

5.10 Land Use and Planning

5.10.1 Environmental Setting

Utility Corridors

The proposed project would entail modification and removal of power lines and installation of supporting infrastructure (conductor, conduit, and poles) in the cities of San Diego and Del Mar. As described in detail in Chapter 4, “Project Description,” activities would occur along approximately 6 miles of existing overhead power line between the Del Mar Substation (northwest of the intersection of Interstate 5 [I-5] and Via de la Valle) and an existing steel pole located near the intersection of Vista Sorrento Parkway and Pacific Plaza Drive (TL666D). Project components would also be installed underground beneath San Dieguito Drive and Racetrack View Drive (C510) and beneath the Sorrento Valley Pedestrian/Multi-Use Path (C738).

This section evaluates potential land use impacts based on the physical changes to the existing environment that could be caused directly or indirectly by project construction (including activities at temporary workspaces) and operation. The significance of effects expected to result from the proposed project is evaluated according to the criteria presented in Table 5.10-1.

Existing Land Uses

Existing land uses adjacent to the proposed project’s utility corridors are presented here based on a review of maps prepared by the Planning and Community Development Department in Del Mar and the Planning Department of the City of San Diego, as well as field observations made during a site visit in March 2018. The proposed project’s four components account for a combined linear distance of approximately 8.0 miles of electrical transmission lines, part of a larger network in the greater project vicinity. The northernmost corridor alignment (TL6973D and TL674A) follows Via De La Valle westward adjacent hilly topography accommodating low-density residential neighborhoods, commercial businesses, and shopping centers, in addition to public parks, event centers, and open spaces, including San Dieguito River Park, and Del Mar Horse Park, and Del Mar Fair Grounds.

~~North South~~ of Via Del La Valle, immediately west of I-5, the TL666D corridor roughly parallels Jimmy Durante Boulevard, passing by the Del Mar Fairgrounds. follows a segment of the Coast to Crest Trail within the San Dieguito River Park, a large regional open space that extends from the Pacific coast in Del Mar to Volcan Mountain in the town of Julian. The Del Mar Fairgrounds is a regional destination located northwest of the San Dieguito Lagoon. It hosts the San Diego County Fair and a number of horse racing events throughout the year. ~~The TL666D corridor spans the fairgrounds’ surface parking lot, its alignment roughly paralleling Jimmy Durante Boulevard.~~ TL666D then follows a segment of the Coast to Coast Trail within the San Dieguito River Park, a large regional open space that extends from the Pacific coast in Del Mar to Volcan Mountain in the town of Julian.

The TL666D corridor aligns southward along San Dieguito Drive. To the east is San Dieguito Lagoon, a protected riparian open space with trails and a coastal boardwalk accessible from San Dieguito Drive near Jim Durante Boulevard, north of Crest Canyon. Low-density residential neighborhoods are located on the

1 hillside west of San Dieguito Drive. ~~South~~ North of Crest Canyon Open Space Park, ~~north of the~~ and the
2 Del Mar Heights residential neighborhood, San Dieguito Drive becomes Racetrack View Drive. Existing
3 TL666D pole and power line infrastructure continues overhead ~~adjacent to west of Minorea Cove and~~
4 ~~behind the Del Mar Hills Elementary School grounds, adjacent to I-5.~~ Along Mango Drive, land uses in
5 the TL666D corridor are residential and commercial until the Torrey Pines State Natural Reserve
6 Extension area, which is protected open space. TL666D spans approximately 0.5 miles across the Torrey
7 Pines Natural Reserve Extension Area in a southerly alignment, where power lines cross ~~residences~~
8 residential areas and enter Los Peñasquitos Lagoon and Torrey Pines State Reserve, south of Carmel
9 Valley Road and Portofino Drive. The utility corridor extends 0.8 miles through the Los Peñasquitos
10 Lagoon, paralleling the Amtrak Pacific Surfliner passenger rail corridor and Peñasquitos Creek about a
11 quarter mile to the east. It then follows Sorrento Valley Road for about 0.65 miles, at which point it
12 crosses I-5 and connects to an existing riser pole-12 kilovolt (kV) tap on the eastern side of the freeway.
13

14 Project components would also be installed within a Class I (pedestrian and bicycle-exclusive use)
15 segment of the Sorrento Valley Road Multi-use Trail, which originates at Carmel Valley Road and travels
16 adjacent to I-5 (City of San Diego 2013). Industrial and commercial land uses are prevalent south of the
17 Torrey Pines Natural Reserve reflected by the office buildings, warehouses, and automotive service
18 centers in the area.

