July 20, 2023



ROY SAPAU DIRECTOR July 20, 2023 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES 505 South Vulcan Avenue, Encinitas, CA 92024 www.encinitasca.gov

ANNA COLAMUSSI ASSISTANT PLANNING DIRECTOR

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

- 1. Title: Sanctuary Project Project Number(s): MULTI-002610-2018, SUB-002612-2018, USE-003068-2019, DR-002611-2018, BADJ-004435-2021, ITRP-004018-2020
- Lead agency name and address: City of Encinitas
 505 South Vulcan Avenue Encinitas, California 92024
- a. Contact: Rachael Lindebrekke, Project Manager
 b. Phone number: 760.633.2703
 - c. E-mail: rlindebrekke@encinitasca.gov
- 4. Project location:

APN: 265-331-49-00 (Address not assigned) Existing lot southwest of Rancho Santa Fe Road and Ranch View Terrace in Encinitas, California 92024.

The project is located approximately 3 miles east of Interstate (I) 5 and approximately 0.5 miles north of Encinitas Boulevard in the city of Encinitas in north San Diego County, California. More specifically, the site occurs immediately west of Rancho Santa Fe Road, and primary access to the site is provided by Rancho Santa Fe Road at Ranch View Terrace (Figure 1, Project Location).

- Project Applicant name and address: Nuevo-Real Estate, 745 Cole Ranch Road, California 92024
- 6. General Plan: Rural Residential 2 (RR2) Density: 2.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) N/A
- 7.Zoning
Use Regulation:Rural Residential 2 (RR2)
21,500 net square feet

- 1 -

Maximum density: Height Limitation: Special Area Regulation: Two units per net acre 22 feet (two stories) Special Study Overlay Designation, 30.34.030 Hillside/Inland Bluff Overlay Zone, 30.34.080 Scenic/Visual Corridor Overlay Zone.

8. Description of project:

Nuevo Real Estate (Applicant) proposes the Sanctuary Project (project), which includes the processing of a Tentative Map, Major Use Permit, Design Review Permit, Boundary Adjustment and a Planning Commission Interpretation.

8.1 Project Location

The project site is a vacant 8.32-acre parcel (APN 265-331-49) located on the southwest corner of Rancho Santa Fe Road and Ranch View Terrace, in the eastern-central part of the City of Encinitas, California. A larger rectangular portion of the subject site extends 800 feet on its major axis (perpendicular to Rancho Santa Fe Road) and 400 feet on its minor axis (Parallel to Rancho Santa Fe Road). A smaller narrow rectangular strip extends the subject site further east from its northeast corner to contact the subject site with Rancho Santa Fe Road. This narrow strip has approximate dimensions of 500 feet by 50 feet. The parcel has an existing land use designation of Rural Residential (RR-2) and a zoning designation of Rural Residential 2 (RR-2).



SOURCE: Open Street Map 2022

FIGURE 1 **Project Location** Sanctuary Project

DUDEK & -

1,000

2,000 Feet

Page intentionally left blank

8.2 Existing Conditions

The 8.32-acre project site is currently vacant, and is surrounded on all sides by residential housing developments. Historical documents indicate that the site was previously used for agriculture, but has been vacant since approximately 1979. The site currently supports dense vegetation in the form of five relatively discrete to broadly overlapping plant communities or habitat types. These are Southern Maritime Chaparral, disturbed Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub, Non-native Vegetation, Eucalyptus Woodland, and Disturbed/Developed Habitat.

8.3 Project Description

The project includes the processing of a Tentative Map, Major Use Permit, Design Review Permit, Boundary Adjustment and a Planning Commission Interpretation. The existing 8.32-acre (358,293 SF) project site is a vacant site located at Rancho Santa Fe Road and Ranch View Terrace. The project consists of a residential subdivision development on undeveloped land and necessary infrastructure improvements. Specifically, the project proposed development of eleven lots: nine detached residential lots, one private street/drainage lot, and one open space lot, construction of a new cul-de-sac street, and implementation of drainage features, utilities, and landscaping improvements.

The nine residential lots would range in size from 6,002 SF to 7,534 SF net lot area. The private street/drainage lot will be 46,763 SF, and the open space lot will be 246,695 SF. The development proposes 218,345 SF of undeveloped open space area and 6,722 SF of active recreational open space. Upon completion, the developed residential area would have 28,240 square feet of impervious surfaces (26.3%), and 79,043 square feet of pervious surfaces (73.7%) and 42,385 SF of landscaping.

Construction

Site construction would include the following construction phases:

Site Preparation

The project would involve removal of existing vegetation and clearing and grubbing of the northernmost corner of the site where the residential lots and private street would be located, totaling approximately 139,948 SF. Approximately 218,345 SF (8.26 acres), or 89% of the original 8.32-acre parcel, would remain as undeveloped open space. Site preparation would take approximately 5 days to complete and would involve the use of rubber tired dozers and tractors, loaders and backhoes.

Grading

Following vegetation removal, the project would involve grading and earthwork, including approximately 12,500 cubic yards (cy) of cut, 4,500 cy of fill, and 8,000 cy of soil exported off site during remedial grading of the nine residential pads. Grading would take approximately 8 days to complete and would involve the use of excavators, graders, rubber tired dozers, scrapers and tractors. An on-site truck would be present during the site preparation and grading phases for dust control.

Construction and Paving

Access to the residential subdivision would be provided along Rancho Santa Fe Road at Ranch View Terrace. A new private cul-de-sac road with a minimum width of 24 feet would be constructed to access all nine residential lots from Ranch View Terrace. The project would improve the intersection of Rancho Santa Fe Road, Ranch View Terrace and 7th Street at all four corners by constructing ADA compliant pedestrian ramps and new cross walk striping. Other public improvements along the property frontage would include repairing any damaged areas of Rancho Santa Fe Road and Ranch View Terrace and providing full A/C width overlay along the existing portions of Ranch View Terrace from Rancho Santa Fe Road to the project's entry.

A public sewer main would also be extended from Ranch View Terrace to service the site. Sewer lines would also be placed in Cole Ranch Road. The development would underground all overhead public utility lines, including electric, cable, telephone, fiber optic, and any other similar wire within Ranch View Terrace, and would also extend all water lines and natural gas lines within this road. Additionally, the project would remove all existing utility poles and appurtenances along Rancho Santa Fe Road, Ranch View Terrace, the sideline of the property, as well as any utility lines running through the site or in an adjacent easement along the project frontage.

Upon completion of construction, landscaping would be installed throughout the subdivision.

The Construction/Paving Phase would take approximately 266 days (230 days for building construction, 18 days for paving and 18 days for architectural coating) and would involve the use of cranes, forklifts, generator sets, tractors, cement and modular pavers, paving equipment, rollers and air compressors.

Project Design Features

The proposed project would implement the following construction-related project design features (PDFs) intended to emissions from project construction. The project would implement PDF-AQ-1 – PDF-AQ-3, as follows:

- PDF-AQ-1 Standard construction practices would be employed to reduce fugitive dust emissions and include watering of the active sites and exposed surfaces up two times per day, depending on weather conditions; watering unpaved roads, and limiting vehicle speeds on unpaved roads. Construction of the project would be subject to SDAPCD Rule 55 Fugitive Dust Control. Compliance with Rule 55 would limit fugitive dust that may be generated during grading and construction activities.
- PDF-AQ-2 The project will provide temporary electricity to the project site during the building construction phases and prohibit the use of diesel-fueled/natural gas fueled generators during the building construction phases.

- PDF-AQ-3 The project will limit air compressors used during the architectural coasting/painting places to equipment that is electric-powered.
- 9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

The parcels adjacent to the project site on the north, east and south are designated as Rural Residential (RR2) in the City's General Plan and zoned Rural Residential 2 (RR2). The parcels adjacent to the project site on the west are designated as Residential 8 (R8) and zoned Residential 8 (R-8). Existing development patterns surrounding the project site include residential-type land uses immediately to the north, south, east and west. There is also a church that is contiguous to the northeast portion of the site and the Olivenhain Meeting Hall that is catty corner to the project entrance.

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

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Landscape Plans	City of Encinitas
Grading Permit	City of Encinitas
Tentative Map	City of Encinitas
Major Use Permit	City of Encinitas
Design Review Permit	City of Encinitas
Boundary Adjustment	City of Encinitas
Planning Commission Interpretation	City of Encinitas
City Right-of-Way Permits	City of Encinitas
Construction Permit	
Excavation Permit	
Encroachment Permit	
Improvement Plans	City of Encinitas
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination	RWQCB
System (NPDES) Permit	
General Industrial Storm Water Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm Water	RWQCB
Permit	
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Sewer District Approval	Cardiff Sanitary 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?



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.

Aesthetics	Agriculture and Forest Resources	⊠ <u>Air Quality</u>
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Energy
Geology & Soils	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Hazards & Haz. Materials
Hydrology & Water Quality	Land Use & Planning	Mineral Resources
⊠ <u>Noise</u>	Population & Housing	Public Services
Recreation	<u>Transportation</u>	Utilities & Service Systems
Wildfire	⊠ <u>Tribal Cultural</u> <u>Resources</u>	Mandatory Findings of <u>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.

08/04/2023

Signature	Date
Rachael Lindebrekke	Associate Planner

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 off site 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

- 11 -

I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099 -- Would the project:

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



Potentially Significant Impact \boxtimes Less than Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation No Impact Incorporated

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. Offsite 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 situated adjacent to Rancho Santa Fe Road, which is not designated as a scenic roadway in the City's General Plan, and is not within a significant viewshed as mapped/located by the City of Encinitas (City of Encinitas 1991). Due to intervening terrain and vegetation, the project site is not visible from the nearest City-mapped vista point (i.e., Oakcrest Park Viewpoint; located approximately 1.65 miles to the west of the project site). Therefore, views from this designated vista point would not be affected by development of the project.

Photographs of three Key Observation Points as agreed to by the City were taken during a site visit conducted in March 2023. The photograph locations are depicted in Figure 2, Key Observation Points Key Map. The existing conditions photographs capture public vantage points to the project site and illustrate the existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding area as experienced from the Key Observation Points. These photographs serve as the baseline images for the project's visual simulations, which are depicted in Figure 3, Key Observation Point 1 - Via Del Cerrito and Woodwind Road; Figure 4, Key Observation Point 2 - Ranch View Terrace; and Figure 5, Key Observation Point 3 - Rancho Santa Fe Road. The visual simulations present the existing view and post-project view from the three Key Observation Points towards the project site.



FIGURE 2 Key Observation Point Key Map

DUDEK

Sanctuary Project

SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

Page intentionally left blank

Existing View Looking East from Via Del Cerrito and Woodwind Road



Visual Simulation of the Sanctuary Project from Via Del Cerrito and Woodwind Drive



SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

- 16 -

Page intentionally left blank

July 20, 2023

Existing View West from Ranch View Terrace



Visual Simulation of the Sanctuary Project from Ranch View Terrace



SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

- 18 -

Page intentionally left blank

July 20, 2023

Existing View West looking West from Rancho Santa Fe Road



Visual Simulation of the Sanctuary Project from Rancho Santa Fe Road



SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

- 20 -

Page intentionally left blank

July 20, 2023

According to the Encinitas General Plan Resources Management Element (specifically, Figure 3, Visual Resource Sensitivity), the mapped Rancho Santa Fe Road scenic view corridor appears to extend to and encompass the project site. Except for a stand of tall and mature eucalyptus trees located on a low knoll near existing residences to the east, the development footprint on the project site is not readily visible from Rancho Santa Fe Road due to presence of intervening, elevated terrain that supports single-family residential development and mature vegetation/landscaping including a small lemon tree grove near the intersection of Rancho Santa Fe Road and Woodwind Drive. While the project site is undeveloped and includes canyon terrain and special status plant species (see Section IV, Biological Resources, for additional detail), canyon slopes and special status plant species are generally located in the western portion of the project site that would not be developed and these resources are not generally visible through the project site from Rancho Santa Fe. See Figure 5, which presents an existing view and post-project view from Rancho Santa Fe Road towards the project site. The project would only minimally alter brief duration views from segments of Via Del Cerrito and Woodwind Drive and from Rancho View Terrace adjacent to the site. See Figures 3 and 4, which show the existing view and post-project view east of Via Del Cerrito and Woodwind Road and west of Ranch View Terrace, respectively. Due to aforementioned criteria and analysis presented above, project development would have a less than significant effect on a scenic vista and scenic view corridor.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Incorporated

No 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.

 \square

The project site is not located along or in proximity to a state scenic highway. I-5 is an eligible state scenic highway through North San Diego County and the project site is located approximately 2.85 miles east of the interstate (Caltrans 2023). The City's General Plan Resource Management Element (Policy 4.7) designates I-5 crossing the San Elijo Lagoon, Manchester Avenue (from San Elijo Avenue to Encinitas Boulevard), and El Camino Real (from Encinitas Boulevard to La Costa Boulevard) as scenic highways/visual corridor viewsheds (City of Encinitas 1991, see Policy 4.7). At the San Elijo Lagoon crossing, I-5 is located approximately 2.75 miles to the southwest of the project site and the nearest segment of Manchester Avenue (i.e., Manchester Avenue at Encinitas Boulevard) is located 0.40 miles to the south of the project site. Lastly, El Camino Real is approximately 1.3 miles to the west of the project site. The project SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

site is not visible from I-5 at the San Elijo Lagoon or El Camino Real due to distance and intervening visual barriers (e.g., terrain and vegetation). Similarly, the project site is not visible from northbound Manchester Avenue at Encinitas Boulevard due to distance, intervening vegetation/landscaping, and development.

Because proposed development would not be visible from a state scenic highway or a locally designated scenic highways/visual corridor viewsheds, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No impacts to state scenic highways would occur.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation		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 incorporated City of Encinitas and the combined population of Encinitas and adjacent Carlsbad exceeds 100,000 persons, the project is located within an urbanized area. Thus, the latter criterion 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.

As discussed above in threshold Ia, The project site is situated adjacent to Rancho Santa Fe Road, which is not designated as a scenic roadway in the City's General Plan Resources Management Element (City of Encinitas 1991). Although the project would alter existing views of visible portions of the subject site (specifically, brief duration views from segments of Rancho View Terrace adjacent to the site and views from Via Del Cerrito and Woodwind Drive near the site; see Figures 3 and 4, which show the existing view and post-project view east of Via Del Cerrito and Woodwind Road and west of Ranch View Terrace respectively), such development would be consistent with the goals and policies defined in the General Plan. Additionally, the project would be subject to City review for conformance with design requirements identified in the Municipal Code for the RR2 zone (i.e., for height, lot coverage, etc.). Specific exceptions to such standards are requested for development of the project as proposed through the Major Use Permit, Planned Residential Development. This includes net lot area, front yard setbacks, side yard setbacks, lot width, and lot depth and lot coverage for lots 8 and 9. Through the deviation of RR2 standards, the project is able to minimize disturbance, grading, and preserve open space.

The project does not propose any off-site improvements, other than to provide access to the site from Rancho Santa Fe Road and property improvements along the Rancho Santa Fe Road and Ranch View Terrace such as undergrounding utilities and new landscaping. 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 a residential subdivision 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 residential subdivision would change the on-site use from an undeveloped/vacant property to a developed condition, as described above, the site is not considered to be of high scenic value and has limited visibility from public vantage points in the surrounding area.

