noise level of 75 dBA for more than eight hours during any 24-hour period when measured at residential property lines.

Based on the currently proposed construction activities, noise levels are only expected to be 75 dBA or greater at residential property lines when activity is taking place within 35 to 65 feet of the nearest property line, and at all other times will be less than 75 dBA. Due to the large area of the site, this scenario is only expected to take place for very brief periods of time throughout the day, and for this reason, construction limited to the twelve allowable hours of operation

established within the code will comply with City of Encinitas noise regulations. General good practice measures should also be followed, including reasonable maintenance of equipment, conservative planning of simultaneous equipment operation, and using equipment with effective mufflers. Compliance with mitigation measures M-NOI-1 and M-NOI-2 will reduce this to less than significant.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:**

a) Induce substantial unplanned 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project is for the development of a hotel. This physical change would not induce substantial population growth in the area because it would only attract paid lodging on a short-term basis. In addition, the Project site and approximately 6 square miles of surrounding lands that have a population of greater than 1,000 persons per square mile and is considered "urban" by the U.S. census. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Proposed Project would not displace any existing people or housing because the Project site is presently vacant.

#### **XV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Based on the service availability forms received for the Project, the Proposed Project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the Project from the following agencies/districts: Leucadia Wastewater District and Encinitas Fire District. The Project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities, including, but not limited to, fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the Project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the Project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

**XVI. RECREATION**

- 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

- 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION** -- Would the project:

- a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is the designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), of which the CMP is an element, to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced

CEQA review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project's impacts on CMP system roadways, their associated costs and identify appropriate mitigation.

The City of Encinitas has also developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the city. The TIF program creates a mechanism to proportionally fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. These new projects were based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected buildout (year 2030) development conditions on the existing Mobility Element roadway network throughout the City of Encinitas. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies would be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's RTP. The RTP, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, State, and Federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would not have a direct impact related to a conflict with any plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system. Project trips, or average daily trips (ADTs), is approximately 287 ADTs during project operation. Pursuant to the Traffic Study dated June 2021, trips would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. Further, payment of the TIF would be required at issuance of building permits.

Implementation of the Project would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, nor would it generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

b) Would the project conflict or be consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, *Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts*, land use projects would be evaluated based on vehicle miles traveled. As discussed above, traffic associated with Project operation has an estimated trip generation of 287 ADTs. The Project would not generate sufficient traffic to require advanced CEQA review per the CMP. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** T The proposed project would not include sharp curves or dangerous intersections. Instead, the site would be improved with high visibility driveway ingress and egress and sidewalks. A 5-foot-wide sidewalk is proposed along the project frontage onto La Costa Avenue. No changes would be made to the alignment of existing streets.

In addition, the Project would not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the Project would not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would not generate traffic volumes that would impede emergency access. A 24-foot-wide emergency vehicle access easement is proposed to ensure adequate emergency vehicle circulation and turnaround (refer to Figure 1-3A in Appendix 3.10). The

project would not alter any established emergency vehicle routes or otherwise interfere with emergency access.

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of Historical Resources as defined in Public Resources Code §5020.1(k), or

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Due to the high potential for uncovering unknown subsurface archaeological resources, including Native American tribal cultural resources, cultural resource mitigation monitoring shall be undertaken for any and all on-site and off-site ground disturbing activities. If on-site and/or off-site ground disturbing activities (e.g., exploratory trenching or excavations) are required for any informal or formal solicitation (written or spoken) of construction bids or similar requirements, all applicable requirements identified in mitigation measures CUL-3 to CUL-9 shall be undertaken by the applicant and/or owner. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Due to the high potential for uncovering unknown subsurface archaeological resources, including Native American tribal cultural resources, cultural resource mitigation monitoring shall be undertaken for any and all on-site and off-site ground disturbing activities. If on-site and/or off-site ground disturbing activities (e.g., exploratory trenching or excavations) are required for any informal or formal solicitation (written or spoken) of construction bids or similar requirements, all applicable requirements identified in mitigation measures CUL-3 to CUL-9 shall be undertaken by the applicant and/or owner. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As noted in Section V, Cultural Resources, Questions b) and c), monitoring of initial ground disturbance by a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor would be implemented to mitigate potential impacts to sensitive resources, should subsurface resources be found during the construction process. Thus, potential impacts tribal cultural resources, as defined in Public Resources Code §5024.1(c) would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** -- Would the project:

- a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Proposed stormwater drainage facilities would include infiltration basins located in the northern portion of the facility, as well as along the access driveway parcel. In addition, connection to the existing San Dieguito Water District water line along La Costa Avenue would be established at the Project entrance to supply water to the facility. The Project would not require the construction or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities. The project is proposing a connection to natural gas with SDG&E. No telecommunications facilities would be required. Therefore, the Project would not require the construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The San Dieguito Water District is providing water to the proposed project, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Limited water required during the construction phase would be trucked in as necessary. Therefore, the Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project.

c) 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Project would connect to the Leucadia Wastewater District; therefore, the Project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers service capacity.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project proposes recycling, reduction, and reuse of construction materials. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are four, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid

waste capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs and the Project would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- |                          |  |                                     |                              |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project proposes recycling, reduction, and reuse of construction materials. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The Project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**XX. WILDFIRE** -- If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

- a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- |                          |  |                                     |                              |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. Project access has been designed in conformance with State law, and local regulations, and in coordination with the Encinitas Fire District. The Project complies with emergency access requirements, per the San Diego County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code, including turning radius and maneuverability of large emergency vehicles such as fire trucks and ambulances. Per Encinitas Fire District emergency vehicle requirements, the paved width of the Project access road would total 24 feet, including a turnaround at the northern end of the facility. Further, the Project would contribute its fair share towards funding the appropriate fire and emergency medical services to adequately serve the Project, as determined through required development fees. Therefore, the Project would not

substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

- b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentration from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project is not listed as a high fire hazard area but is located. The Project would comply with regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Fire Code. Implementation of these fire safety standards would occur during the building permit process.

Based on review of the Project by City staff and through compliance with the Encinitas Fire District's conditions, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Therefore, based on Project coordination with staff, compliance with the City Fire Code, and compliance with the Encinitas Fire District's conditions, impacts associated with fire risk would be less than significant.

- d) Expose people or structure to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** As previously stated in response XX(b), a Stormwater Management Plan and Drainage Study has been prepared for the Project to ensure adequate drainage. Proposed new stormwater drainage facilities would include a large infiltration basin located at the northern end of the facility, as well as two smaller basins along the sides of the project. In addition, pursuant to the Geotechnical Investigation, the potential for landslides at the Project site is low due to the minimal grading required at the site. Therefore, impacts from downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes would be considered less than significant.

**XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

- a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- |                                     |  |                          |                              |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to Project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the Proposed Project's potential for significant cumulative effects. As a result of this evaluation, the Proposed Project was determined to have potential significant effects related to air quality, geology (paleontological resources), cultural and tribal resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance.

As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this Project would result. Therefore, this Project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- |                                     |  |                          |                              |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects located within a 1-mile radius of the Project were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	ADDRESS	PROJECT NUMBER
2100 N Coast Highway Hotel	2100 N Coast Highway	04-268
Nine Residential Unit Project	378 Fulvia Street	13-187
Weston Development	510 La Costa Avenue	15-222
One Unit Development	1569 Lorraine Drive	17-152
Mixed Use Project	740 N. Coast Highway 101	17-197
Surfer's Point 25-room hotel	100 Carlsbad Boulevard	17-205
16 residential units	555 N Vulcan Avenue	18-220
90 units (not submitted but evaluated regardless)	1251 N Vulcan Avenue	17-280
30-room hotel, 96 family units, and 18,261 sf of commercial/retail space	N Coast Highway 101	MULTI-3780-2020
137 condos and 18,000 sf retail	Ponto Beachfront at Carlsbad Boulevard	2016-0002-MS

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in Sections I through XIX of this form. In addition to Project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the Project's potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, the Proposed Project was determined to have potential significant effects related to air quality, geology (paleontological resources), cultural and tribal resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance.

As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this Project. Therefore, this Project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in

Sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VII. Geology and Soils, IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, X Hydrology and Water Quality, XIII. Noise, XIV. Population and Housing, and XVII. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, the Proposed Project was determined to have potential significant effects related to air quality, geology (paleontological resources), cultural and tribal resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance.