20 5.10.2 Regulatory Setting

22 Federal

23 No federal lands are located within the project area; therefore, no federal regulations related to land use
24 are relevant to the proposed project.

26 State

27 California Coastal Act of 1976

28 The California Coastal Commission (CCC), in partnership with coastal cities and counties, plans and
29 regulates development in the coastal zone in accordance with the California Coastal Act of 1976 (CCA).
30 The CCA broadly defines “development” to include construction activities and the use of land and water
31 within the coastal zone. Title 14, Section 13253 of the California Code of Regulations states that a
32 Coastal Development Permit (CDP) is required for projects located within coastal zones that have the
33 potential to damage the coastal environment, including utility projects. Section 13253 defines coastal
34 zones as “property ... located between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea or within 300
35 feet of... the mean high tide line of the sea where there is no beach.” Portions of the project area are
36 within the coastal zone and are therefore subject to CCA regulations. The CCC delegates authority to
37 issue CDPs to local permitting agencies with certified a Local Coastal Programs (LCPs). Local
38 governments, in partnership with the CCC, use LCP implementing policies to guide future development
39 activity within the coastal zone.

40
41 The cities of San Diego and Del Mar have certified LCPs that encompass the project area. The Coastal
42 Zone is divided into a number of planning units. Within the city of San Diego, the proposed project would
43 be located within the North City LCP. The North City LCP is divided into sub-segments, of which the
44 following four are relevant to the proposed project: the Torrey Pines Community Plan, Torrey Hills

1 Community Plan, Via De La Valle Specific Plan, and North City Future Urbanizing Subarea II (San
2 Dieguito) Framework Plan. Policies in these plans have been designed to protect and enhance California's
3 coastal resources and to conform to LCPs in their respective areas.

4 Natural Community Conservation Planning Act

6 The Natural Community Conservation Planning Act of 1991 (NCCP) was designed to conserve natural
7 communities at the ecosystem scale, while accommodating compatible land uses. The California
8 Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) is the principal state agency implementing the NCCP program.
9 The NCCP, established in 1995 by agreement between SDG&E, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and
10 California Department of Fish and Wildlife, represents an approach to the long-term preservation of
11 sensitive habitat and animal species within an ecosystem where SDG&E's develops, operates, and
12 maintains electrical facilities. Project components would be located on lands subject to SDG&E's
13 Subregional NCCP, the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP), and the Water
14 Authority's Subregional NCCP/Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Relevant policies and protocols are
15 discussed further in Section 5.4, "Biological Resources" and 5.9, "Hydrology and Water Quality." No
16 relevant policies related to land use are contained within SDG&E's Subregional NCCP.

17 ~~California Public Utilities Commission General Order No. 131-D~~

19 ~~The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the siting
20 and design of the proposed project; therefore, CPUC projects are exempt from local land use regulations
21 and discretionary permitting.¹ However, General Order No. 131-D, Section XIV.B states: "the public
22 utility shall consult with local agencies regarding land use matters." Accordingly, the CPUC will continue
23 to coordinate with the local agencies regarding the project components as they relate to land use. The
24 public utility, under jurisdiction of the CPUC, is required to obtain any non-discretionary local permits
25 (CPUC 1995).~~

26 **Regional and Local**

28 In accordance with California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) General Order No. 131-D, the CPUC
29 has sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the siting and design of the proposed project; therefore, CPUC
30 projects are exempt from local land use regulations and discretionary permitting.¹ However, General
31 Order No. 131-D, Section XIV.B states: "the public utility shall consult with local agencies regarding
32 land use matters." Accordingly, the CPUC will continue to coordinate with the local agencies regarding
33 the project components as they relate to land use. The public utility, under jurisdiction of the CPUC, is
34 required to obtain any non-discretionary local permits (CPUC 1995).