Additionally, as the project is surrounded by small patches of open space and single-family residential development to the north, south, east, and west, sensitive project design elements have been incorporated and reflect 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. The project is consistent with applicable design criteria and regulatory requirements aimed at maintaining the existing character of the area and would not conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality. Further, the project would be partially screened by existing vegetation and proposed landscaping and would have limited visibility from public vantage points in the surrounding area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Outdoor lighting installed within the development footprint on the project site would be limited to building exterior mounted fixtures (lighting along the project driveway is not anticipated) and would be similar to the outdoor lighting sources installed on residential properties in the surrounding area. Further, outdoor lighting on the project site would

be 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 shielded outdoor lighting fixtures would 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. In addition, luminaries, lamps, or light sources would be installed so as to not be directly visible from any adjoining residential property. Also, compliance with the Performance Standards – Residential Lighting Standards outlined in Chapter 30.40 (I) (1)(2) of the City of Encinitas's Municipal Code is required prior to issuance of a building permit and thus, the project would be required to demonstrate that shielded on-site lighting sources do not exceed light levels of one-half foot candle at the property line. 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the project:

Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or local Importance a) (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?

 \square

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Incorporated

Less than Significant Impact: Historical documents indicate that the site was previously used for agriculture, but the project site has been vacant since approximately 1979 and all agricultural operations have ceased. Pursuant to the DOC maps, the project is Urban and Built-Up land. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation	\square	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 2 miles

- 25 -

away (DOC 2023). 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))?

Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	\square	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site, including off-site 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 of the property and a rezone is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones. There would be no impact.

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



Less than Significant Impact



Less Than Significant With Mitigation \square Incorporated

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is in an urbanized setting in Encinitas and does not contain forest land. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of forestland or the conversion of forestland to non-forest use. There would be no impact.

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 nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	\square	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: As described above in response II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources, a), the project site and the surrounding area is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land and 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. No impacts would occur.

III. AIR QUALITY

This section evaluates potential changes to air quality resulting from the implementation of the proposed project. Information and analysis in this section have been compiled based on an understanding of the existing ambient air quality of the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) and review of existing technical data, applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines, as well as the following technical reports prepared for this proposed project:

• Air Quality Technical Report – Encinitas Sanctuary Project (Appendix A)

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)?

Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) and is regulated by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). The SDAPCD monitors air pollution, implementation of the City's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP), 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 (RAQS).

The SDAPCD is responsible for developing the San Diego portion of the SIP and has developed an attainment plan for attaining the 8 hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards (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 SDAB. 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 of San Diego. As such, projects that are consistent with the growth anticipated by the General Plan would be considered consistent with the RAQS.

The project is zoned for Rural Residential 2 uses and the proposed use is consistent with the City's underlying zoning and General Plan land use designation for the site. The project would not require a General Plan Amendment or rezone, and anticipated growth associated with the project does not exceed that projected by SANDAG. 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. The project would add nine residential units with an estimated population of 24 residents. The added residents would represent approximately 1% of the anticipated population growth population and housing units would be well within the growth projections. Based on the above information, the increase in population and housing units would be well within the growth projections. As such, vehicle trip generation and planned development for the project are considered to be anticipated in the SIP and RAQS. Because the proposed land uses and associated vehicle trips are anticipated in the local air quality plans, the project would be consistent at a regional level with the underlying growth forecast in the RAQS and would not conflict with SANDAG's regional growth forecast for the City. 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?

Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Currently, San Diego County is in "non-attainment" status for federal and state Ozone (O₃) and state Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns and less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ in both urban and rural areas include 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.

Air quality is an inherently cumulative issue with the SDAB being the geographic scope of analysis. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development, and the SDAPCD develops and implements plans for future attainment of ambient air quality standards. Based on these considerations, project-level thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants are relevant in the determination of whether the project's individual emissions would have a cumulatively significant impact on air quality.

Recognizing this, the SDAPCD's emissions thresholds are devised to regulate air basin-wide emissions at the project level. If project's fall below these thresholds, they are determined not to contribute significantly to cumulative air basin-wide emissions, and accordingly would not result in a significant project impact.

CalEEMod was run to determine the proposed project's potential construction and operational air quality emissions (see Appendix A). As shown below in Table 1 and Table 2, the proposed project's construction and operational emissions would be below applicable screening thresholds.

Year	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM 10	PM2.5
	Pounds pe	er Day				
2024	3.72	36.2	33.8	0.09	9.78	5.49
2025	1.54	0.99	1.58	<0.01	0.13	0.05
Maximum (lbs/day)	3.72	36.2	33.8	0.09	9.78	5.49
Significance Threshold	75	250	550	250	100	55
SDAPCD Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 1. Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NOx = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; Sox = sulfur oxides; PM10 = coarse particulate matter; PM2.5 = fine particulate matter

The values shown here are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod and include fugitive dust mitigation pursuant to PDF AQ-1

Source: Appendix A – Air Quality Technical Report – Encinitas Sanctuary Project

Table 2. Estimated Maximum Daily Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM 10	PM _{2.5}
	Pounds pe	r Day				
Area	14.2	0.27	17.0	0.03	2.34	2.33
Energy	<0.01	0.06	0.03	<0.01	0.01	0.01
Total (lbs/day)	14.6	0.64	19.7	0.04	2.58	2.38
SDAPCD Thresholds	75	250	550	250	100	55
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; No_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; So_x = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = coarse particulate matter; PM_{2.5} = fine particulate matter; <0.01 = reported value is less than 0.01.

Source: Appendix A – Air Quality Technical Report – Encinitas Sanctuary Project

Based on the proposed construction and operational activities, the project would not be expected to result in substantial emissions such that any criteria pollutant air quality standard would be violated. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant; impacts would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact
\ge	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

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

Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

Mobile-source impacts occur on two basic scales of motion. Regionally, project-related travel will add to regional trip generation and increase the vehicle miles traveled within the local airshed and the SDAB. Locally, project traffic will be added to the City's roadway system. If such traffic occurs during periods of poor atmospheric ventilation, consists of a large number of vehicles "cold-started" and operating at pollution-inefficient speeds, and operates on roadways already crowded with non-project traffic, there is a potential for the formation of microscale CO "hotspots" in the area immediately around points of congested traffic. Because of continued improvement in mobile emissions at a rate faster than the rate of vehicle growth and/or congestion, the potential for CO hotspots in the basin is steadily decreasing.

Projects contributing to adverse traffic impacts may result in the formation of CO hotspots. To verify that the project would not cause or contribute to a violation of the CO standard, a screening evaluation of the potential for CO hotspots was conducted in the project's Air Quality Technical Report (Appendix A). The City does not have guidance regarding CO hotspots; as such, the County's CO hotspot screening guidance was followed to determine whether the project would require a site-specific hotspot analysis. Per guidance, any project that would place receptors within 500 feet of a signalized intersection operating at or below level of service (LOS) E (peak-hour trips exceeding 3,000 trips) must conduct a "hotspot" analysis for CO. Likewise, projects that will cause road intersections to operate at or below a LOS E (i.e., with intersection peak-hour trips exceeding 3,000) will also have to conduct a CO "hotspot" analysis. There are no signalized intersections within 500 feet of the project site. The Local Transportation Analysis prepared by LOS Engineering, Inc. on December 2021 (Appendix B) determined that the project would not result in any traffic effects relative to LOS under existing, existing plus project, cumulative, and cumulative plus project. Thus, the potential to cause a Chotspot is less than significant.

Since the last update of the SDAPCD's guidance (2007), the County has evaluated the potential for the growth anticipated under the General Plan Update to result in CO "hot spots" throughout the County. To do this, the County reviewed the CO "hot spot" analysis conducted by the SCAQMD for their request to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for redesignation as a CO attainment area. In SCAQMD's analysis, they modeled the four most congested intersections identified in their basin (South Coast Air Basin [SCAB]), which included the following:

- Long Beach Boulevard and Imperial Highway proximity to the Lynwood monitoring station, which consistently records the highest 8-hour CO concentrations in the SCAB each year.
- Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue the most congested intersection in Los Angeles County, with an average daily traffic volume of 100,000 vehicles/day.
- Highland Avenue and Sunset Boulevard one of the most congested intersections in the City of Los Angeles.
- Century Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard one of the most congested intersections in the City of Los Angeles.

The SCAQMD's analysis found that these intersections had an average 7.7 ppm 1-hour CO concentrations predicted by the models, which is only 38.5% of the 1-hour CO CAAQS of 20 ppm. Therefore, even the most congested intersections in SCAQMD's air basin would not experience a CO "hot spot." The air quality monitoring station closest to the most congested intersection in Los Angeles County (Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue) is the VA Hospital, West Los Angeles Station (Site ID 060370113) located at Wilshire Boulevard and Sawtelle Boulevard, approximately 0.5 miles to the southwest. Ambient CO levels monitored at this representative monitoring station are outlined in Table 3 for the original analysis year (2002), and for the most recent year of available data (2021). As shown, there is noticeable improvement in background levels of CO since the SCAQMD's regional hotspot analysis.

Table 3. Ambient Carbon Monoxide Concentrations for SCAQMD's Most CongestedIntersection

Year	CO Concentration (ppm)		
	Maximum 1-hour	Maximum 8-hour	
2002	4.3	2.7	
2021	1.5	1.0	

Source: EPA 2022

For the County of San Diego, there are no roadways/segments identified as deficient facilities under the worst-case traffic scenario that have an average daily trip (ADT) greater than the 100,000 that was anticipated for the most congested intersection analyzed by SCAQMD. The most congested intersection in the County is Campo Road/SR-94 between Jamacha Boulevard and Jamacha Road in Valle De Oro. According to Table 5.23 of the Traffic and Circulation Assessment: County of San Diego General Plan Update (Wilson & Company 2009), this intersection has an ADT of 79,200, which is only 79% of the most congested intersection in the SCAB.

Project-generated trips would only represent 0.1% of the most congested intersection in the SCAB, which were determined to not experience a CO "hot spot" according to SCAQMD's 2003 analysis. In addition, the CO "hot spot" analysis performed by SCAQMD included emissions for 1997 and 2002. Both running exhaust emission factors and idling emission factors predicted by the EMFAC model decreased from 1997 through 2002 as outlined in Table 4 below. This decrease in CO emission factors is indicative of a phase-out of older vehicles and increasingly strict emissions standards implemented by CARB. Emission factors for San Diego County from the EMFAC2007 Model, which were used in the General Plan Update analysis, indicated that running exhaust emissions of CO would be less than 6.708 g CO per mile in 2010. Continued improvement in vehicular emissions at a rate faster than the rate of vehicle growth and/or congestion means that the potential for CO hotspots in the SDAB is likely to decrease.

Year	CO Concentration (grams CO/mile)		
	Running Exhaust	Idling Exhaust	
1997	13.13	2.43	
2002	7.98	1.30	

Table 4. Carbon Monoxide Emission Factors Predicted by the EMFAC Model

Source: SCAQMD 2003

The County of San Diego concluded in the General Plan Update (2011) that because the most congested intersections in San Diego are less congested than those from the SCAB, and because emissions of CO would be lower than those used in the SCAQMD analysis, CO concentrations would be lower within San Diego County, and no CO "hot spots" are anticipated as was concluded in the SCAQMD analysis.

Given that proposed development will not result in traffic that exceeds traffic volumes considered in the General Plan Update analysis, coupled with the considerably low level of CO concentrations in the project area, and continued improvements in vehicle emissions, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in CO "hot spots". Consequently, implementation of the project would not result in CO concentrations in excess of the health protective CAAQS or NAAQS, and as such, would not expose sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations or health effects. Therefore, impacts related to sensitive receptor exposure to substantial CO concentrations would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Toxic Air Contaminants

In addition to impacts from criteria pollutants, project impacts may include emissions of pollutants identified by the state and federal government as toxic air contaminants (TACs) or hazardous air pollutant (HAPs). The greatest potential for TAC emissions during construction would be diesel particulate matter emissions from heavy equipment operations and heavy-duty trucks, and the associated health impacts to sensitive receptors. Construction of the project would occur over a period of 13 months and following completion of construction activities, project-related TAC emissions would cease. The closest sensitive receptors to the project site are single-family residences immediately adjacent on the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. As such, a construction health risk analysis (HRA) was performed for the project as discussed below. Based on results from the HRA, the maximally exposed individual resident off site would be located at

the single-family residences to the east of the project site and south of the new proposed private roadway. Table 5 summarizes the results of the HRA for project construction

Impact Parameter	Units	Project Impacts	CEQA Threshold	Level of Significance
Off-site				
Cancer Risk	Per Million	33.71	10.0	Potentially Significant
HIC	Not	0.04	1.0	Less than Significant
	Applicable			

Table 5. Construction Activity Health Risk Assessment Results Prior to Mitigation

Source: Appendix A's Appendix B

Notes: CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act; HIC – Chronic Hazard Index

The results of the HRA demonstrate that the TAC exposure from construction diesel exhaust emissions would result in cancer risk above the 10 in 1 million threshold and Chronic Hazard Index less than 1. Therefore, TAC emissions from construction of the project would result in a potentially significant impact and thus mitigation is required. Mitigation Measure (MM) AQ-1 as outlined below would require the use of Tier 4 Interim or Equivalent (e.g., Tier 4 Final) for construction equipment greater than 80 horsepower. Table 6 shows the mitigated HRA results.

Impact Parameter	Units	Project Impacts	CEQA Threshold	Level of Significance	
Off-site					
Cancer Risk	Per Million	7.78	10.0	Less than Significant	
HIC	Not Applicable	<0.01	1.0	Less than Significant	
HIC	Not Applicable	0.04	1.0	Less than Significant	

Table 6. Construction Activity Health Risk Assessment Results With Mitigation

Source: Appendix A's Appendix B

Notes: CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act; HIC – Chronic Hazard Index

The results of the HRA as shown in Table 6 demonstrate that the TAC exposure from construction diesel exhaust emissions after implementation of mitigation would not result in cancer risk above the 10 in 1 million threshold and Chronic Hazard Index less than 1. Therefore, TAC emissions from construction of the project would result in a less than significant impact with mitigation.

Health Effects of Criteria Air Pollutants

Construction and operation of the project would not result in emissions that exceed SDAPCD's emission thresholds for any criteria air pollutants. The SDAPCD thresholds are based on the SDAB complying with the NAAQS and CAAQS which are protective of public health; therefore, no adverse effects to human health would result from the project. The following provides a general discussion of criteria air pollutants and their health effects.

Regarding VOCs, some VOCs would be associated with motor vehicles and construction equipment, while others are associated with architectural coatings and asphalt off-gassing, the emissions of which would not result in exceedances of County of San Diego thresholds.

Generally, the VOCs in architectural coatings and asphalt are of relatively low toxicity. Additionally, SDAPCD Rule 67.0.1 restricts the VOC content of coatings for both construction and operational applications.

