

# CHAPTER 5.0

## CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

---

Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR address cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect would be cumulatively considerable. Cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of an individual project would be considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current, or probable future projects. A cumulative effect is not deemed considerable if the effect would be essentially the same whether the proposed project is implemented or not.

Probable future projects may be limited to those which: 1) have an application on file at the time that the Notice of Preparation is released; 2) are included in an adopted capital improvement program, general plan, regional transportation plan, or other similar plan; 3) are included in a summary of projections of projects (or development areas designated) in a general plan or a similar plan; 4) are anticipated as later phases of approved projects; or 5) are included in money budgeted by public agencies.

The basis for the analysis of cumulative impacts is dependent on the nature of the issue. According to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of cumulative effects "need not provide as great a detail as is provided for the affects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness." The evaluation of cumulative impacts will be based on "a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside of the control of the agency." Present and probable future projects are addressed in this cumulative analysis, while past projects were considered as part of the existing setting and analyzed under each individual topic in Chapter 4.0. This analysis includes projects that require agency approval for an application that has been received by the reviewing agency at the time of the Draft EIR, but does not include information that became known or available after the completion of the Draft EIR.

In addition, reasonable mitigation measures for cumulatively significant impacts should be discussed; however, CEQA acknowledges that "with some projects, the only feasible mitigation for cumulative impacts may involve the adoption of ordinances or regulations rather than the imposition of conditions on a project-by-project basis."

## 5.1 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

Potential cumulative projects were identified for the analysis of cumulative impacts. These projects are listed below in Table 5-1, along with their physical location and brief description.

**Table 5-1. Cumulative Projects Summary**

Project Name	Address/ APN No.	Description
1. Gillespie Field Redevelopment	To the north and west of the intersection of Bradley Avenue and Wing Boulevard	Redevelopment of a 70-acre parcel in the center of Gillespie Field.
2. Princess Joann	The eastern boundary of the City of Santee on the east side of Magnolia Avenue between Kerrigan Street and Princess Joann Road.	Development of 24 acres of the 119-acre site. Proposed development of 39 single family homes with remainder of site open space.
3. Santee Office Park	North of Mission Gorge Road, west of Magnolia Avenue	Development of 250 multifamily residential units, a 3,300 seat multiplex theatre, two acres of retail, and 2.02 million square feet of office space.
4. River Walk Residential	North of Mission Gorge Road, east of Cuyamaca Street	Development of 230 single family residential units.
5. Fanita Ranch	North of Mast Boulevard between Fanita Parkway and Cuyamaca Street	Development of 1,380 single family residential units, a 22 room inn, office, retail, and 62-acres of public park land.
6. Edgemoor Skilled Nursing Facility	South of Mast Boulevard, west of Cottonwood Avenue	Development of a 192-bed skilled nursing facility.
7. Home of the Guiding Hands (TM 5383)	10025 Los Ranchitos Road	Development of 62 single family residential units.
8. Lakeside Downs (TM 5214)	APN 377-111-32; 377-112-29, 30, 31; 379-011-01, 02; 379-040-032	Development of 147 single family residential units.
9. Silver Sage Condominiums (TM 5396)	11719-49 Woodside Avenue	Development of 80 multifamily residential units.
State Route (SR) 52 Extension Project	Located approximately 1,000 feet north of the project site between Mission Gorge Road and Prospect Avenue	Extension of SR-52 from SR-125 to SR-67. Expected to be completed in 2010, prior to the completion of Phase 1 of the proposed project.

Source: LLG, 2009

## 5.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

The following discussion of cumulative impacts is organized by each environmental topic addressed for the proposed project. At the beginning of each topical discussion, a description of the universe or area of influence for each topic is provided followed by an analysis of the cumulative effects.

### 5.2.1 AESTHETICS

The area of projects that would be considered for the aesthetics cumulative effects analysis is defined as the viewshed for the proposed project site. Cumulative projects listed in Table 5-1, would be located within this viewshed or adjacent to this viewshed. It is assumed that development of the cumulative

projects would be designed to mitigate any adverse aesthetic impacts to the viewshed, consistent with policies identified in the City of El Cajon General Plan and the City of Santee General Plan.

The proposed project site would be developed with industrial land uses, consistent with the surrounding industrial land uses and Gillespie Field. Implementation of the proposed project would alter views of the site as a result of the construction of the proposed development; however, views of the project site from these uses are not considered scenic. However, the proposed project would also be adjacent to a few single-family residences, which are considered visually sensitive. The view from these homes currently consists of the project site, Gillespie Field, industrial development, and includes undeveloped ridgelines in the background. The proposed project would be consistent with the visual character of the existing view of surrounding industrial development and Gillespie Field. The project site is not considered a scenic resource; however, a portion of the project site would be vegetated with coastal sage scrub, consistent with the existing setting. Additional landscaping with native vegetation would be included throughout the development. Additionally, as described above, the proposed project would not adversely impact views of the undeveloped ridgelines from adjacent residents or views from the public bike trail. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative aesthetics impact.