35 San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan

37 The San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan is operated under the San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers
38 Authority agreement between the County of San Diego and Cities of Del Mar, Escondido, Poway, San
39 Diego, and Solana Beach. The planning effort was initiated to preserve the San Dieguito River Valley's
40 sensitive resources and rural character and to provide a concept for future recreational amenities within
41 the planning area. The Joint Powers Authority intends for member agencies to adopt the Concept Plan and

¹ The CPUC does not require land use or discretionary approval from a local agency body such as a planning
commission, city council, or county board of supervisors.

1 incorporate it into local planning documents accordingly. The Concept Plan has also been coordinated
2 with the MSCP and its implementing agreements (San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority 2002).

3
4 City of Del Mar Community Plan

5 The City of Del Mar Community Plan—also known as the city’s General Plan—is Del Mar’s
6 “constitution for development.” It comprises multiple elements that provide a comprehensive slate of
7 citywide and location-based policies for growth and development. The Community Plan also includes
8 policies to protect open space and habitat within the San Dieguito River Floodway and Lagoon, an area
9 where a portion of the removal work associated with TL666D is proposed (City of Del Mar 1976).

10
11 City of Del Mar Local Coastal Plan

12 Del Mar’s Local Coastal Plan is a compilation of goals, policies, and recommendations to achieve
13 compliance with the CCA. The plan includes various mandatory elements pertaining to development of
14 the coastline, preservation of natural and visual resources, and maximizing the physical use and
15 enjoyment of the coastal zone by the public. The Land Use Plan, which is part of the Local Coastal Plan,
16 is a compulsory LCP element that identifies the makeup of the community through a system of
17 designations characterizing land uses for all property within the city. Policies in the Land Use Plan
18 revolve around a central theme of preserving the existing character of Del Mar and its vicinity. (City of
19 Del Mar 1993)

20
21 City of Del Mar Municipal Code

22 Del Mar’s Municipal Code implements the designations identified in the Land Use Plan through the
23 imposition of specific controls, requirements, and performance standards stipulating where certain types
24 of uses may be permitted and how intensely such uses may operate. Within Del Mar, a portion of the
25 existing TL666D utility corridor traverses land designated Commercial (Racetrack-Fairgrounds, North
26 Commercial); Open Space (Floodway Zone); and Residential (Very Low Density Residential). (City of
27 Del Mar 2017)

28
29 City of San Diego General Plan

30 The proposed project would be located in part within the city of San Diego. Approximately 1.28 miles of
31 TL674A, 6.24 miles of TL666D, 1.06 miles of the C510 conversion, and 0.12 miles of the C738
32 conversion are within the city. The city’s General Plan establishes the framework of policies, objectives,
33 and land use designations to guide long-term development (City of San Diego 2015).

34
35 City of San Diego Municipal Code

36 The proposed project corridor would cross several zoning districts within the city of San Diego:
37 Agriculture Residential, Commercial (Community Commercial, Commercial Visitor), Open Space (Open
38 Space Park, Open Space Floodway), Residential (Very Low Density Residential, Residential Single Unit,
39 Multiple Unity Residential, and Industrial (Industrial Light) (City of San Diego 2017). As previously
40 discussed, the proposed project would not be subject to local discretionary regulations due to the CPUC’s
41 exclusive jurisdiction over electric transmission facilities in the state of California, pursuant to CPUC
42 General Order No. 131-D (CPUC 1995).

1 Torrey Pines Community Plan and Local Coastal Program

2 The area covered by the Torrey Pines Community Plan comprises primarily open space and sensitive
3 environmental resources, such as the San Dieguito Lagoon, Los Peñasquitos Lagoon, Torrey Pines State
4 Reserve, and Crest Canyon. SDG&E infrastructure, including the Del Mar Substation and five overhead
5 69 kV power lines, is located within the Torrey Pines Community Plan area. Accordingly, the City of San
6 Diego considers utility lines that traverse sensitive environmental resources to be impactful and should be
7 rerouted as feasible. The Torrey Pines Community Plan includes implementing policies of the LCP
8 specific to the community (City of San Diego 2014a).