In addition, VOCs and NO_x are precursors to O₃, for which the SDAB is designated as nonattainment with respect to the NAAQS and CAAQS (the SDAB is designated by EPA as an attainment area for the 1-hour O₃ NAAQS standard and 1997 8-hour NAAQS standard). The health effects associated with O₃ are generally associated with reduced lung function. The contribution of VOCs and NOx to regional ambient O3 concentrations is the result of complex photochemistry. The increases in O₃ concentrations in the SDAB due to O₃ precursor emissions tend to be found downwind from the source location to allow time for the photochemical reactions to occur. However, the potential for exacerbating excessive O₃ concentrations would also depend on the time of year that the VOC emissions would occur because exceedances of the O3 NAAQS and CAAQS tend to occur between April and October when solar radiation is highest. The holistic effect of a single project's emissions of O₃ precursors is speculative due to the lack of quantitative methods to assess this impact. Nonetheless, the VOC and NO_x emissions associated with project construction could minimally contribute to regional O₃ concentrations and the associated health impacts. Due to the minimal contribution during construction and operation, as well as the existing good air quality in coastal San Diego areas, health impacts would be considered less than significant.

Regarding NO₂, which is a constituent of NO_x, construction of the project would not contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for NO₂ since NO_x emissions would be less than the applicable SDAPCD threshold. NO₂ health impacts are associated with respiratory irritation, which may be experienced by nearby receptors during the periods of heaviest use of off-road construction equipment. However, these operations would be relatively short term, and the offroad construction equipment would be operating on various portions of the site and would not be concentrated in one portion of the site at any one time. Construction of the project would not require any stationary emission sources that would create substantial, localized NO₂ impacts.

As discussed earlier, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ pose a greater health risk than larger-size particles. When inhaled, these tiny particles can penetrate the human respiratory system's natural defenses and damage the respiratory tract. PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ can increase the number and severity of asthma attacks, cause or aggravate bronchitis and other lung diseases, and reduce the body's ability to fight infections. Similar to O₃, construction of the project would not exceed thresholds for PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} and would not contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for particulate matter. Due to the minimal contribution of particulate matter during construction and operation, health impacts would be considered less than significant.

Based on the preceding considerations, health impacts from project-related criteria air pollutant emissions would be considered less than significant.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the results of the HRA demonstrate that mitigation would be required in order to reduce impacts associated with TAC emissions from construction of the project to less than significant. Thus, implementation of MM-AQ-1 would be required. After implementation of MM-AQ-1, the TAC exposure from construction diesel exhaust emissions would not result in cancer risk above the 10 in 1 million threshold, nor a Chronic Hazard Index greater than 1.0. VOC and NO_x emissions, as described previously, would minimally contribute to regional O₃ concentrations and the associated health effects. In addition to O₃, NO_x emissions would not contribute to potential exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for NO₂.

The existing NO₂ concentrations in the area are well below the NAAQS and CAAQS standards. Thus, it is not expected the project's operational NO_x emissions would result in exceedances of the NO₂ standards or contribute to the associated health effects. CO tends to be a localized impact associated with congested intersections. The associated CO "hotspots" were discussed previously as a less than significant impact. Thus, the project's CO emissions would not contribute to significant health effects associated with this pollutant. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} would not contribute to potential exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for particulate matter and would not obstruct the SDAB from coming into attainment for these pollutants and would not contribute to significant health effects associated with particulates. Therefore, overall health impacts associated with criteria air pollutants would be considered less than significant with mitigation.

Mitigation

MM-AQ-1 will be made a condition of approval as outlined below:

Tier 4 Interim Construction Equipment. Prior to the commencement of any MM-AQ-1: construction activities, the applicant or its designee shall provide evidence to the City of Encinitas (City) that for off-road equipment with engines rated at 80 horsepower or greater, no construction equipment shall be used that is less than Tier 4 Interim or equivalent (e.g. Tier 4 Final or other technology that achieves equivalent particulate matter control). An exemption from these requirements may be granted by the City if the applicant documents that equipment with the required tier is not reasonably available and equivalent reductions in PM₁₀ exhaust emissions are achieved from other construction equipment. The applicant shall be responsible for preparation of a new air quality assessment demonstrating that health risks are below significance thresholds of 10 in a million with the revised equipment mix. Before an exemption may be considered by the City, the applicant shall be required to demonstrate that three construction fleet owners/operators in the San Diego Region were contacted and that those owners/operators confirmed Tier 4 equipment could not be located within the San Diego region. The City shall review the exemption request and provide a determination within 10 business days from receipt of the request.

- 35 -

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

Potentially Significant ImpactImpactImpactLess Than Significant With MitigationIncorporatedNo 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.

Odors would be generated from vehicles and/or equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment and architectural coatings. Such odors are temporary and for the types of construction activities anticipated for project components, would generally remain localized and occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people.

In addition to the odor source, the distance between the sensitive receptor(s) and the odor source, as well as the local meteorological conditions, are considerations in the potential for a project to frequently expose the public to objectionable odors. Although localized air quality impacts are focused on potential impacts to sensitive receptors, such as residences and schools, other land uses where people may congregate (e.g., workplaces) or uses with the intent to attract people (e.g., restaurants and visitor-serving accommodations should also be considered in the evaluation of potential odor nuisance impacts. The project is a residential development, which is not expected to produce any nuisance odors; therefore, impacts related to odors caused by the project would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section evaluates potential changes to biological resources resulting from the implementation of the proposed project. Information and analysis in this section have been compiled based on a review of existing technical data, applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines, as well as the following technical reports prepared for this proposed project:

- Results of a Biology Field Survey of the Ranch View Terrace Project Site, Encinitas (Appendix C)
- Draft Resources Management Plan for the Sanctuary at Olivenhain Preserve (Attachment A of Appendix C)

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?

Г		٦
ł		I
L		J

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation
No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:

Special Status Species

Approximately 3.04 acres of the 8.5-acre project site would be directly impacted by the project as a result of grading and development. As stated in Appendix C, three special-status plant species were observed at the project site: Del Mar manzanita (*Arctostaphylos glandulosa ssp. Crassifolia*; federally endangered, California Rare Plant Rank [CRPR] 1B.1), coast white ceanothus (*Ceanothus verrucosus*; CRPR 2B.2), and Torrey pine (*Pinus torreyana*; CRPR 1B.2). The project would not impact all of the 18 Del Mar manzanita individuals on site, and mitigation would be required via the MHCP Narrow Endemic Policy (MM-BIO-1). The project would impact all of the nine coast white ceanothus individuals on site, and mitigation would be required via the MHCP Narrow Endemic Policy (MM-BIO-1). The project would impact all of the nine coast white ceanothus individuals on site, and mitigation would be required via the MHCP Narrow Endemic Policy (MM-BIO-1). The project would impact all of the nine coast white ceanothus individuals on site, and mitigation would be required via the MHCP Special Considerations Policy. The project would Impact all four Torrey pine individuals on site, and replacement mitigation at a 1:1 ratio requirement would be required (MM-BIO-1).

As stated in Appendix C, the following special-status wildlife species were observed at the project site: red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*; protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code 3503, 3503.5, 3511, and 3513) and San Diego desert woodrat (*Neotoma lepida intermedia*; California Species of Special Concern). A protocol-level survey for coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*; federally threatened) was conducted in 2019 and was negative, indicating the site is not occupied by the species.
No other special-status wildlife species were determined to have a moderate or high potential to occur on site (Appendix C).

Impacts to special-status species would be considered less than significant with mitigation (MM-BIO-1).

Sensitive Species

According to Appendix C, sensitive species are located or were observed on the project site as follows.

Sensitive Plant Communities/Habitats

Sensitive vegetation communities consist of; (1) those recognized as "sensitive" by the City of Encinitas and/or the Wildlife Agencies (California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service); (2) those which are known to be rare within the region; (3) those which are known to support populations of sensitive animal or plant species; and/or (4) those which serve as locally or regionally important wildlife corridors.

The following on-site habitats are considered sensitive by the City of Encinitas and the Wildlife Agencies:

- Southern Maritime Chaparral
- Disturbed Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub

These sensitive habitats are degraded to a large extent by the edge effects of adjoining development. Nevertheless, they support sensitive species (see below) and are significantly depleted in the region.

Sensitive Species

Sensitive species are those plants and animals listed as Rare, Endangered, Threatened, or otherwise noteworthy by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the City of Encinitas, or other regulatory agencies. Sensitive plant species locations on site are shown in Figures 5 and 6 of Appendix C.

The following sensitive plant species were detected during the biological field survey of the project site:

- Del Mar Manzanita (Arctostaphylos glandulosa ssp. Crassifolia) ~18 individuals
- Coast White Ceanothus (Ceanothus verrucosus) ~ 9 individuals
- Torrey Pine (*Pinus torreyana*) ~ 4 individuals

The following sensitive animal species were detected during the survey:

- Red-shouldered Hawk (Buteo lineatus) one individual flying over site
- San Diego Desert Woodrat (*Neotoma lepida intermedia*) stick nests observed in several places

Del Mar Manzanita, Coast White Ceanothus (also known as Coast White Lilac, Wart-stemmed Ceanothus, and other common names) and Torrey Pine are found in the western portion of the property. These rare plants are of varying degrees of sensitivity. Del Mar Manzanita is a federally-listed Endangered Species and a Narrow Endemic in the MHPA. Coast White Ceanothus and Torrey Pine are sensitive plant species, with special measures of protection for the Coast White Ceanothus. Additional sensitive plants could occur on this site although they were not readily detectable at the time of the field surveys due to the historic drought experienced in Southern California in 2017-18.

A single, Red-shouldered Hawk was detected using areas of the property and stick nests characteristic of San Diego Desert Woodrat were observed in several places. It is also expected that a few wide-ranging sensitive animals, such as various native bats and fossorial reptiles could utilize this site in relatively low numbers. However, given the size of the property, no significant populations of any additional sensitive animals would be expected, in any case.

In addition, a California Gnatcatcher (CAGN) presence/absence survey was performed between November 2019 and April 2019, and no CAGN were found during the survey.

Impacts to sensitive species would be considered less than significant with mitigation (MM-BIO-1).

- **MM-BIO-1**: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, impacts to 18 Del Mar manzanita, nine coast white ceanothus, four Torrey pine individuals shall occur at a minimum ratio of 1:1 for Del Mar manzanita, 1:1 for coast white ceanothus, and 1:1 for Torrey pine, unless otherwise required by the City or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Mitigation for impacts to these three plant species shall be accomplished on-site through one or a combination of translocation or new plantings, habitat-based preservation, and/or purchase of conservation Mitigation Bank credits, as follows:
 - 1:1 replacement ratio of the 18 Del Mar Manzanita, nine coast white ceanothus, and four Torrey pine individuals impacted to be planted at an on-site location approved by the City and USFWS. Monitoring and management of the mitigation planting site would also be required; or

Preservation of on-site mitigation land, recordation of a biological open space (BOS) easement, and preparation of a Resources Management Plan (RMP) to address long-term monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives, in perpetuity, approved by the City and USFWS. The location shall be deemed acceptable by the City and USFWS. Longterm management shall be funded through a non-wasting endowment in an amount determined through a Property Assessment Record (PAR) or similar method for determining funding amount. The mitigation land shall be owned by a conservancy, the City or other similar, experienced entity subject to approval by the City and USFWS. Or,

- If demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City and USFWS that on-site preservation of mitigation land is not feasible to fulfill all or a portion of mitigation obligations, then the project shall include purchase of southern maritime chaparral credits at an approved conservation Mitigation Bank deemed acceptable by the City and USFWS. The mitigation credits shall include lands occupied by Del Mar manzanita, coast white ceanothus, and Torrey pine; resulting in a 1:1 replacement ratio for these species.
- 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?



Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Direct impacts to vegetation communities and habitat types are presented below in Table 7. Southern maritime chaparral and Diegan coastal sage scrub are considered sensitive natural communities. Also presented are impacts to mature Eucalyptus Woodland trees. No riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities occur on site.

Table 7 Direct Impacts to Vegetation Communities

Vegetation Community/ Habitat Type	Existing On-site Acreage	Impacted Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	Required Mitigation Acreage
Southern Maritime Chaparral	5.00	0.41	3:1	1.23
Disturbed Diegan Coastal Sage	0.90	0.33	2:1	0.66
Scrub				
Non-native Vegetation	1.00	1.00	None	None
Eucalyptus Woodland	1.30	1.10	1:1	1.10
Disturbed/Developed Habitat	0.30	0.20	None	None
Total	8.50	3.04		1.89

Impacts to 0.41 acres of southern maritime chaparral, 0.33 acres of disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub would be considered less than significant with mitigation (MM-BIO-2). Further, 1.10 acres of Eucalyptus Woodland would be replaced at a 1:1 ratio in order to comply with Goal 7.1 of the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) (MM-BIO-2).

MM-BIO-2: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, impacts to 0.41 acres of southern maritime chaparral shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio, impacts to 0.33 acres of disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio, and 1.10 acres of Eucalyptus Woodland shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio, unless otherwise required

by the City and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Unless otherwise mitigated by MM-BIO-1, mitigation for southern maritime chaparral, disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub and Eucalyptus Woodland shall be accomplished off-site through a combination of habitat-based preservation, and/or purchase of conservation Mitigation Bank credits, as follows:

- Off-site preservation of mitigation land, recordation of a BOS easement, and preparation of a Resource Management Plan to address long-term monitoring, maintenance, management, and reporting directives, in perpetuity, approved by the City and USFWS. The location shall be deemed acceptable by the City and USFWS. Long-term management shall be funded through a non-wasting endowment in an amount determined through preparation of a PAR or similar method for determining funding amount. The mitigation land shall be owned by a conservancy, the City or other similar, experienced entity subject to approval by the City and USFWS.
- If demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City and USFWS that off-site preservation of mitigation land is not feasible to fulfill all or a portion of mitigation obligations, then the project shall include purchase of southern maritime chaparral credits at an approved conservation Mitigation Bank deemed acceptable by the City and USFWS.
- 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?

Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	\square	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 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, no impacts would be expected as a result of the project.

- 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?
 - - Less Than Significant With Mitigation
 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. Avoidance of the avian breeding season will be implemented and if an active nest is observed, avoidance measures will be implemented. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Le

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."

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 Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project is located in the easterncentral part of the city, within the Encinitas "Softline Focused Planning Area", as defined in the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) Subregional Plan, which was developed for certain north San Diego County cities in anticipation of Subarea Plan preparation and implementation. The City of Encinitas is not actively working on a Subarea Plan at this time, and one is not anticipated in the near future. As analyzed in Appendix C, higher mitigation ratios could be required by the City or the Wildlife Agencies because the City of Encinitas does not have an active Subarea Plan currently in process. Mitigation for habitat impacts can be achieved by off-site habitat restoration which includes approximately 2 acres of disturbed habitat within the in City of Encinitas, San Diego County California. The Mitigation Plan will restore no less than 1.23 acres of Southern Maritime Chaparral and 0.66 acres of Coastal Sage Scrub in a Cityapproved and Wildlife Agency-approved location. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the policies of the Softline Focused Planning Area and impacts would be less than significant. - 42 -

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	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site is vacant and does not include any 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 the records search, 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?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact
\boxtimes	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	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.

SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project requires grounddisturbing activities and the potential for inadvertent discovery of archeological resources. The following mitigation measures (MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-9) will ensure that any archeological resources encountered are preserved accordingly as outlined below.