Therefore, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this Project. Therefore, this Project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

## XX. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Michael Baker International, (April 2022), Visual Resources Analysis Report

Castells, Shelby; Red Tail Environmental, (October 2018), Cultural Resources Survey Report

ECORP Consulting (May 2022), Cultural Resources Inventory

Engineering Design Group., (February 2018), Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation and Foundation Recommendations Proposed Commercial Structure

Engineering Design Group., (February 2020), Addendum No. 2

Eilar Associates, Inc., (February 2022), Greenhouse Gas Analysis

Eilar Associates, Inc., (February 2021), Noise Impact Analysis

Leighton Consulting, Inc., (November 2017), Draft Phase I and Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment

Leighton Consulting, Inc., (January 2019), Soil Management Plan

County of San Diego, (September 2020), Voluntary Assistance Program Case

Leighton Consulting, Inc., (September 2020), Community Health and Safety Plan

City of Encinitas (October 2020), Stormwater Intake Form

Paso Laret & Suiter, (July 2021), Preliminary Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Stormwater Treatment Study

Mizuta Traffic Consulting, (June 2021), Traffic Study

Mizuta Traffic Consulting, (September 2021), Supplemental Traffic Analysis

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to [www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov). For County regulation refer to [www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com). All other references are available upon request.

### AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. ([www.intl-light.com](http://www.intl-light.com))

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPIP),

Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. ([www.lrc.rpi.edu](http://www.lrc.rpi.edu))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. ([www.blm.gov](http://www.blm.gov))

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

### AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. ([www.conserv.ca.gov](http://www.conserv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov), [www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. ([www.qp.gov.bc.ca](http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. ([www.nrcs.usda.gov](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov), [www.swcs.org](http://www.swcs.org)).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. ([soils.usda.gov](http://soils.usda.gov))

#### AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. ([www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov))

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFW and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. ([www.dfg.ca.gov](http://www.dfg.ca.gov))

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5<sup>th</sup> Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. ([www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. ([ecos.fws.gov](http://ecos.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. ([migratorybirds.fws.gov](http://migratorybirds.fws.gov))

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating

and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997.  
([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6,  
Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits.  
([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land  
and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site  
Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and  
Design Criteria. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3,  
Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San  
Diego Area, California. 1973. ([soils.usda.gov](http://soils.usda.gov))

### GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA)  
White Paper: CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and  
Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject  
to the California Environmental Quality Act, January 2008.  
(<http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf>)

City of Encinitas, Climate Action Plan (CAP), 2020.  
(<https://encinitasca.gov/Climate>)

### HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes  
from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter  
16 Section 162. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033.  
([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services  
Act. ([WWW.LEGINFO.CA.GOV](http://WWW.LEGINFO.CA.GOV))

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998.  
([www.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and  
§25316. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067.  
([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings.  
([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code,  
Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation  
Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996.  
([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health,  
Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release  
Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines.  
(<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, [www.oes.ca.gov](http://www.oes.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health,  
Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business  
Plan Guidelines. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

Uniform Building Code. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire  
Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building  
Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association

Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition.  
([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

### HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report  
Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local  
Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan  
Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of  
California. 1998. ([rubicon.water.ca.gov](http://rubicon.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, California's  
Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003.  
([www.groundwater.water.ca.gov](http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8,  
August 2000. ([www.dpla2.water.ca.gov](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov))

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-  
8692. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General  
Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-  
DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-  
DWQ) ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm  
Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq.  
([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board,  
Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994.  
([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov), <http://www.amlegal.com/>)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002.  
([www.projectcleanwater.org](http://www.projectcleanwater.org))

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water  
Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance  
Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San  
Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and  
amendments. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title  
33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall,  
Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States  
Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code  
Division 7. Water Quality. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element,  
Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997.  
([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit  
No. CAS0108758. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality  
Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

#### LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

#### MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Subdivision Map Act, 2011. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

#### NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, effective August 3, 2011. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. ([www.iso.ch](http://www.iso.ch))

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

#### POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

#### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. ([www.dot.ca.gov](http://www.dot.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority ALUCP'S [http://www.san.org/sdcraa/airport\\_initiatives/land\\_use/adopted\\_docs.aspx](http://www.san.org/sdcraa/airport_initiatives/land_use/adopted_docs.aspx)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. ([www.gpoaccess.gov](http://www.gpoaccess.gov))

#### UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. ([ccr.oal.ca.gov](http://ccr.oal.ca.gov))

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.