9
10 Torrey Hills Community Plan

11 The area covered by the Torrey Hills Community Plan is bounded by Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve
12 and I-5 and is located adjacent to the Torrey Pines and the Carmel Valley Community Plan areas (City of
13 San Diego 2014b). An approximately 123-acre portion of the Torrey Hills Community Plan is located
14 within the California Coastal Zone. This plan provides policies to guide future development within the
15 coastal zone. SDG&E owns a 40-acre facility that accommodates a 230 kV substation located east of the
16 project area. Major utility corridors connect to this substation within the area covered by the Torrey Hills
17 Community Plan.

18
19 Via De La Valle Specific Plan

20 The approximately 125-acre area covered by the Vie De La Valle Specific Plan is located east of I-5 in
21 the northwestern sector of the city of San Diego. A series of existing overhead kV transmission lines are
22 located within a 150-foot-wide SDG&E easement within this planning area. A local coastal element-
23 compatible land use policy for Via De La Valle indicates that utilities should be placed underground.
24 (City of San Diego 1984)

25
26 North City Future Urbanizing Subarea II Framework Plan

27 The proposed project would be located within Subarea II near the San Dieguito River valley and within
28 the California Coastal Zone. The North City Future Urbanizing Subarea II Framework Plan does not
29 contain any specific policies that are relevant to the proposed project. (City of San Diego 2014c)

30
31 **Conservation Plans**

32 The following conservation plans include policies to preserve a network of habitat and open space land
33 uses within the proposed project corridor in order to maintain ecosystems and biodiversity.

34
35 County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP)

36 The San Diego MSCP, governed by the County of San Diego, serves as an MSCP pursuant to Section
37 10(a)1(b) of the Endangered Species Act and a Natural Community Conservation Plan under the
38 California Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act. The MSCP was developed to protect
39 biodiversity and enhance the quality of life in the region through the preservation of a network of habitats
40 and open space areas. The area covered by the San Diego MSCP is known as the Multiple Planning
41 Habitat Area (MHPA). The MSCP outlines specific criteria and requirements for projects within the
42 MHPA and authorizes take for 85 covered species. (City of San Diego 1998)

1 Local jurisdictions implement their respective portions of the San Diego MSCP Plan through subarea
2 plans, which describe specific implementing mechanisms for the San Diego MSCP. The San Diego
3 MSCP Subarea Plan, also referred to as the South County MSCP, applies to unincorporated lands within
4 southern San Diego County. The City of San Diego has also adopted a subarea plan. Additionally, much
5 of the proposed project would be within the northern area of the city of San Diego MHPA in Los
6 Peñasquitos Lagoon and Torrey Pines State Natural Reserve Extension. The regional MSCP subarea
7 plans collectively serve as a multiple species HCP pursuant to Section 10(a)1(b) of the federal
8 Endangered Species Act.

9
10 The San Diego MSCP allows for the development of infrastructure and utility projects and road
11 modifications within MHPA boundaries if a project is consistent with adopted community or subregional
12 plans, and incorporates appropriate mitigation strategies and/or alternatives to minimize impacts to
13 sensitive biological resources. Projects within the MHPA must demonstrate compliance with the land use
14 considerations described in the MSCP that are intended to preserve biological resources. Utility lines are
15 considered conditionally compatible with the MHPA when developed in accordance with the described
16 measures. Projects within the MHPA must demonstrate compliance with the land use adjacency policies.

17 San Diego Gas & Electric Subregional Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP)

18
19 The current SDG&E NCCP was approved in December 1995 and authorized the take of 110 covered
20 species resulting from SDG&E's ongoing activity impacts, including installation, use, maintenance, and
21 repair operations and expansion of its systems (SDG&E 1995). The current NCCP prescribes as
22 "operational protocols" various protection, mitigation, and conservation measures that SDG&E must
23 implement as part of its covered activities to ensure the survivability and conservation of protected
24 species and their habitat. The 61 operational protocols provided in the current NCCP include provisions
25 for personnel training; pre-activity studies; and maintenance, repair, and construction of facilities,
26 including access roads, survey work, and emergency repairs. The proposed project would located within
27 the area where SDG&E's utility operations are currently covered by the current NCCP. SDG&E may
28 elect to utilize their NCCP to permit the proposed project's impacts to covered species and their habitat.
29 Relevant operational protocols are reflected in the topical analyses in this Initial Study as applicant-
30 proposed measures, best management practices, or mitigation measures as warranted.