- **MM-CUL-1:** A qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for precontact ("prehistoric") and historic archaeology, in collaboration with and at the direction of traditionally and culturally affiliated (TCA) Native American Tribes, shall provide pre-construction cultural resources awareness training, including but not limited to tribal cultural resources (TCRs) that may be designated or recorded as "archaeological", cultural landscapes, and flora, fauna, and geological materials of cultural significance and concern, to all construction personnel. Training will include appropriate protocol following the unanticipated discovery of any archaeological deposits and/or significant geological deposits during construction. A qualified professional archaeologist approved by TCA Native American Tribes shall be retained to monitor all ground-disturbing activity associated with the project.
- **MM-CUL-2** Due to the high potential for uncovering unknown subsurface TCRs or other historical resources that may be designated or recorded as archaeological or cultural resources, 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.
- MM-CUL-3 A Cultural Resource Mitigation Monitoring Program shall be conducted to provide for the identification, evaluation, treatment, and protection of any cultural resources that are affected by or may be discovered during the construction of the proposed project, including but not limited to TCA ancestral places that may be designated or recorded as "archaeological", cultural landscapes, and flora, fauna, and geological materials of cultural significance and concern. The monitoring shall consist of the full-time presence of an archaeological monitor, who is a professional archaeologist working under the direction of the qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for precontact ("prehistoric") and historic archaeology, and TCA Native American monitors for, but not limited to, any clearing or grubbing of vegetation, tree removal, demolition and/or removal of remnant foundations, pavements, abandonment and/or installation of infrastructure; grading or any other ground disturbing or altering activities, including the placement of imported fill materials (note: all fill materials shall be absent of any and all cultural resources); and related road improvements, including, but not limited to, La Costa Avenue. Other tasks of the monitoring program shall include the following:

- 1. The requirement for cultural resource mitigation monitoring shall be noted on all applicable construction documents, including demolition plans, grading plans, etc.
- 2. The archaeological monitor and TCA Native American monitors shall attend all applicable pre-construction meetings with the Contractor and/or associated Subcontractors.
- 3. The archaeological monitor shall maintain ongoing collaboration with TCA Native American monitors during all ground disturbing or altering activities, as identified above.
- 4. In the event that more than one TCA Consulting Tribe requests to provide a TCA Native American monitor for activities subject to these measures, the City will allow for either: 1) up to one monitor from each TCA Consulting Tribe to be present simultaneously;
- 5. The archaeological monitor and/or TCA Native American monitor may halt ground disturbing activities if archaeological artifact deposits, or cultural features, and/or significant geological deposits are discovered. In general, ground disturbing activities shall be halted within a 50-foot radius of the discovery to allow a determination of potential significance, the subject of which shall be determined by the archaeological monitor and the TCA Native American monitors and at the direction of TCA Consulting Tribes. Ground-disturbing activities shall not resume until the qualified archaeologist, in consolation with the TCA Native American monitors, deems the cultural resource, feature, or deposit has been appropriately documented and avoided and/or protected. At the discretion of the archaeological Monitor in consultation with the TCA Native American monitors, the location of ground disturbing activities may be relocated elsewhere on the project site to avoid further disturbance of cultural resources. The qualified archaeologist in collaboration with the appropriate authorities or monitors from the TCA Consulting Tribes shall be called to evaluate the significance of the find and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgement. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:
 - a. If the qualified archaeologist in collaboration with and at the direction of the appropriate authorities from the TCA Native American Tribes determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately, and no agency notifications are required.

- b. If the qualified archeologist in collaboration with and at the direction of the appropriate authorities from the TCA Native American Tribes determines that the find does represent a cultural resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the City and landowner. The City shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR under all eligibility Criteria. Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the City, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the site either: 1) is not eligible for or CRHR; or 2) that the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation treatment measures have been completed to its satisfaction or, if it is a TCR, the satisfaction of the TCA Consulting Tribes.
- 6. The avoidance and protection of discovered unknown and significant cultural resources and/or unique archaeological resources is the preferable mitigation for the proposed project. If avoidance is not feasible, a Data Recovery Plan may be authorized by the City as the lead agency under CEQA. If data recovery is required, then TCA Consulting Tribes shall be notified and consulted in drafting and finalizing any such recovery plan.
- 7. The archaeological monitor and/or TCA Native American monitors may also halt ground disturbing activities around known archaeological and/or culturally significant deposits or cultural features if, from their respective opinions, there is the possibility that they could be damaged or destroyed.
- 8. If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measured are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (Assembly Bill {AB} 2641). The archaeological monitor 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.

- MM-CUL-4 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, and subject to approval of terms by the City, the applicant or owner, and/or contractor shall enter into a Pre-Excavation Agreement with the TCA Consulting Tribes. The purpose of this agreement shall be to formalize protocols and procedures between the applicant or owner, and/or contractor, and the TCA Consulting Tribes for the protection and treatment of, but not limited to, such items as Native American human remains, funerary objects, cultural and religious landscapes, ceremonial items, traditional gathering areas and cultural items, located and/or discovered through the cultural resource mitigation monitoring program in conjunction with the construction of the proposed project, including additional archaeological surveys and/or ethnographic studies. excavations. geotechnical investigations, soil surveys, grading, or any other grounddisturbing activities.
- **MM-CUL-5** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant or owner, and/or contractor shall provide a written and signed letter to the City's Director of Development Services, stating that a City-approved qualified archaeologist and TCA Native American monitors have been retained at the applicant or owner and/or contractor's expense to implement the monitoring program, as described in the pre-excavation agreement. A copy of the letter shall be included in the grading plan submittals for the grading permit.
- **MM-CUL-6** Prior to any ground disturbing activities and/or the issuance of a grading permit and concurrent with any demolition activities within the project area, a Phase II archaeological assessment shall occur and be completed, and identify any additional potential negative impacts to subsurface tribal cultural resources that have not yet been identified due to safety conditions at the project area. The Phase II archaeological assessment shall be developed by the qualified archaeologist and the TCA Consulting Tribes. All sacred sites, significant tribal cultural resources and/or unique archaeological resources encountered within the project area shall be avoided and preserved as the preferred mitigation, if Feasible.
- **MM-CUL-7** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, and in order for potentially significant archaeological artifact deposits and/or cultural resources to be readily detected during mitigation monitoring, a written "Controlled Grade Procedure" shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the TCA Consulting Tribes, and the applicant or owner, subject to the approval of City representatives. The Controlled Grade Procedure shall establish requirements for any ground disturbing work with machinery occurring in and around areas

the archaeological monitor and TCA Native American monitors determine to be sensitive through the cultural resource mitigation monitoring process. The Controlled Grade Procedure shall include, but not be limited to, appropriate operating pace, increments of removal, weight and other characteristics of the earth disturbing equipment. A copy of the Controlled Grade Procedure shall be included in the grading plan submittals for the grading permit.

- **MM-CUL-8** Prior to the release of the grading bond, a Monitoring Report and/or Evaluation Report, which describes the results, analysis and conclusions of the cultural resource mitigation monitoring efforts (such as, but not limited to, the Research Design and Data Recovery Program) shall be submitted by the qualified archaeologist, along with TCA Native American monitors' notes and comments, to the City's Director of Development Services for approval.
- **MM-CUL-9** The landowner shall relinquish ownership of TCRs collected during the cultural resource mitigation monitoring conducted during all ground disturbing activities, and from any previous archaeological studies or excavations on the project site to the appropriate TCA Consulting Tribe and dignified treatment and disposition, including reburial on-site in a location determined in consultation with the appropriate TCA Consulting Tribes, in accordance with the Tribe's cultural and spiritual traditions. All cultural materials that are associated with burial and/or funerary goods will be repatriated to the Most Likely Descendant as determined by the Native American Heritage Commission per California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

Implementation of the mitigation measures outlined above would ensure impacts to archeological resources remain less than significant.

- c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?
 - Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation
 No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Per MM-CUL-3, in the event human remains, or remains that are potentially human, are uncovered during construction, a qualified archeologist 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?

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

 \mathbb{N} Less Than Significant With Mitigation \square No Impact Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact:

Construction

During construction, the proposed project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass. Fossil fuels to power construction vehicles and other energy-consuming equipment would be used during site clearing and grubbing, grading, and construction. Fuel energy consumed during these activities would be temporary in nature and would not represent a significant demand on energy resources. Project construction equipment would be required to comply with the latest EPA and CARB engine emissions standards. These standards require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption.

As such, project construction would not represent a substantial increase in demand for local or regional energy supplies. It is expected that construction fuel consumption associated with the proposed project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than other similar development projects of this nature.

- 49 -

<u>Operation</u>

The proposed project would meet or exceed 2019 Title 24 energy efficiency requirements. The proposed project would also comply with CALGreen Tier II standards. Other energy-saving features incorporated into the proposed development include restrictions on natural gas hearths, implementing low-flow water fixtures, drought-tolerant landscaping, ENERGY STAR appliances, high-efficiency HVAC systems, and stormwater reuse systems on site to collect, filter and reuse captured stormwater in landscaped areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during operation.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact \mathbb{N} Less Than Significant With Mitigation
 - Incorporated

No Impact

Less than Significant Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project would follow applicable energy standards and regulations during the construction and operational phases. The proposed project would meet or exceed 2019 Title 24 energy efficiency requirements. The proposed project would also comply with CALGreen Tier II standards. Further, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the City of Encinitas CAP. Thus, through the mobile source emission regulatory framework, Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, and RPS, emissions would be reduced for the proposed project to a level that is consistent with the goals of AB 32. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

This section evaluates potential changes to geology and soils resulting from the implementation of the proposed project. Information and analysis in this section have been compiled based on an understanding of the existing conditions and review of existing technical data, applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines, as well as the following technical reports prepared for this proposed project:

Limited Geotechnical Investigation and Update Report (Appendix D)

Would the project:

- Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, a) 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.

1	

Potentially Significant ImpactImpactImpactLess Than Significant With MitigationImpactNo ImpactIncorporatedImpactImpact

A Limited Geotechnical Investigation for the proposed 11 Lot Subdivision, Ranch View Terrace Project, was conducted on December 30, 1987 and updated on April 20, 2018. This investigation included the proposed project site and on November 24, 2020, geologic mapping within the limits of the proposed development was conducted and the results recorded. Collectively these three studies as herein referred to as the Geotechnical Investigation. The following responses has incorporated the analysis from the Geotechnical Investigation, and the Geotechnical Investigation is included herein as Appendix D.

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: A review of geologic literature pertaining to the general site area indicates the subject site is not within any State mapped Earthquake Fault Zone or County of San Diego mapped fault zones. 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. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	
------------------------------------	--

Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The site is considered to lie within a seismically active region, as is all of Southern California. The nearest active fault is the Rose Canyon fault zone located within any State mapped Earthquake Fault Zones or County of San Diego mapped fault zones. The seismic risk at the project site is similar to that of the surrounding developed area. Severe ground shaking is most likely to occur during an earthquake on one of the regional active faults in Southern California. The effect of seismic shaking would be minimized by adhering to the recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation for site preparation, fill placement, foundations and slabs-on-grade and the California. Therefore, impacts from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

SANCTU MULTI-0	JARY PROJECT 02610-2018 - 51 -		July 20, 2023
iii	. Seismic-related ground failure, ir	cludinę	g liquefaction?
	Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitigatior Incorporated		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. As noted in Appendix D, given the nature of the soil materials underlying the site and the lack of near surface water, the potential for liquefaction or other forms of seismic ground failure is not expected provided that the project adheres to the recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation for site preparation, fill placement, foundations and slabs-on-grade. Therefore, the potential for liquefaction would be considered less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: As noted in Appendix D, geologic hazards and maps were reviewed of the subject area, and the review did not indicate landslide deposits at the area in and around the project site. The investigation found no evidence of deep-seated landslides or other forms of slope instability on the property. In addition, based on review of available geologic literature, topographic maps, and stereoscopic aerial photographs, no evidence of landslides was indicated at the project site. Therefore, the potential for landslides or large-scale slope instability is considered low. Impacts are less than significant.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The project involves grading on site and would be required to comply with the City's Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. Compliance with these regulations would minimize the potential for water and soil erosion. In addition, the areas of the project site

that have saturated soils and/or erosion gullies would be over excavated and soils replaced in accordance with the applicable specification as recommended in Appendix D. Provided these recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation are followed, unsuitable soil materials per the Unified Soil Classification System, would be considered to possess low to medium potential for expansion.

In addition, the project would implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would include best management practices (BMPs) that will stop site erosion and siltation during construction. The project would also have a Stormwater Quality Management Plan that would have BMPs to control erosion and drainage during project operation and maintenance. Proposed new stormwater drainage facilities would include private street drainage and Hydromodification (HMP) biofiltration basins to meet the requirements for hydromodification management flow and storm water pollutant control. These facilities will capture runoff and protect downstream resources.

In addition, erosion caused by concentrated storm water runoff flow would be controlled by BMPs such as adding erosion control blankets, adding stone at flow entry points, or minor re-grading to restore proper drainage in accordance with the SWQMP (Appendix E).

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 off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project would involve grading and earthwork, including 12,500 CY of cut, 4,500 CY of fill, and 8,000 CY of soil export. 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 (Appendix D). 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 excavation and foundation design that recommends the existing soils be excavated to a minimum depth of 36 inches below the bottom of proposed foundations, or to the depth of dense formational materials, whichever is greatest. The investigation also demonstrated that the site would be suitable for development when constructed in accordance with Geotechnical Investigation's recommendations for foundations in engineered fill, the 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 VII, Geology and Soils, Question a, iii through iv, listed above.

SANCTUARY PROJECT
MULTI-002610-2018

- 53 -

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?



Potentially Significant ImpactImpactImpactLess Than Significant With MitigationImpactNo ImpactIncorporatedImpactImpact

Less than Significant Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: As noted in Appendix D, based on laboratory testing and observations, it is anticipated that on-site soil materials possess a very low to low expansion potential. Although not anticipated, should an abundance of highly expansive materials be encountered, selective grading may need to be performed. In addition, Appendix D notes recommendations for site preparation, fill placement, foundations, stormwater basin design and slabs-on-grade that would be followed. According to the project's Geotechnical Investigation, by incorporating these geotechnical recommendations to ensure soil stability and proper engineering design of the foundation pads, and by designing and constructing the project in compliance with the California Building Code design standards, potential impacts related to geologic units or soils would be reduced 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?

Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	\square	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 Cardiff Sanitation 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?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact
\ge	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	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.

Based on the City's General Plan Figure 4, Cultural Resource Sensitivity, the site is mapped as having low sensitivity for paleontological resources. However, 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. Therefore, mitigation would be required in order to reduce impacts to less than significant (**MM-GEO-1**).

- **MM-GEO-1:** 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 paleontologist. 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.

- 55 -

- 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.
- 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?
 - Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Dimpact

SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

- 56 -

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

No Impact

	Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
ı	Less Than Significant With Mitigation		No Import

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact:

Incorporated

GHG Overview

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 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 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 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 in November 2020. The CAP outlines actions that the City of Encinitas will undertake to meet its 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's CAP meets the requirements set forth in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.5, whereby a lead agency (e.g., the City) may analyze and mitigate the significant effects of GHG emissions at a programmatic level, such as in a general plan, a long-range development plan, or a separate plan, to reduce GHG emissions. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)(3), 15130(d), and 15183(b), a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative GHG emissions effect may be determined not to be cumulatively considerable if it complies with the requirements of a CAP. GHG emissions are an inherently cumulative impact.