## 5.2.2 AIR QUALITY

In analyzing cumulative impacts from a proposed project, the analysis must specifically evaluate a project's contribution to the cumulative increase in pollutants for which the San Diego Air Basin is listed as "non-attainment" for the CAAQS. A project that has a significant impact on air quality with regard to emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and/or VOCs as determined by the screening criteria for the air basin would have a significant cumulative effect. The proposed project would not exceed the established screening levels for any criteria pollutants, except NO<sub>x</sub> during simultaneous project construction of Phase 3 and operation of Phases 1 and 2. Therefore the proposed project would have a significant direct impact with respect to NO<sub>x</sub>. Emissions of all other pollutants would have a less than significant direct impact. However, in the event direct impacts from a project are less than significant, a project may still have a cumulatively considerable impact on air quality if the emissions from the project, in combination with the emissions from other proposed, or reasonably foreseeable, future projects are in excess of the established screening level thresholds, and the project's contribution accounts for more than an insignificant proportion of the cumulative total emissions.

As stated above, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by the applicable general plans and SANDAG's growth forecasts would be consistent with the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). Also, projects that are consistent with the SIP rules (i.e., the federally-approved rules and regulations adopted by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD)) are consistent with the SIP. Projects that are consistent with rules and regulations that are promulgated under the RAQS would thereby be consistent with the RAQS.

The project's emissions during simultaneous construction of Phase 1 and operation of Phases 1 and 2 would be above the significance threshold for NO<sub>x</sub> in 2012. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, but not to below the significance threshold. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, this direct impact would be cumulatively significant, since when combined with other cumulative project emissions, it would cause a greater exceedance of the significance threshold. However, the impact would be temporary in nature. Once project construction is finished, NO<sub>x</sub> emissions levels would be reduced to below the threshold level.

The proposed project site is currently designated for open space (OS) uses and as Special Development Area 1 (SDA-1). A very small portion of the site is also designated for Public Institution (PI). The proposed project would require a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of the project site from OS, PI and SDA-1 to Industrial Park (IP). The redesignation of the site would allow industrial development similar to that allowed under the existing SDA-1 designation. Therefore, the project would not propose development that is greater than that anticipated in the General Plan in areas of the project site that are currently designated SDA-1. The area of the site currently designated PI is very small and redesignation of this area to IP would have a negligible effect on development of the site. In areas of the project site that are currently designated OS, development of industrial uses may propose development that is greater than that allowed under the General Plan. A small northwestern portion of the project site currently designated OS would be developed with low-density industrial buildings. While the proposed low-density industrial project would develop the site with uses greater than those allowed under the OS designation, this is only a small portion of the project site and would not substantially affect the development allowable under the City's General Plan. In addition, all industrial uses are required to be in compliance with the APCD Rules and Regulations which are generated by the SIP strategies. Therefore, industrial uses are presumed to be in conformance with the SIP. The proposed project would be in compliance with strategies for attaining and maintaining air quality standards. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the RAQS or applicable portions of the SIP.

Planned or reasonably foreseeable projects were generally accounted for in the Traffic Impact Study (LLG 2009), and were therefore considered in the evaluation of CO hot spots. Based on the CO hot spots evaluation provided in Section 4.2, Air Quality, a cumulative impact associated with traffic emissions would not occur.

Cumulative projects would result in a significant cumulative  $PM_{10}$  impact if their combined emissions would exceed the established screening level threshold for this pollutant.  $PM_{10}$  emissions decrease rapidly in close proximity to the source. At 330 feet from the source,  $PM_{10}$  concentrations decrease by 99 percent. Thus, in order for a cumulative  $PM_{10}$  impact to occur, simultaneous construction/grading would need to occur at the proposed project site and on another parcel within 330 feet of the site. However, none of the cumulative projects listed in Table 5-1 would be located within 330 feet of the proposed project site. The closest cumulative project is the SR-52 Extension Project, located approximately 1,000 feet from the proposed project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative  $PM_{10}$  impact. Although settling properties for  $PM_{2.5}$  are slightly different from  $PM_{10}$ , it can reasonably be assumed that due to the distance between the project and the nearest cumulative project, cumulative impacts for  $PM_{2.5}$  would not be significant.

### **5.2.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

The area of projects that would be considered for the biological resources cumulative effects analysis is defined as the NCCP coverage area. Implementation of the cumulative projects listed in Table 5-1 would include significant direct impacts to sensitive habitat, plant or animal species. Each of the listed projects would have to mitigate for any lost habitat as a result of their development. Cumulative impacts could be identified for combined large losses of sensitive habitat or species.