31 **5.10.3 Environmental Impacts and Assessment**

32 **Applicant-Proposed Measures**

33
34 No applicant-proposed measures are identified to address the topic of land use.

35 **Significance Criteria**

36
37 Table 5.10-1 includes the questions from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines to evaluate the proposed
38 project's potential to cause environmental impacts related to land use based on the three significance
39 criteria below.
40
41

Table 5.10-1 Land Use and Planning Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plans, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

The physical division of an established community is typically associated with loss of mobility through a neighborhood or between a community and its outlying areas. For example, construction of a freeway could create a barrier to accessing an existing neighborhood just as removal of a roadway could limit accessibility that could potentially divide an established community. The area surrounding the proposed project supports a variety of uses, including recreation and open space, infrastructure, residential, commercial, and industrial. Residential communities exist along the entire proposed corridor.

As described in Chapter 4, “Project Description,” the proposed project would involve removal and reconfiguration of approximately 6 miles of overhead 69 kV power line in designated corridors (TL666D; TL674A; C510 and C738) and implementation of the proposed project would neither disrupt nor divide surrounding communities. Because this activity involves the removal of an existing overhead power line, it would not physically divide an established community. Construction work would occur along the corridor alignments within existing city rights-of-way and SDG&E utility easements. Ancillary workspaces would function as access areas, stringing and or pole installation/removal sites, fly yards, and staging and/or lay-down areas for the storage of equipment and materials on a temporary basis. As illustrated in Table 5.10-2, most temporary workspaces would be established on land zoned for open space and for residential use. Fly yards and underground work areas would necessitate the greatest spatial needs by type of space.

During construction, SDG&E would extend existing power lines underground that would require temporary lane closures for excavation within city streets to install duct banks, particularly along Via De la Valle. Pole removal and topping would occur along the entire project corridor, including within some residential areas, particularly near San Dieguito Drive, Minorca Way, Mango Drive, the area north of Carmel Valley Road, and near Del Mar Hills Elementary School. These activities may temporarily disrupt normal traffic flow between neighborhoods and businesses along Via De La Valle, San Dieguito Drive, and Racetrack View Road.

Table 5.10-2 Temporary Work Spaces (in acres)

Type of Work Area	Zoning Categories ^(a)					
	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Open Space	Misc.	Total
Drop Zone	0.01	-	0.01	0.04	-	0.06
Fly Yard	0.92	-	-	5.1	0.10	6.12
Guard Structure Work Area	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.08
Pole Work Area	0.36	0.05	0.09	0.23	0.03	0.76
Pole Work Area (Pedestrian Access Only)	0.05	-	-	0.07	-	0.12
Staging Yard	1.11	-	-	-	-	1.11
Stringing Site	1.09	0.38	0.23	0.44	0.32	2.46
Underground Work Area	1.61	2.80	0.01	0.59	-	5.01
Work Area	0.56	0.01	-	0.03	-	0.60
Acres by Zoning Category	5.74	3.26	0.35	6.51	0.46	16.32

Source: SanGIS 2016

Note:

^(a) Zoning districts are condensed and acreages are broadly represented for illustrative purposes in generalized categories.

Key:

Misc. = miscellaneous

- = no project work areas within lands designated under this zoning category

1
2 Although construction of the proposed project would require lane closures, construction traffic
3 restrictions would be temporary and intermittent in duration. As described in Section 5.16,
4 “Transportation and Traffic,” SDG&E would stage trenching operations to maintain vehicular and
5 pedestrian traffic across areas that are not under active construction. In addition, as described in Chapter
6 4.0, “Project Description,” SDG&E would locate staging and fly yards within previously disturbed areas
7 that are mostly industrial or commercial in nature (parking lots, vacant fields, etc.) as a means of limiting
8 construction traffic on active roadways. As a result, the proposed project would not create permanent
9 physical barriers that would divide established communities or isolate land uses, and the impact would be
10 less than significant.