The City developed its Single Family Green Building Checklist (Checklist) to evaluate a single family residential project's consistency with the CAP. Projects that are consistent with the CAP, as determined through the use of the Checklist may rely on the CAP for the cumulative impact analysis of GHG emissions. The Checklist is intended to provide a streamlined review process for the GHG emissions analysis of proposed new single family development projects that are subject to discretionary review and trigger environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

The City's threshold approach is consistent with CEQA Guidelines 15183.5 and supported by substantial evidence. Although the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has not provided guidance on a recommended GHG threshold; the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has recently undergone an extensive review and update of its recommended GHG thresholds (BAAQMD 2022). In its April 2022 Justification Report, BAAQMD focused on the significance threshold approach endorsed by the California Supreme Court's decision in its decision in the Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish and Wildlife [(2015) 62 Cal.4th 221], which concentrated on determining whether the project would be doing its "fair share" to implement California's ambitious long-term climate goals. This approach is based on the principle inherent in CEQA that an individual project would make a less than cumulatively considerable contribution if it would do its part to address the cumulative problem. The California Supreme Court stated, "if a plan is in place to address a cumulative problem, a new project's incremental addition to the problem will not be 'cumulatively considerable' if it is consistent with the plan and is doing its fair share to achieve the plan's goals" (Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife [2015] 62 Cal.4th 223).

BAAQMD's recommended GHG thresholds for showing a project achieves its "fair share" of GHG reductions includes implementation of specific design elements intended to help achieve

SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

carbon neutrality by 2045 or consistency with a local GHG reduction strategy that meets the criteria under CEQA Guidelines 15183.5(b).

As discussed above, the City's CAP meets the CEQA Guidelines criteria as a qualified GHG reduction plan under 15183.5(b) and is applied herein to the project to determine its significance. As noted above, the City's Checklist for single family development is used solely to determine consistency with the CAP. Nevertheless, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines 15064.4, GHG emissions resulting from construction and operation of the project were quantitatively estimated.

The City's CAP is a qualified GHG reduction plan. The CAP includes enumerated goals consistent with state targets set forth in AB 32 and SB 32; therefore, if a project is considered consistent with the CAP, it is also consistent with the applicable regulations.

Table 8 includes the applicable CAP items from the Single Family Green Building Checklist and the related project consistency analysis.

CAP Measure	Checklist Item	Project Consistency
CAP Measure BE-2: Require Decarbonization of New Residential Buildings. Complete 1,200 new low-rise residential electrification by 2030.	All Electric Building Requirements (EMC 23.12.110 B). All residential new construction shall be all- electric unless an exemption is applicable and approved by the City (see EMC 23.12.110 B). All-Electric buildings must include: ⊠ No natural gas or propane plumbing in the building or on the property:	Consistent. The project is a residential project that includes 9 dwelling units and includes PDF-GHG-1, which would require an all- electric development. Accordingly, the project would comply with the CAP measure and checklist item.
	 No gas meter connection; Electricity as the source of energy for space heating, water heating, cooking appliances, and clothes drying appliances; and If a pool is associated, may use solar thermal pool heating, but no gas. 	

Table 8. Climate Action Plan Consistency - Single Family Green Building Checklist

CAP Measure	Checklist Item	Project Consistency
CAP Measure RE-2: Require New Homes to install Solar Photovoltaic Systems. Require: 1) New single-family homes to install at least 1.5 W solar per square feet or minimum 2 kW per home, and 2) New multi-family homes to install at least 1 W solar per square feet or minimum 1 kW per unit.	Single Family Solar PV. (T24P6 150.10(a)) All newly constructed single- family buildings are required to install solar photovoltaic equipment sized according to CA Title 24, Part 6, Energy Code Section 150.10(a) which otherwise applies to newly constructed buildings.	Consistent. This measure requires information on the total conditioned floor area of the homes to determine the quantity and sizing of the solar photovoltaic system. Currently, the specifics on the conditioned floor area are not available. However, the project would comply with this measure through the building permit process to ensure the appropriate amount of solar is installed.
CAP Measure CET-4:	EV Charging: New 1 and 2-	Consistent. The project
Require Residential Electric	family dwellings and	would comply with this
Vehicle Charging Stations	townhouses with attached	measure through the
(EVCS). Require new	private garages (EMC	building permit process.
residential units to install	23.12.110 E).	Based on the current 9
EVCS equipment. Single	For each family dwelling, a	residential units the project
family units are to install	dedicated 208/240-volt	Would Install 9 dedicated
complete 40-Amp electrical circuit (EV Ready).	branch circuit shall be installed in the raceway required by section 4.106.4.1 ("EV-Ready"). The branch circuit and overcurrent protective device shall be rated at 40 amperes minimum.	circuits in the raceway.

Table 8. Climate Action Plan Consistency - Single Family Green Building Checklist

CAP Measure	Checklist Item	Project Consistency
CAP Measure WE-1: Regularly Conduct Water Rate Studies and Implement Approved Water Rates. San Dieguito Water District (SDWD) and Olivenhain Municipal Water District (OMWD) complete regular water rate studies and adopt modified water rates as approved by Board of Directors. This measure is intended to reduce water use and GHG emissions associated with treatment and conveyance of water. This measure includes supportive measures such as converting all current municipal landscape adjacent to recycled water pipelines to recycled water and looking for opportunities to work with the San Elijo Joint Powers Authority to extend recycled water pipelines to additional municipal facilities, when economically viable.	Graywater Systems (EMC 23.12.110 D). Newly constructed single-family dwellings shall be pre- plumbed for a graywater system in accordance with Chapter 15 of the California Plumbing Code and including a connection to in a convenient location for integration of the graywater system with landscape irrigation systems and accepting graywater from all sources permissible in conformance with the definition of graywater as per Section 14876 of the California Water Code	Consistent. The project would comply with this measure through the building permit process. At the time the building permits are sought, the plan sheets will show the homes pre-plumbed for a graywater system.

Table 8. Climate Action Plan Consistency - Single Family Green Building Checklist

The City's CAP has accounted for growth in housing through the 2020 CAP update. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use and zoning, as such the projected growth from development of the project would be consistent with the CAP projections. As shown in Table 8, the project would not conflict with the City's CAP implementation measures as evidenced by the project's consistency with the City's Single Family Green Building Checklist. Therefore, the project would not generate GHG emissions that would be cumulatively considerable and would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Impacts would be less than significant.

California Air Resources Board 2008 and 2017 Scoping Plans

AB 32 establishes a statewide goal to reduce GHG emissions back to 1990 levels by 2020. CARB adopted the AB 32 Scoping Plan as a framework for achieving AB 32 goals with the most recent being the 2008 and 2017 Scoping Plans. While the 2008 and 2017 Scoping Plans are not directly applicable to specific projects, the plans contain several state regulatory measures aimed at the identification and reduction of GHG emissions. CARB has adopted many of the measures identified in the plans, such as those that reduce emissions from area sources and vehicle fleets, which are not applicable to individual development projects.

The proposed project would comply with all applicable regulations adopted in furtherance of the 2008 and 2017 Scoping Plans to the extent required by law.

San Diego Association of Governments' San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan

SANDAG developed San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan to provide a regional growth management strategy that targets per-capita GHG emissions reductions from passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks in the San Diego region. The Regional Plan integrates land use and transportation strategies to meet GHG emissions reduction targets that are forecasted to achieve the state's 2035 and 2050 GHG reduction goals. The Regional Plan incorporates local land use projections and circulation networks in city and county general plans. Typically, a project would be consistent with the Regional Plan if it does not exceed the underlying growth assumptions in the Regional Plan. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in 9 residential units, which is consistent with what was included in the City's General Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with SANDAG's regional growth forecast for the City.

Additionally, the proposed project includes energy efficiency features that support the policy objectives of the Sustainable Communities Strategy and Regional Transportation Plan required by SB 375.

Quantification of GHG Emissions

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines 15064.4, GHG emissions resulting from construction and operation of the project were quantitatively estimated.

Construction

Table 9 shows the estimated annual GHG construction emissions associated with the project. Complete details of the construction emissions calculations are provided in Appendix A of Appendix A.

Year	CO ₂	CH4	N ₂ O	R	CO ₂ e
		l	Metric Tor	ns	
2024	343.00	0.01	0.01	0.07	346.00
2025	2.24	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	2.27
Total	345.24	0.01	0.01	0.07	348.27
	Amortized E	missions ((30 years)		11.61

Table 9. Estimated Annual Construction GHG Emissions

Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1.1.5

Notes: GHG = greenhouse gas; CO_2 = carbon dioxide; CH_4 = methane; N_2O = nitrous oxide; R = refrigerant; CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent.

See Appendix A for complete results. <0.01 = reported value is less than 0.01.

As shown in Table 9, the estimated total GHG emissions from construction of the project would be approximately 348.27 MT CO₂e. When amortized over 30 years, the estimated annual GHG emissions from construction of the project would be approximately 11.61 MT CO₂e per year.

Operation

Table 10 shows the estimated annual GHG operational emissions associated with the project. Total annual operational emissions were combined with amortized (30 years) construction emissions. Complete details of the operational emissions calculations are provided in Appendix A of Appendix A.

Emissions Source	MT CO ₂	MT CH₄	MT N ₂ O	R	MT CO ₂ e	
Mobile	109.00	0.01	< 0.01	0.18	111.00	
Area	13.30	0.01	<0.01	-	13.70	
Energy	27.20	<0.01	<0.01	-	27.20	
Water	1.63	0.01	<0.01	-	1.97	
Waste	0.53	0.05	0.00	-	1.85	
Refrigerants	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	
Total	152.00	0.08	0.01	0.20	156.00	
Amortized Construction Emissions (30 years)						
Project Operations + Amortized Construction Total						

Table 10. Summary of Estimated Annual GHG Emissions

Source: See Appendix A for complete results.

Notes: GHG = greenhouse gas; MT = metric tons; CO_2 = carbon dioxide; CH_4 = methane; N_2O = nitrous oxide; R = refrigerants; CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent. <0.01 = reported value is less than 0.01.

As shown in Table 10, the total project emissions during operation were estimated to be approximately 156 MT CO₂e per year. With the addition of the amortized construction emissions of approximately 11.61 MT CO₂e per year, the total annual emissions would be 167.61 MT CO₂e per year.

Summary

The project would not conflict with the City's CAP as evidenced through the project's consistency with the City's Single Family Green Building Checklist. Accordingly, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions or generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment; therefore, the project's impacts on GHG emissions would be less than significant.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section evaluates potential hazards and hazardous material considerations resulting from the implementation of the proposed project. Information and analysis in this section have been compiled based on an understanding of the existing conditions and review of existing technical data, applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines, as well as the following technical reports prepared for this proposed project:

- Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Ranch View Terrace (Appendix F)
- Limited Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment Proposed 9 Lot Subdivision (The Sanctuary) (Appendix G)
- County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health's Site Assessment & Mitigation Program Consultation Letter for the Sanctuary Project (Appendix H)
- Fire Protection Plan Sanctuary Project (Appendix I)

Would the project:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, a) 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 \square No Impact Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials can result in potential hazards to the public through accidental release. Such hazards are typically associated with certain types of land uses, such as chemical manufacturing facilities, industrial processes, waste disposal, and storage and distribution facilities. None of these uses are proposed by the project, rather, the project would consist of 9 single-family residential units and associated infrastructure improvements. Construction of the proposed project may result in temporary hazards related to the transport and use of hazardous materials, including those used for construction vehicle use and maintenance (diesel fuel, motor oil, etc.). The SWPPP prepared for the proposed project includes standard provisions to avoid significant effects associated with

the use of such materials. Once operational, the proposed project would not result in the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials due to the nature of residential uses.

Adherence to existing regulations would ensure compliance with safety standards related to use and storage of hazardous materials. Safety procedures mandated by applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations would ensure substances are handled appropriately and minimize the potential for an accidental release. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Potentially Si
Less Than S
Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Project construction activities could result in the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as gasoline fuels, asphalt, lubricants, paint, and solvents. Although care will be taken to transport, use, and dispose of small quantities of these materials by licensed professionals, there is a possibility that upset or accidental conditions may arise which could release hazardous materials into the environment. Accidental releases of hazardous materials are those releases that are unforeseen or that result from unforeseen circumstances, while reasonably foreseeable upset conditions are those release or exposure events that can be anticipated and planned for.

Project construction activities would occur in accordance with all applicable local standards adopted by the City of Encinitas, as well as state and federal health and safety requirements intended to minimize hazardous materials risk to the public, such as Cal/OSHA requirements, the Hazardous Waste Control Act, the California Accidental Release Protection Program, and the California Health and Safety Code.

Once the project is operational, hazardous material use associated with the residences, landscaping, and maintenance would be limited to private use of commercially available cleaning products, landscaping chemicals and fertilizers. The use of these substances is expected to be in relatively small quantities, typical for residential uses and landscape maintenance and would be subject to applicable federal, state, and local health and safety laws and regulations intended to minimize health risk to the public.

The Phase I ESA (Appendix F) was prepared 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). In addition, a Limited Phase 2 ESA (Appendix G) was then subsequently prepared for the project. According to these ESAs, there are no known or suspected "recognized environmental

SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

conditions" (RECs) as defined in the ASTM E 1527-13 Standard present on the project site. Both ESAs were reviewed by the County of San Diego's Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Program, and on January 26, 2023, a SAM concurrence letter was issued stating that the soil assessment was adequate and laboratory data supports the property to be redeveloped for residential use (see Appendix H).

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.

The results of the Phase 1 ESA did note that a portion of the property was likely utilized for agriculture in the past during a time when organochlorine pesticides (OCPs) were commonly utilized. Such OCP residuals such as DDT were banned in the late 1970s, but may remain in near surface soils within limited areas of the site. Furthermore, the Phase 1 ESA found that past agriculture practices could have used metals and metalloids such as copper, lead and arsenic to control insects and unwanted plant growth. Thus, the Phase 2 ESA collected soil samples for laboratory analyses to evaluate the potential presence of OCP and metal/metalloid residuals. The Phase 2 laboratory results found that OCP residuals and metal/metalloids were below regulatory values or, in the case of arsenic, less than typical background values and that environmental remedial activities were not necessary for the project site. Thus, impacts would be 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?

Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is approximately 0.25 miles to the southeast from the nearest school, Park Lane Elementary School, which is located at 2050 Park Dale Lane in Encinitas, California. Project construction would involve routine handling of hazardous materials such as solvents, paints, oils, grease, and caulking. These materials would be handled in compliance with applicable regulations such as those discussed under the Regulatory Setting. Small amounts of these materials would be handled during construction. However, these are typical for construction projects and would not include acutely hazardous materials. In addition, BMPs would be employed during construction (e.g., practicing good housekeeping, properly disposing of hazardous waste) to prevent spills of hazardous materials into the surrounding environment. Further, as discussed under Threshold Ixb above, the Phase 1 ESA did not locate any RECs at the property and the Phase 2 ESA found that the potential presence of OCP residuals and metal/metalloid residuals were below regulatory values or less than typical background values and that environmental remedial activities were not necessary for the project

- 66 -

site. Thus, the potential for exposing the surrounding environment (including schools) to hazardous materials would be less than significant.

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?



Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	\square	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impacts would result.

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?



Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

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 5 miles northwest 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?

Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		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 on site. 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.

- 68 -

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?

Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The Fire Protection Plan (Appendix I) for the proposed project found that development of the property will result in certain unavoidable impacts due to grading, construction, landscaping, and other associated changes in land-use. The removal of the Eucalyptus stand of trees will greatly reduce the threat of a wildland fire spreading embers. The existing open space / native chaparral will continue to be a threat to burn. The Behave Fire Modeling under worst case weather scenario results in a 28-foot flame length. The 50 feet of clearing and the masonry wall will provide defensible space like the 100-foot requirement. In addition, the additional access and fire hydrants will assist the fire department in attacking a fire. The building of the project will improve the overall safety of the immediate area around the site.

The project is 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

This section evaluates potential hydrology and water quality impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project. Information and analysis in this section have been compiled based on an understanding of the existing conditions and review of existing technical data, applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines, as well as the following technical reports prepared for this proposed project:

- Preliminary Hydrology Study for the Sanctuary (Appendix J)
- City of Encinitas Stormwater Intake and Priority Development Project Stormwater Quality Management Plan for The Sanctuary Development (Appendix E)

- 69 -

Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?
 - Potentially Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation
 Incorporated
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation

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.

Potential water quality impacts associated with short-term grading and construction activities include discharge of construction-related sediment and hazardous materials (e.g., fuels). To ensure that construction activities do not cause water quality to be impaired, a SWPPP would be prepared and implemented. In accordance with the requirements of Section A of the Construction General Permit, the SWPPP would contain a site map(s) which shows the construction site perimeter, existing and proposed buildings, lots, roadways, stormwater collection and discharge points, general topography both before and after construction, and drainage patterns across the project. The SWPPP would list the BMPs that would be used to protect stormwater runoff and the placement of those BMPs. Additionally, the SWPPP would contain a visual monitoring program, a chemical monitoring program for "nonvisible" pollutants to be implemented if there is a failure of BMPs, and a sediment monitoring plan if the site discharges directly to a water body listed on the 303(d) list for sediment. Therefore, with implementation of BMPs during construction as required by the SWPPP, water quality impacts would be reduced or avoided. Project construction activities would not substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.

Potential pollutants due to the long-term occupancy of the proposed project 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. The project proposes the use of hydromodification biofiltration basins to meet the requirements for hydromodification management flow control and storm water pollutant control, vegetation stabilization planting, stabilized construction entrance, materials management, and waste management. To meet the treatment and flow control requirements listed in the City of Encinitas BMP Manual for post-construction BMPs.

According to the Preliminary Hydrology Study (December 15, 2020) (Appendix J), the 8.32-acre property is bound by residential homes to the north, south, east, and west. The existing property consists of undisturbed natural terrain. The drainage characteristics of the site consist generally of overland flow from northwest to east/southeast, discharging to a small channel along Rancho Santa Fe Road, which flows southerly eventually discharging to Escondido Creek which flows southwesterly to San Elijo Lagoon and ultimately discharges to the Pacific Ocean.

The portion of the property being developed is in the eastern part of the property. Off-site stormwater runs onto the project site along the western project site boundary. Per the Web Soil Survey application available through the United States Department of Agriculture, the site is categorized to have hydrologic group D soils.

Using the Rational Method Procedure outlined in the San Diego County Hydrology Manual dated June 2003 (SDCHM), the 100-year, 6-hour storm event peak flow rate was calculated for the project site in the existing condition (County of San Diego 2003). Table 11 below summarizes the existing condition hydrologic analysis.

Table 11. Summary of Existing Condition 100-Year Storm Event Hydrologic Analysis

Drainage Basin	Acre	Q100 (cubic feet per second)
A	9.7	22.44

The Priority Development Project (PDP) SWQMP (March 2019) (Appendix E) has been prepared to demonstrate that the project would comply with all operational requirements.

Once the site is developed, runoff will rain to proposed stormwater infrastructure that will outlet into the proposed bioretention treatment basins. Stormwater will be caught in a subdrain system, or overflow into one of two proposed grate inlets where it will all outlet to a proposed storm drain pipe and down the existing slope and out to a proposed curb outlets. From there it will sheet flow to the existing curb inlet, down to Escondido Creek which flows southwesterly to San Elijo Lagoon and ultimately discharges to the Pacific Ocean.

The project proposes pervious features include pervious pavers, landscape areas and biofiltration basins. The project site would be graded to create pads suitable for the construction of structures including new private streets, biofiltration basins, curb and pervious parking stalls, and associated underground utilities. Grading is proposed to honor the existing condition drainage basins.

The proposed project and proposed storm drain design would be capable of safely conveying the 100-year storm runoff flow, and 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 potential 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.

- 71 -

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

Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Public water service for the project would be provided by the Olivenhain Municipal Water District (OMWD). The project does not include the use of groundwater wells. Project implementation would not include development activities that could otherwise deplete groundwater supplies. Groundwater 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.

The PDP SWQMP prepared for the project (Appendix E) 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: hydromodification biofiltration basins, vegetation stabilization planting, stabilized construction entrance, materials and waste management, and permeable surfaces. Thus, 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
△ Less than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation
Incorporated
No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: As outlined in the PDP SWQMP prepared for the project (Appendix E), 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.

In the existing condition, the westerly portion of the site currently drains into the man-made pond approximately 100 feet due north of APN 265-331-32. The overflow of said pond then flows southeasterly overland discharging in between APN's 265-331-33 and 34. The natural conveyance of water is via sheet flow making its way south onto Woodwind Drive into an existing

concrete brow ditch. The existing brow ditch meanders south and east conveying the flow into an existing culvert on Rancho Santa Fe Road. The runoff generated by the easterly portion of the project site flows through the residential lots to the east and a smaller easterly portion of the site discharges onto Ranch View Terrace. The easterly flows travel east onto Rancho Santa Fe Road, then south, ultimately into the culvert located at the intersection of Woodwind Drive and Rancho Santa Fe Road.

In the proposed condition, runoff would be directed to the two proposed infiltration basins, Drainage Basin A and Drainage Basin B. Drainage Basin A consists of the majority site including the northern and eastern portions of the project site. Stormwater flows overland and in proposed storm drain easterly and northerly to a proposed Hydromodification management (HMP) Biofiltration with Partial Retention basin located in the northern corner of the site. The basin would discharge through a proposed PVC pipe to Ranch View Terrace.

In the proposed condition, stormwater discharging from the site will maintain similar patterns. The flows generated by the northerly and easterly portion of the site including runoff from BMP Basin A will discharge onto Ranch View Terrace via a stormdrain pipe, travel easterly along Ranch View Terrace via a new curb and gutter to Rancho Santa Fe Road. The flows then will travel southerly along a new rolled G-4 Type curb and gutter until it reaches the culvert located at the intersection of Woodwind Drive and Rancho Santa Fe Road.

Areas that lie within the property but outside the project site will continue to flow as in the existing condition.

The HMP Biofiltration basins will provide hydromodification management flow control and storm water pollutant control to meet the requirements the California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region municipal storm water permit (Order No. R9-2013-0001, referred to as MS4 Permit).

These measures would control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements. The PDP SWQMP also 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. With implementation of these BMPs and 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:
SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

- 73 -

Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation		No Impact

 \square Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: As outlined in the PDP SWQMP prepared for the project (Appendix E), 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.

As described in threshold question c), runoff would be directed to the proposed infiltration basins. 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, Question b.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern that could increase the rate or amount of surface runoff leading to flooding on or off site. The Hydrology Study (Appendix J) analyzes drainage before and after proposed development of the project site as described above in threshold a, 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. As stated in Appendix J, the existing 100year peak discharge from the site is 26.23 cubic feet per second. The post developed condition with proposed project and proposed HMP biofiltration basins are sized to accommodate the increase in peak runoff in the proposed condition and are designed to meet the requirements for both pollutant control and hydromodification management. The design would be capable of safely conveying the 100-year storm runoff flow.

In the proposed condition, runoff would be directed to the two proposed infiltration basins. Drainage Basin A consists of the majority site including the northern and eastern portions of the project site. Stormwater flows overland and in proposed storm drain easterly and northerly to a proposed Hydromodification management (HMP) Biofiltration with Partial Retention basin located in the northern corner of the site. The basin would discharge through a proposed PVC pipe to Ranch View Terrace. In the proposed condition, stormwater discharging from the site will maintain similar patterns. The flows generated by the northerly and easterly portion of the site including runoff from BMP Basin A will discharge onto Ranch View Terrace via a stormdrain pipe, travel easterly along Ranch View Terrace via a new curb and gutter to Rancho Santa Fe Road. The flows then will travel southerly along a new rolled G-4 Type curb and gutter until it reaches the culvert located at the intersection of Woodwind Drive and Rancho Santa Fe Road.

Areas that lie within the property but outside the project site will continue to flow as in the existing condition.

The HMP Biofiltration basins will provide hydromodification management flow control and storm water pollutant control to meet the requirements the California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region municipal storm water permit (Order No. R9-2013-0001, referred to as MS4 Permit). There are also many instruments into the storm drain system designed 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. 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

Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation		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 systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.

SANCTU MULTI-0	JARY PROJECT 02610-2018	- 75 -		July 20, 2023
(iv) ir □	npede or redirect flood flows? Potentially Significant Impact		\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
	Less Than Significant With Mitig Incorporated	gation		No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: As discussed above, runoff would be directed to proposed infiltration basins which would maintain flow below pre-development values. 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?

Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	\square	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: According to the California Emergency Management Agency Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning- County of San Diego- Encinitas Quadrangle, the site is not located in a tsunami inundation area, and therefore, it is not anticipated that inundation due to tsunami would occur (California Emergency Management Agency 2011. In addition, based on the distance between the site and large, open bodies of water, inundation of the site due to a seiche event is not anticipated. Additionally, the project site is located outside of the FEMA-mapped 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the potential for on-site flooding is considered low. As the potential for project inundation relative to flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones is low, it is not anticipated that project implementation would risk release of pollutants as the result of such events. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site would be in compliance with the San Diego Basin Water Quality Control Plan and is not located within a County Sustainable Groundwater Management Act or Groundwater Sustainability Plan basin area. In addition, the project 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)	Р	hysically divide an established commun	nity?	
		Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
		Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project is located on a single 8.32-acre parcel that is surrounding by residential uses and does not propose the introduction of major new 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 residential General Plan land use 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?

Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation		No Impact
Incorporated		

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site is located within the Hillside/Inland Bluff Overlay Zone according to the City of Encinitas Hillside/Inland Bluff Overlay Zone map (February 2008) (City of Encinitas 2023). This designation applies to areas where site-specific analysis indicates that 10% or more of the area of a parcel of land exceeds 25% slope. The Planning Commission is the authorized agency for reviewing and granting discretionary approvals for proposed development within the Hillside/Inland Bluff Overlay Zone. A slope analysis was conducted for the site and reviewed by the City, which found that the proposed project has been designed to comply with the requirements of the Hillside/Inland Bluff Overlay Zone. With strong consideration for habitat and steep slopes, the project is being proposed as a Planned Residential Development. This approach allows design flexibility to concentrate the development area away from sensitive habitat, bluffs, and steep slopes.

Once completing a slope analysis to determine the area of slopes greater than 25% grade, the plan was designed to preserve as much steep slope in its natural state as possible. After several versions, it was determined there was no other feasible site or design alternative to further reduce steep slope encroachment. Therefore, the project proposes 9.48% steep slope encroachment which is less than 10% allowed per code.

The proposed development has attempted to minimize encroachments into natural slopes over 25% to the greatest extent possible. Some grading will occur in areas with natural slopes over 25%. However, much of the disturbance occurring in the areas with natural slopes over 25% pertains to brush clearing related to fire prevention measures.

The remaining undisturbed slopes greater than 25% grade are being conserved as part of a conservation easement including 218,345 square feet of open space. This area will be managed by a land management company approved by the City of Encinitas and according to the Resource Management Plan submitted as part of the mitigation plan for the project. Along with steep slopes, the conservation easement will protect several endangered species of plants including southern maritime chaparral, coastal sage, del mar manzanita, Torrey pines, and several others.

The planting, maintenance, and removal of public and mature trees within the public right-of-way or on public property are regulated by the City's General Plan Resource Management Element (Policies 3.1, 3.2, and 3.6) and Chapter 15.02 of the City's Municipal Code. As stated under Policy 3.1, mature trees of community significance cannot be removed without City authorization. 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." As described above in Section IV, the project site contains a stand of mature trees growing on a low knoll near the site's eastern property edge qualifies as Eucalyptus Woodland. This mainly consists of large to small Murray Red Gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*) trees and others, with little to no understory. Eucalyptus Woodland is of no biological resource value and normally would not need to be preserved in place, relocated or transplanted; however, to comply with Goal 7:1 of the City's CAP, 1.10 acres of Eucalyptus Woodland would be replaced at a 1:1 mitigation ratio (see MM-BIO-2).

The City of Encinitas General Plan and Zoning Ordinance designates the project site as RR-2 (rural residential) which allows for 2 dwelling units per acre. Based on the project's development acreage of 8.23 acres, a total of 9 dwelling units would be permitted on the project site.

Relative to the Development Standards and Policies, the project is being proposed as a Planned Residential Development that allows design flexibility in some of the development standards. As part of the Planned Residential Development (PRD), the project proposes a reduction on the lot width and depths of the proposed parcels as well as a reduction in the some of the setbacks as follows: 1) some of the interior side yard setbacks have been reduced from 10 feet to 5 feet; 2) the street side yard setback was reduced from 15 feet to 10 feet on Lot 7; and 3) the front yard setbacks were reduced from 30 feet to 25 feet. The rear yard setbacks were not reduced under the proposed project. The PRD also proposes for lots 7, 8 and 9 to have an additional 5% in lot coverage allowance due to their unique lot design. With the approval of the Planned Residential

SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

Development, the project would be consistent with the standards as determined by the City's review of the project's proposed components. Thus, the proposed project is consistent with the underlying land use and zoning.

The City's CAP requires all new housing be constructed with rooftop solar panels, low-flow fixtures, and solar water heaters, all of which the project proposes to incorporate. At the time of preparation of this MND, the City has not adopted implementing ordinances for these requirements. Refer to the GHG section above for a summary of proposed project measures consistent with the City's CAP. As determined therein, the proposed project would not impede implementation of the City's CAP.

Overall, the project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?
 - Potentially Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation
 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?

Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	\bowtie	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

This section evaluates potential noise impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project. Information and analysis in this section have been compiled based on an understanding of the existing conditions and review of existing technical data, applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines, as well as the following technical reports prepared for this proposed project:

• Noise Assessment – Sanctuary Residential Subdivision (Appendix K)

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The project includes the subdivision and development of one 8.23-acre lot into eleven lots with graded pads, and does not include the construction of any residential homes or other structures. The landscaping proposed will be native and require minimal water throughout the facility. The proposed project is located west of Rancho Santa Fe Road, between Ranch View Terrace on the north and Woodwind Drive on the south. Entry to and from the property will take place from Rancho Santa Fe Road and includes a driveway to the property. A Noise Impact Analysis was prepared for the project by Dudek in February 2023 (Appendix K). 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 acceptable exterior noise levels for single family residences is an L_{dn} of 60 dBA in order to be considered acceptable. This noise level criterion should be applied where outdoor use is a major consideration (e.g., backyards of single-family residences). The 60 dB criterion serves as a screening threshold, anticipated exterior noise exposure above this level triggers a requirement for a site-specific acoustic evaluation to be performed. The maximum conditionally acceptable noise level for proposed single-family residential developments is 70 dBA Ldn., where an acoustic evaluation has been performed and it is demonstrated that exterior noise would not exceed this level. Interior noise levels are not to exceed an Ldn of 45 dBA.