11
12 Once project construction is complete and the reconfigured circuitry is operational, the power lines would
13 require occasional maintenance to ensure safety and reliability of the electrical network. Utility
14 infrastructure would be maintained by SDG&E personnel in the same manner as it is currently. Similar to
15 existing infrastructure, the proposed project would comprise overhead and underground lines, and
16 maintaining these facilities would not conflict with or change the facilities’ relationship, compatibility, or
17 functionality with adjacent land uses. Moreover, the removal and decommissioning of approximately 6
18 miles of 69 kV power lines on line TL666D would eliminate service demands and future maintenance
19 needs within this corridor relative to existing conditions. As a result, implementation of the proposed
20 project would neither create new barriers nor divide established communities. This impact would be less
21 than significant.

22
23 **Significance: Less than Significant.**
24

1 *b. Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency*
2 *with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local*
3 *coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an*
4 *environmental effect?*
5

6 The proposed project would be located within the California Coastal Zone and subject to a CDP from the
7 CCC. Local governments, in partnership with the CCC, use the LCP implementing policies as a guide to
8 future development activities within the coastal zone. The City of San Diego and City of Del Mar have
9 certified LCPs that would apply to the project area.
10

11 A potential or actual conflict between a proposed project and policy does not, in itself, indicate a
12 significant effect on the environment within the context of CEQA. A policy inconsistency is considered
13 significant pursuant to CEQA only when it would result in a significant, adverse physical environmental
14 impact. As described in Section 5.4, “Biological Resources,” the biological study area for the proposed
15 project includes areas that are recommended to be classified Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas
16 (ESHAs) per the CCA, and habitat values contained within an ESHA must be protected against
17 significant disruption. The proposed project could conflict with a number of policies that have been
18 adopted to protect sensitive habitat or animal species. If unmitigated, potential conflicts with policies
19 presented in the ~~Analysis of Relevant Plans and Policies~~ Land Use and Planning Policy Matrix (Appendix
20 G) could result in significant impacts on the environment. Potential impacts on ESHAs would be reduced
21 with Mitigation Measures (MM) **BR-2**, **MM BR-4**, and **MM BR-6**, outlined in Section 5.4, “Biological
22 Resources.”
23

24 As previously discussed, per General Order No. 131-D, CPUC projects are exempt from local land use
25 regulations and discretionary permitting. Accordingly, the CPUC will continue to coordinate with the
26 local agencies regarding the project components as they relate to land use. In general, most of the relevant
27 policies address protecting natural resources from conflicts that may arise from encroachment and
28 incompatible land uses. In the main, most local planning documents support the undergrounding of
29 utilities and removal of infrastructure from sensitive environmental areas.
30

31 Environmental plans and policies are those, like the San Diego MSCP, LCP, and CCA that directly
32 address environmental issues and/or contain targets or standards that must be met in order to preserve or
33 improve the characteristics of the area’s physical environment. While implementation of the proposed
34 project may result in temporary construction-related impacts and would require work within sensitive
35 environmental areas, SDG&E would implement mitigation measures to reduce potential environmental
36 impacts and thus would not lead to a conflict with local planning documents. Once operational, the
37 electrical network would operate similarly to existing conditions, albeit with infrastructure within
38 San Dieguito Lagoon and Los Peñasquitos Lagoon removed from service. As a result, SDG&E
39 maintenance crews would no longer require access to these environmentally sensitive areas for
40 maintenance.
41

42 The proposed project, with mitigation identified in topical sections in this Initial Study, would not
43 obviously or substantially conflict with any such adopted environmental plan or policy, and the impact
44 would be less than significant.
45

46 **Significance: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.**

1
2 *c. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community*
3 *conservation plan?*
4

5 The majority of the project area is located within areas protected under the City of San Diego MSCP. In
6 addition, small portions of the project area within Los Peñasquitos Lagoon and the Torrey Pines State
7 Natural Reserve Extension are located within the area covered by the City of San Diego MHPA. As
8 analyzed in Section 5.4, “Biological Resources,” the applicant shall adhere to **MM BR-2**, which would
9 ensure that all ESAs, including ESHAs, are demarcated to prevent substantial adverse effects, including
10 destruction or degradation of habitat and species associated with project activities involving trampling,
11 water runoff, and sedimentation.

12
13 **Significance: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.**

14
15 **References**

16 California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). 1995. General Order No. 131-D (Supersedes General
17 Order No. 131-C). Decision 95-08-038. Modified August 11, 1995.

18 City of Del Mar. 1976. City of Del Mar Community Plan.

19 <http://www.delmar.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/3341> Accessed: January 5, 2018.

20 _____ . 1993. Local Coastal Program <http://www.delmar.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/261>
21 Accessed: January 5, 2018.

22 City of Del Mar. 2017. Municipal Code.

23 https://library.municode.com/ca/del_mar/codes/municipal_code?nodeId=TIT30ZO Accessed:
24 January 19, 2018.

25 City of San Diego. 1984. Via De La Valley Specific Plan.

26 <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/viadelavalle/plan> Accessed: January 5,
27 2018.

28 City of San Diego. 1998. City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program.

29 [http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/mscp/docs/SCMSCP/FinalMSCPPProgramP](http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/mscp/docs/SCMSCP/FinalMSCPPProgramPlan.pdf)
30 [lan.pdf](http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/mscp/docs/SCMSCP/FinalMSCPPProgramPlan.pdf) Accessed: January 16, 2018.

31 City of San Diego. 2013. City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan.

32 [https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/programs/transportation/mobility/pd](https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/programs/transportation/mobility/pdf/bicycle_master_plan_final_dec_2013.pdf)
33 [f/bicycle_master_plan_final_dec_2013.pdf](https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/programs/transportation/mobility/pdf/bicycle_master_plan_final_dec_2013.pdf). Accessed: January 15, 2018.

34 City of San Diego. 2014a. Torrey Pines Community Plan.

35 [https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/community/profiles/torreyhills/pdf](https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/community/profiles/torreyhills/pdf/torrey_pines_cp_102314.pdf)
36 [/torrey_pines_cp_102314.pdf](https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/community/profiles/torreyhills/pdf/torrey_pines_cp_102314.pdf) Accessed: January 5, 2018.

37 _____ . 2014b. Torrey Hills Community Plan.

38 [https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/community/profiles/torreyhills/pdf/t](https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/community/profiles/torreyhills/pdf/torrey_hills_cp_20102314.pdf)
39 [orrey_hills_cp_20102314.pdf](https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/community/profiles/torreyhills/pdf/torrey_hills_cp_20102314.pdf) Accessed: January 5, 2018.

- 1 _____ . 2014c. North City Future Urbanizing Subarea II Framework Plan.
2 <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy//planning/community/profiles/ncfua/pdf/nfcu>
3 [_final_102314.pdf](#) Accessed: January 16, 2018.
- 4 City of San Diego. 2015. City of San Diego General Plan Land Use Element.
5 https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/lu_2015.pdf Accessed: January 5, 2018.
- 6 _____ . 2017. City of San Diego Municipal Code. [https://www.sandiego.gov/city-](https://www.sandiego.gov/city-clerk/officialdocs/legisdocs/muni)
7 [clerk/officialdocs/legisdocs/muni](#) Accessed: January 16, 2018.
- 8 San Diego Gas & Electric. 1995. San Diego Gas & Electric Subregional Natural Community
9 Conservation Plan.
10 [http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/dudek/CNF/SDGE%20Subregional%20NCCP%20\(01-](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/dudek/CNF/SDGE%20Subregional%20NCCP%20(01-)
11 [25-13S\).pdf](#) Accessed: January 16, 2018.
- 12 San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority. 2002. San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan.
13 <http://www.sdrp.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/SDRP-Concept-Plan.pdf> Accessed: January
14 16, 2018.
- 15 SanGIS. 2016. Download Data. <http://www.sangis.org/download/index.html> Accessed: November 8,
16 2016.

This page intentionally left blank.