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 Noise Assessment for the proposed project evaluated the construction noise with a Microsoft Excel-based noise prediction model emulating. Input variables consisting of the receiver/land use types, the equipment type (i.e., backhoe, crane, truck, etc.), the number of equipment pieces, the duty cycle for each piece of equipment (i.e., percentage of each hour the equipment typically works), and the distance from the sensitive noise. Noise-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the project include residences on properties to the north, west, south, and east of the project site. The closest off-site residence is located approximately 55 feet north from the closest boundary of a future construction zone for one of the residential lots; the closest homes to the east are approximately 65 feet from the closest future construction zone boundary; the homes to the south are approximately 75 feet from the closest future construction zone boundary; and homes to the west. Are approximately 590 feet from the closest future construction zone boundary. Using the provided construction information and the distance identified for the closest receivers, the construction noise model was used to predict noise from on-site construction activities. The construction noise was modeled at each of the representative distances to determine construction noise exposure for the existing adjacent homes on each side of the project site. The results are summarized in Table 12.

Task/Activity	Nearest Residence North (55 Feet)	Nearest Residence East (65 Feet)	Nearest Residence South (75 Feet)	Nearest Residence West (590 Feet)
	Lmax	Lmax	Lmax	Lmax
Site Preparation	88	86	85	62
Grading	88	87	85	62
Building Construction	89	87	86	63
Architectural Coating	77	76	74	52
Paving	88	87	85	62
Highest Noise Level All Phases	89	87	86	63

Table 12. Construction Noise Levels Per Phase at Closest Residences

Table 12 does not display hourly average construction noise levels at nearby residences, as the Encinitas ordinance is based upon Lmax. However, hourly average noise levels were also modeled. Thus, unmitigated hourly average (LEQ 1 Hour) construction noise levels would range from 70 to 84 dBA. This average noise level would be up to 38 dBA above the documented daytime level at the closest residences. Thus, construction noise would represent a substantial increase over ambient, and would make use of exterior living areas at adjacent residential lots

SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

undesirable. Compared to existing ambient noise levels, construction noise would be a potentially significant short-term construction noise impact.

Since construction noise is predicted to exceed the allowable limit of 75 dBA Lmax at the closest residences to the north, east west of the project site. The following mitigation measure would be required to address this significant impact.

In order to mitigate noise impacts at outdoor use areas, a temporary soundwall would apply to ambient noise increases during construction. With typical outdoor to indoor attenuation of 25 dBA for standard construction residential structures, interior noise levels at the closest residence during construction would peak at approximately 60 dBA, which should not interfere with conversation or other daytime activities indoors.

Table 13 presents the construction noise levels at the closest neighbors to the north, east, south and west with the required temporary soundwall in place. It should be noted that the soundwall along the west side of the development envelop is not required in order to mitigate construction noise levels at residences to the west, but rather would mitigate noise levels at residences along the northern and southern property boundaries that are close to future construction zone boundaries. As illustrated in Table 13, post mitigation sound levels would comply with the Encinitas construction noise limit of 75 dba Lmax.

Task/Activity	Nearest Residence North (55 Feet)	Nearest Residence East (65 Feet)	Nearest Residence South (75 Feet)	Nearest Residence West (590 Feet)
	Lmax	Lmax	Lmax	Lmax
Site Preparation	74	73	71	58
Grading	74	73	71	58
Building Construction	75	73	72	59
Architectural Coating	63	62	60	43
Paving	74	73	71	58
Highest Noise Level All Phases	75	73	72	58

Table 13. Mitigated Construction Noise Levels Per Phase at Closest Residences

Table 13 does not display hourly average construction noise levels at nearby residences; However, hourly average noise levels were also modeled for the mitigate scenario. Hourly average (LEQ 1 Hour) construction noise levels would range from 56 to 70 dBA. This average noise level would be up to 25 dBA above the documented daytime level at the closest residences, which would be very clearly noticeable and could lead to annoyance. Nonetheless, the mitigated average noise levels in exterior living areas at adjacent residential lots would not be harmful, nor present a deterrent to use of yard areas. With typical outdoor to indoor

attenuation of 25 dBA for standard construction residential structures, mitigated interior noise levels at the closest residence during construction would peak at approximately 45 dBA, which should not interfere with conversation or other daytime activities indoors. Therefore, mitigation would be required in order to reduce impacts to less than significant (MM-NOI-1).

Traffic Noise

As shown in Appendix K, operation of the project would involve trip generation that would result in traffic noise level increases on each roadway segment of no more than 0.1 dBA CNEL, which would not be discernible to the human ear. According to the traffic modeling results, some residences along Rancho Santa Fe Road may be exposed to exterior noise levels that exceed the Noise Element recommended maximum of 60 dBA Ldn. However, the project would increase traffic noise exposure by no more than 0.1 dBA, which is a less than discernible increase. The project would therefore not have a considerable contribution to traffic noise levels that could already exceed recommended levels at vicinity residences. Project traffic noise contributions would therefore be a less than significant noise impact.

Operation Noise Assessment Results

Additionally, calculations in the Noise Assessment (Appendix K) 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. 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.

Mitigation

In order to mitigate noise impacts at outdoor use areas, a temporary soundwall would apply to ambient noise increases during construction. The temporary soundwall mitigation would be a condition of approval and would apply to ambient noise increases during construction.

- **MM-NOI-1** A temporary soundwall shall be erected prior to the commencement of site preparation activities and maintained throughout construction of the project, along the northern, eastern, southern, and western development envelope boundaries, to the extents indicated in Figure 2 of the Sanctuary Project Noise Assessment. A licensed surveyor or registered civil engineer shall ensure the design of the wall installation such that it does not encroach into the proposed open space areas. The soundwall shall be a minimum of 10 feet in height, measured from the ground elevation on the project side of the soundwall. The soundwall shall be of solid material with a minimum STC rating of 25.
- b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Potentially Significant	\square	Less than Significant
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: 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.

The Noise Assessment for the proposed project (Appendix K) found that construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration at local receptors, depending on the equipment and methods used, distance to the affected structures, and soil type. Ground-borne vibration levels resulting from typical construction activities occurring within the project site were estimated by data and methods published by Caltrans (2020). Ground vibration levels associated with various types of construction equipment are summarized in Table 9 of the Noise Assessment, and the assessment predicted the vibration source level of construction equipment provided in Table 9, the distance to the closest sensitive receiver (i.e., residence), and the equation supplied in the Caltrans (2020) construction vibration assessment methodology, to estimate the project's construction-related vibration impacts at the closest residence. The findings of this analysis found that project construction-related vibration levels at the residence closest to the project site would in all cases represent less than 30% of the significance threshold for human annoyance (0.24 PPV in/sec). The construction would have no potential to cause structural damage to the closest residences, or to result in annoyance for the occupants of such residences. Project construction vibration impacts would therefore be less than significant.

- 84 -

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?

l			
Г		٦	
I		l	

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated 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 5 miles northwest of the project site, and there are no private airstrips in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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)?

]	Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
]	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project includes the subdivision and development of one 8.23-acre lot into eleven lots with graded pads. This physical change would not induce substantial population growth in the area because it would only require the use of temporary construction workers that would come from the local area and would only add an estimated population of 24 residents. The added workers and residents would represent approximately 1% of the anticipated population growth population and housing unit anticipated for the City's growth projections. 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?
 - Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation No Impact

- 85 -

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?
 - Parks? iv.
 - v. Other public facilities?

Potentially Significant Impact	\square	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated		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:

Fire Service

The project is within the service boundary and is eligible for service. The closest Fire Station to the project site is Fire Station #6 at 770 Rancho Santa Fe Road, which is approximately 2 minutes or 0.7 miles from the project site. Due to the project site's proximity to existing fire stations and the existing service level maintained by the Encinitas Fire Department and because the proposed project would meet all access, water, and protection system requirements, per the California Building Code and the California Fire Code as well as all other applicable City codes, the proposed project would receive adequate Fire Department services in the event of an emergency.

Additionally, Title 23 of the City's Municipal Code requires the payment of fire service mitigation fees as a condition of discretionary projects. Fees are determined by the Fire Chief and, once collected, are used to provide capital facilities and equipment for fire prevention and control, to include station construction, station expansion, and fire apparatus acquisition (Municipal Code Section 23.92.040). The project developer would be required to make payment of such fees prior to issuance of a building permit to reduce potential effects on the City's ability to provide adequate fire protection services. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a need for expanded or newly constructed facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

Police Service

Law enforcement services would be provided by the San Diego County Sheriff's Department from its North Coastal Station. The station is located at 2175 North El Camino Real, approximately 2 miles west of the project site. The station currently has adequate resources to respond to emergencies at the project site. The development of 9 single-family residences would not adversely affect the level of law enforcement protection or response times from the North Coastal Station and would not require the hiring of sheriff's department staff. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for expanded or newly constructed facilities.

Schools

The project site is located within the Encinitas Union School District (EUSD) and San Dieguito Union High School District (SDUHSD) and would contribute additional school aged children to Olivenhain Pioneer Elementary School, Diegueno Middle School, and La Costa Canyon High School. EUSD has a student generation rate of 0.41 students per household, and SDUHSD has a student generation rate of 0.3 students per household. Based on these generation rates, the project is anticipated to generate 4 elementary school students, and 3 middle/high school students.

The proposed project would contribute to overcrowding of the elementary, middle, and high school. Based on a review of available data through the California Department of Education, each school has capacity for the additional students based on historical enrollment. Specifically, Olivenhain Pioneer Elementary School's enrollment for 2021/2022 was 570 students; therefore, the addition of 4 elementary school students would not be expected to exceed prior years enrollment.

Similar to Olivenhain Pioneer Elementary, Diegueno Middle School's enrollment dropped from 930 students in 2019–2020 to a total of 780 students in 2021-22; therefore, the increase of 3 students from the proposed project is not expected to exceed previous enrollment totals. Likewise, La Costa Canyon enrollment experienced a decrease from a peak of 1,947 students in 2018-2019 to 1,647 students in 2021-22; therefore, the increase of 3 students from the proposed project is not exceed previous enrollment totals.

Because all three schools, while potentially experiencing overcrowding would not exceed previous years enrollment, it is not expected that new or expanded facilities would be required to serve the proposed project. Further, all residential development is required to pay impact fees in compliance with Government Code Section 53080 or Section 65970 and in collaboration with the City's Development Services Department to offset the impacts of additional residential development on school facilities. Payment of this fee is intended to offset school district costs and is considered full mitigation by State statute.

Parks

As stated under Recreation Element Policy 1.5 in the Encinitas General Plan, the City's goal is to provide a minimum of 15 acres of local recreational area per 1,000 residents, devoted to neighborhood and other local recreational facilities, community parks, and passive open space in undeveloped preserves (City of Encinitas 1991). Based on the City of Encinitas persons per household coefficient of 2.69 (U.S. Census Bureau 2021), the proposed project would generate approximately 24 people. Generation of approximately 24 people would result in the need for 0.36 acres of recreational land. All residential development in the City, including the proposed project, is required to provide parkland dedications or in-lieu fees (Government Code Section 66007) prior to issuance of a building permit in order to offset the impacts of increased demand on park and recreational facilities.

Other Facilities

Other existing public facilities available to support the population in the vicinity of the project site include libraries, hospitals, and general City administration. The additional public facility use from the anticipated residences would be negligible compared to the utilization of public facilities citywide. Given the small number of additional residents (24 people) and contribution of funds for community facilities, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts to other public facilities. the proposed project would not result in a need for expanded or newly constructed facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

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?



Potentially Significant ImpactImpactLess Than Significant With MitigationIncorporatedIncorporatedIncorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The City of Encinitas Parks, Recreation and Cultural Arts Department maintains 153 acres of developed/undeveloped parks, 82 acres of open space, 45 acres of beaches, 40 miles of trails, and 10 miles of streetscapes (City of Encinitas 2023). The addition of 9 single-family residences and the generation of approximately 24 people would not result in substantial physical deterioration of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities. In addition, the project would pay applicable in lieu fees, including fees for park acquisition and development, open space land acquisition, and trail development. Finally, the project would provide for usable private open space within each lot by complying with setbacks and lot coverage requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

- 88 -

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?



Potentially Significant ImpactLess than 3Less Than Significant With MitigationIncorporatedIncorporatedNo Impact

Less than Significant 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

This section evaluates potential changes to traffic and transportation resulting from the implementation of the proposed project. Information and analysis in this section have been compiled based on a review of existing technical data, applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines, as well as the following technical reports prepared for this proposed project:

• Sanctuary Residential 9 Homes Local Transportation Analysis (Appendix B)

Would the project:

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

No Impact



Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Incorporated

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 Congestion Management Plan (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 Traffic Mitigation Fee 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 (SANDAG 2020). 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 (SANDAG 2020).

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 ADTs, is approximately 90 ADTs during project operation. According to the Local Transportation Analysis by LOS Engineering, Sanctuary Residential 9 Homes, Ranch

View Terrace, City of Encinitas, dated December 9, 2021, roadway segments addressed in the LOS study included Rancho Santa Fe Road, north and south of 7th Street. 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 result in the construction of a new driveway to the new residential subdivision, but would not include any major road improvements or new road design features that would require 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.

The closest major transit station to the project site is the Encinitas Transit Station, located approximately 2.6 miles to the west. The Transit Station also provides access to NCTD's COASTER (commuter heavy rail) and NCTD Bus Routes 101, 304, and 309. Therefore, residents of the proposed project would have access to both the local and regional transit systems. No changes to the existing bus stop are proposed with the project.

As such, 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)?



Less Than Significant With Mitigation No Impact Incorporated

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. Guidance provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) recognizes that small land use projects, which fall below certain screening thresholds, would not have a significant effect on VMT. Projects that are below these thresholds are presumed to be less than significant. According to ITE's Regional Guidelines for Transportation Impact Studies in the San Diego Region (Regional TIS Guidelines), any project that generates fewer than 1,000 ADT if consistent with the City's General Plan, is not required to conduct a VMT analysis. The proposed project would generate 90 ADT and is consistent with the City's General Plan.

Further, because the project would generate less than 110 ADT, it is considered a small project exempt from VMT analysis. This is based on the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory which states that "projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less-than-significant impact." Therefore, absent substantial evidence otherwise, it is reasonable to conclude that the addition of 110 or fewer trips could be considered not to lead to a significant impact. Therefore, impacts to VMT 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)?

 \bowtie



Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation
No Impact
Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project would not include sharp curves or dangerous intersections. Instead, the site would be improved with high visibility driveway ingress and egress to the project driveway. Any existing areas of Ranch View Terrace, which would contain the project's entry to Rancho Santa Fe Road, would be repaired with a full A/C width overlay. The project would construct public improvements along the property frontage of Rancho Santa Fe Road by improving the intersection of Rancho Santa Fe Road, Ranch View Terrace and 7th Street at all four corners with American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant pedestrian ramps and new cross walk striping. 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.

SA Ml	NCTU JLTI-(JARY PROJECT 02610-2018	- 91 -		July 20, 20	023
c)	Resu	It in inadequate emergency acces	ss?			
		Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitig Incorporated	ation	\square	Less than Significant Impact No Impact	

Less than Significant Impact. The project would not generate traffic volumes that would impede emergency access. The access for the project is from Rancho Santa Fe Road to Ranch View Terrace. The project would include an easement to use Ranch View Terrace, and the access road would be 24 feet wide to and meet the 75,000-psi requirement for emergency vehicle access. The 24-foot-wide sections would be marked "Fire Lane, No Parking" All radii would also meet the 28-foot inside turning radius and the cul-de-sac would have a 36-foot-wide radius to accommodate emergency vehicles. The access road serving lots 6 – 9 would also have a fire department approved hammerhead incorporated in the intersection. In addition, additional parking areas would be provided along both access road. These measures would ensure that adequate emergency vehicle circulation and turnaround would be available on site. The project would also not alter any established emergency vehicle routes or otherwise interfere with emergency access along surrounding roads. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

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
 - 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.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact
\square	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact

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?

Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	า 🗌	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact:

Water

Olivenhain Municipal Water District (OMWD) would provide water service to the proposed project and there are adequate facilities to do so. Further, as part of the project approval process, the project applicant would be required to provide on-site water infrastructure and pay appropriate water system capacity fees. Therefore, since OMWD has indicated that it has facilities to serve the project site, and the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan, the proposed project would not require, or result in, the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Wastewater

Cardiff Sanitation District would provide sewer service to the proposed project. As part of the project approval process, the project applicant would be required to provide on-site sewer infrastructure and pay appropriate sewer system connection fees. The City's Wastewater Maintenance Division's existing requirements would ensure that sewer facilities would be sized appropriately and that the wastewater treatment requirements of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) would not be exceeded. Therefore, the wastewater generated by the proposed project would not cause the Cardiff Sanitation Wastewater District to exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the San Diego RWQCB. As such, the proposed project would not require, or result in, the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Stormwater

Once the site is developed, runoff will rain to the proposed stormwater infrastructure that will outlet into the proposed bioretention treatment basins. Stormwater will then be caught in a subdrain system and then be channeled through stormwater drainage facilities would include private street drainage and Hydromodification (HMP) biofiltration basins to meet the requirements for hydromodification management flow and storm water pollutant control. These facilities will capture runoff and protect downstream resources. The stormwater would discharge to a small channel along Rancho Santa Fe Road, which flows southerly eventually discharging to Escondido Creek which flows southwesterly to San Elijo Lagoon and ultimately discharges to the Pacific Ocean. The proposed project and proposed storm drain design would be capable of safely conveying the 100-year storm runoff flow. Construction of stormwater collection and conveyance systems have been included as part of the project and analyzed herein. No significant effects from new or expanded facilities would occur.

Electric Power

San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) is the electrical service provider that would serve the project site. Electrical service currently exists surrounding the project site, and would be extended within the interior of the project site to the various uses proposed (i.e., residences, street lighting etc.) and all electrical lines for the project would be undergrounded. Electrical service connections off site would be within existing rights-of-way and within future street alignments within the proposed project, the impacts of which are analyzed herein. Furthermore, the project would install rooftop solar on site, and high efficiency water heaters and HVAC systems that would reduce electrical demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the expansion or need for new electrical power facilities, the construction or relation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

- 94 -

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

 \mathbb{N}



 Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Incorporated

Less than Significant Impact: The Urban Water Management Planning Act requires each urban water supplier to assess the reliability of its water supply for normal, single dry, and multiple dry water years. Olivenhain Municipal Water District (OMWD)'s 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) was prepared to guide conservation and its water resource management program to comply with state law (OMWD 2021). In 2020, OMWD had 22,592 municipal connections and supplied approximately 19,582 acre feet of water. The demand forecast projects that future demands will remain approximately at current demand levels or decline. As stated in the UWMP, no shortages are anticipated during normal, single, and multiple (five) dry year scenarios.

The proposed project would implement water conservation measures to reduce potable water use to the extent feasible. The project would meet or exceed the conservation measures mandated by the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code. Additionally, the proposed project would include non-mandatory water conservation measures, such as the installation of insulated hot water pipes, pressure reducing valves, water efficient dishwashers, and dual flush toilets.

Overall, the project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Impacts would be less than significant.

- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may c) serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
 - Potentially Significant Impact \bowtie Less than Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation No Impact Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: As stated above, the Cardiff Sanitation District would provide sewer service to the proposed project and it has sufficient facilities to do so. As part of the project approval process, the project applicant would be required to provide on-site sewer infrastructure and pay appropriate sewer system connection fees. The City's Wastewater Management Division's existing requirements would ensure that sewer facilities would be sized appropriately and that the wastewater treatment requirements of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) would not be exceeded. The project would not result in a determination

- 95 -

by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's project demand in addition to the providers' existing commitments. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?



Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation

Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Incorporated

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project would be served by EDCO Waste and Recycling Services, which operates through an exclusive franchise agreement with the City. Solid waste is collected and taken to a local transfer station and then to the Otay Landfill in Chula Vista or the Sycamore Landfill in Santee. The Otay Landfill is expected to cease operation February 28, 2030 and is permitted to accept 6,700 tons per day. The Sycamore Landfill is expected to cease operation on December 31, 2042 and is permitted to accept 5,000 tons per day (CalRecycle 2019a, 2019b.

The City adopted a Construction & Demolition Debris (C&D) Ordinance (Chapter 11.22) that helps divert waste from landfills and comply with statewide mandates. Materials subject to the ordinance include, but are not limited to, asphalt, concrete, brick, dirt, rock, lumber, cardboard, metals and any vegetative or other land clearing/landscaping materials. Projects are required to reuse, salvage or recycle 60% of all C&D debris generated from the project (City of Encinitas 2020).

According to CalRecycle, since 2012, the amount of waste generated by the City of Encinitas has fluctuated between 5.6 and 6.1 lbs/person/day (CalRecycle 2023). As such, it can be expected that during operation, the proposed project would generate approximately 146 pounds, or 0.073 tons, of solid waste per day from the on-site residential uses (24 anticipated residents multiplied by 6.1 pounds of solid waste generation). The amount of solid waste to be generated would be minimal and would not result in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure. It would also not otherwise impar the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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 21440 et 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:

- Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation a) plan?
 - Less Than Significant With Mitigation
 - Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Incorporated

Less than Significant Impact: According to CAL FIRE's Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map, the project site is not located within a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2009); however, the site is located within a High Fire Hazard Zone in the City of Encinitas Hazard Map. Emergency response and evacuation is the responsibility of the City of Encinitas Fire Department. The County of San Diego maintains the San Diego County Emergency Operations Plan, which was approved in 2018 (San Diego County 2018). The Emergency Operations Plan is used by agencies that respond to major emergencies and disasters, including those related to environmental health.

Activities associated with the proposed project would not impede the free movement of emergency response vehicles. Existing off-site roadways would be adequate to serve the development for purposes of emergency evacuation in the event of a wildfire. The proposed project has been designed in compliance with City Fire Department access and design requirements related to fire prevention and subject to the approval of the City's Planning Division.

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. The 24-foot-wide sections would also be marked "Fire Lane, No Parking" All radii would also meet the 28-foot inside turning radius and the cul-de-sac would have a 36-foot-wide radius to accommodate

emergency vehicles. The access road serving lots 6–9 would also have a fire department approved hammerhead incorporated in the intersection. In addition, additional parking areas would be provided along both access road. These measures would ensure that adequate emergency vehicle circulation and turnaround would be available on site. The project would also not alter any established emergency vehicle routes or otherwise interfere with emergency access along surrounding roads. 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?

Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
Less Than Significant With Mitigation		No Impact
Incorporated		

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: According to CAL FIRE Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map, the project site is not located within a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2009), but the project is located in a High Fire Severity Zone on the City of Encinitas Hazard Maps. In addition, single family residential developments exist to the south, east, north and west. During occupancy and operations, the proposed project may introduce potential ignition sources including vehicles, gas- or electric-powered small hand tools (i.e., for maintenance), and standard substances used for routine household cleaning and landscaping maintenance; however, such conditions are not anticipated to exacerbate wildfire risks or increase the risk of exposure of residents to pollutant concentrations.

The proposed project would be constructed in compliance with access and design requirements of the City of Encinitas Fire Department (conditions of approval) and would be subject to payment of public safety services impact fees to ensure risks from wildfire are minimized. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to exacerbate wildfire risks or otherwise expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Impacts would be less than significant.

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.

- 98 -

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?



Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Access to the project site would be provided via Rancho Santa Fe Road at the existing intersection with Rancho Villa Terrace. The driveway road and a private cul de sac would be constructed as part of the project. These roads have been designed for emergency evacuation in the event of a wildfire. Future electrical service improvements would be undergrounded and would not exacerbate fire risk. Water utilities improvements have been designed to achieve the applicable fire flow requirement of 1,500 gallons per minute. Thus, the project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Impacts 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?

]	Potentially Significant Impact	\boxtimes	Less than Significant Impact
]	Less Than Significant With Mitigation		No Impact
	Incorporated		

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: As previously stated in response XX(b), a SWQMP (Appendix E) and Hydrology Study (Appendix J) has been prepared for the project to ensure adequate drainage. Proposed new stormwater drainage facilities would include two large infiltration basins. The proposed project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern that could increase the rate or amount of surface runoff leading to flooding on, or substantial runoff off site. As stated in Appendix J, the existing 100-year peak discharge from the site is 26.23 cubic feet per second. The post developed condition with proposed project and proposed HMP biofiltration basins are sized to accommodate the increase in peak runoff in the proposed condition and are designed to safely convey the 100-year storm runoff flow.

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. Based on review of available geologic literature, topographic maps, and stereoscopic aerial photographs, no evidence of landslides was indicated at the project site. The site is generally underlain by favorable oriented geologic structures, consisting of massively bedded sandstone. Therefore, the potential for landslides or large-scale slope instability is considered low.

Impacts to people or structures due to downslope or downstream flooding as result of runoff or post-fire slope instability or drainage changes would be 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?

 \square

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Incorporated

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, biological resources, geology (paleontological resources), cultural and tribal resources, 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)?



Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation

Incorporated

Less than Significant Impact No Impact - 100 -

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 (Table 14).

Table 14. Past, Present, and Future Projects within 1 Mile of the Project

Project Name	Address	Project Number
Residential Project with 2	2218 13 th Street	17-206
dwelling units		
Residential Project with 16	1335 Desert Rose Way	18-121
dwelling units		
Residential Project with 2	2223 El Camino Del Norte	18-266
dwelling units		
Residential Project with 250	2220 Encinitas Boulevard	MULTI-005356-2022
Apartments		
Residential Project with 140	630 Encinitas Boulevard	MULTI-003629-2020
Apartments		

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, Aesthetics, through XX, Wildfire, 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, biological resources, geology (paleontological resources), cultural and tribal resources, 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?
 - Potentially Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation

Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Incorporated

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 Section I, Aesthetics; Section II, Agricultural and Forestry Resources; Section III, Air Quality; Section IV, Biological Resources; Section V, Cultural Resources; Section VI, Energy; Section VII, Geology and Soils; Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous

Materials; Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality; Section XI, Land Use and Planning; Section XII, Mineral Resources; Section XIII, Noise; Section XIV, Population and Housing; Section XV, Public Services; Section XVI, Recreation; Section XVII, Transportation; Section XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources; Section XIX, Utilities and Service Systems; and Section XX Wildfire. As a result of this evaluation, the proposed project was determined to have potential significant effects related to air quality, biological resources, geology (paleontological resources), cultural and tribal resources, 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.

XXII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to federal, state and local regulations are available on the Internet. For federal regulations, refer to http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/. For state regulations, refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulations refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

- Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2023. "Scenic Highways - California State Scenic Highways." Scenic Highways | Caltrans . Accessed March 31, 2023.
- City of Encinitas. 1991. "Land Use Element." In City of Encinitas General Plan. https://www.leeassociates.com/elee/sandiego/LeeLandTeam/3111Manchester Ave/GeneralPlan-LandUseElement.pdf.
- California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

- DOC (California Department of Conservation), Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv Candice to make edits.ca.gov)
- DOC. 2023. "Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program." https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp.

AIR QUALITY

- CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. April 2005. https://sfmohcd.org/sites/default/files/20 - CARB%2C Air Quality and Land Use Handbook 2005.pdf.
- EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 2022. "AirData: Access to Air Pollution Data." http://www.epa.gov/airdata/ad_rep_mon.html. Accessed May 2022.
- Wilson & Company. 2009. Traffic and Circulation Assessment. Revised May 20, 2009 https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/ content/dam/sdc/pds/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/Appn _G_Traffic.pdf.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- California Health and Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

BAAQMD (Bay Area Air Quality Management District). 2022. "Climate Protection." https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-andclimate/climate-protection.City of Encinitas, Climate Action Plan (CAP), 2020. (https://encinitasca.gov/Climate)

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- County of San Diego. 2003. San Diego County Hydrology Manual. June 2003.
- (https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dpw/FLOOD _CONTROL/floodcontroldocuments/hydrohydrologymanual.pdf)

California Emergency Management Agency. 2011. "Despite Receiving \$136 Million in Recovery Act Funds in June 2009, It Only Recently Began Awarding These Funds and Lacks Plans to Monitor Their Use." California State Auditor Report 2011-406. March 2011. https://www.bsa.ca.gov/pdfs/sr2011/2009-119.4.pdf.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

City of Encinitas. 2023. "Hillside/Inland Bluff Overlay Zone." Encinitas, California Municipal Code, Title 30 Zoning, Chapter 30.34 Special Purpose Overlay Zones. Current as of April 2023.

NOISE

- Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2020. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. April 2020. https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dotmedia/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tcvgmapr2020-a11y.pdf.**PUBLIC SERVICES**
- City of Encinitas. 1991. General Plan. https://archive.encinitasca.gov/WebLink/browse.aspx?id=6656 22&dbid=0&repo=CityofEncinitas.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2021. "QuickFacts: Encinitas City, California." https://www.census.gov/ quickfacts/encinitascitycalifornia.

RECREATION

City of Encinitas. 2023. "Parks, Recreation & Cultural Arts." https://www.encinitasca.gov/government/departments/parksrecreation-cultural-arts.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

SANDAG (San Diego Association of Governments), 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- CalRecycle (California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery). 2019a. "SWIS Facility/Site Summary: Sycamore Landfill (37-AA-0023)." https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/ SolidWaste/Site/Summary/2871.
- CalRecycle. 2019b. "SWIS Facility/Site Summary: Otay Landfill (37-AA-0010)." https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/ Site/Summary/2863.
- CalRecycle. 2023. CalRecycle Homepage. https://calrecycle.ca.gov/.
- City of Encinitas. 2020. "Recycling." https://www.encinitasca.gov/government/departments/publicworks/trash-recycling/recycling#:~:text=What%27s%20 recyclable%20in%20Encinitas%3F&text=Plastic%20bags%20a nd%20any%20soft,and%20loose%20in%20the%20bin.
- OMWD (Olivenhain Municipal Water District). 2021. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. June 2021. https://www.olivenhain.com/wp-content/uploads/2020-UWMP_FINAL-2.pdf.**WILDFIRE**

SANCTUARY PROJECT MULTI-002610-2018

July 20, 2023

CAL FIRE (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2009. "Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map." https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/wildfire-preparedness/fire-hazard-severity-zones/fire-hazard-severity-zones-map/.

San Diego County. 2018. San Diego County Emergency Operations Plan. https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/oes/emergency_ management/oes_jl_oparea.html.