The proposed project would result in a significant impact to the federally endangered San Diego ambrosia. However, this impact would be mitigated through the Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 or 10a Permit processes, which would ensure that steps are taken to ensure the species' survival. In addition, mitigation of the loss of species would mostly likely require creation of habitat elsewhere at a 1:1 or greater ratio and, therefore, no net loss of habitat would occur as a result of the proposed project.

The status of this species as endangered would ensure that other cumulative projects impacting this species, such as the Gillespie Field Redevelopment project, would also be required to undergo the ESA permitting process prior to project construction. This process would minimize the significant cumulative impact to the species. Therefore, with mitigation, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

The proposed project would result in significant impact to federal and state jurisdictional waters. This impact would be mitigated by acquiring permits to allow fill of these waters. Likewise, if any of the listed projects would significantly impact jurisdictional waters, these projects would be required to obtain permits as well.

As indicated in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, the proposed project would result in a significant impact to disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland habitat. In addition, the project would result in a significant direct impact to raptor foraging habitat including non-native grassland and raptor nesting habitat including eucalyptus woodland. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts to any federal or state-listed plant or animal species. Indirect impacts from construction noise to local wildlife would be significant if noise levels exceed 60 dB (A)  $L_{eq}$  in areas where raptors are nesting. Mitigation identified to reduce impacts to disturbed coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland habitat to below a level of significance consists of replacement of the lost habitat at a ratio of 1:1 and 0.5:1, respectively.

Since each cumulative project would also require mitigation for any lost habitat and permits for impacts to jurisdictional waters, there would be no net loss of significant habitat or jurisdictional waters from either the proposed project or from the cumulative projects. Loss value replacements for habitat are established by the resource agencies, and are consistent for all NCCP jurisdictions. This means that from the habitat value perspective, there would be no net loss if the requirements established by the NCCP are met. Mitigation of the project's biological impacts as well as similar requirements placed on the cumulative projects would ensure that the contribution of the proposed project's incremental effect to regional biological impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

## **5.2.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

The area of projects that would be considered for the cultural resources cumulative effects is defined as the El Cajon community planning area, described in the El Cajon General Plan, and the southern portion of the Santee planning area, described in the Santee General Plan. As discussed in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources. If human remains are found on site during project construction, they would be dealt with in accordance with all applicable federal, State and local regulations. Further, the discovery of human remains on site is considered to be unlikely. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a significant cumulative cultural resources impact.

## **5.2.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Soils and geologic conditions in the project vicinity vary by location, and their suitability for development is not uniform throughout the City. Accordingly, the incremental effect of the proposed project to soils and geologic impacts is limited to the proposed project site, and does not include a broader geographical cumulative impact analysis. The project site constraints to development have been identified in Section 4.5, Geology and Soils. The proposed project's adherence to State and local building and design codes would ensure that the project would not result in significant impacts associated with geologic hazards. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in exposing people or property to geologic

hazards including fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, or landslides. The proposed project would result in significant impacts associated with unstable soils; however, these impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance with the implementation of mitigation measures found in Section 4.5, Geology and Soils. The cumulative effects of the impacts associated with geology and soils, which are not directly affected by geology and soils impacts to other projects listed in Table 5-1, would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a significant cumulative geology and soils impact.

## **5.2.6 GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENERGY**

The analysis of global climate change is inherently a cumulative analysis since a single development project would not generate enough GHG emissions to individually influence global climate change. The areas of cumulative impacts for global climate change would be the entire world. Although implementation of the proposed project would result in a new source of GHG emissions from project construction and operation, the levels of the criteria pollutant emissions from all phases of project construction and project operation would be significantly below the screening level threshold. In addition, the proposed project would include design features to reduce GHG emissions, including proximity to transit and landscape cover on 30 percent of the site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not generate enough GHG emissions to individually influence global climate change.

Operation of the proposed project would ultimately be required to meet the regulatory requirements of AB 32 for reductions in GHG emissions. Reductions below the AB 32 guidelines and compliance with future statewide and San Diego County programs would substantially lessen the project's contribution to global climate change. Because specific industrial uses and tenants are not known at this time, it is not possible to determine the precise reductions in GHGs that could be realized through policies or requirements implemented through AB 32. However, as described above, the proposed project would implement design features to reduce the emission of GHGs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Due to the location and elevation of the proposed project site, the cumulative effect of global climate change, including sea level rise, natural disasters and flooding, and water supply, would have a less than significant impact on the proposed project.

The area of projects that would be considered for the cumulative effects of energy consumption would be the entire southern California region served by SDG&E. Cumulative projects would implement energy conservation measures through compliance with Title 24 and would not be expected to result in a significant impact associated with the wasteful or inefficient use of energy. The proposed project would not result in a direct significant impact to energy consumption. The proposed project would reduce its energy demand through compliance with Title 24 and implementation of energy conservation design features such as low water use landscaping and proximity to public transit (Gillespie Field Transit Station). Table 4.6-7 in Section 4.6, Global Climate Change and Energy, provides a complete list of project features that would reduce the energy demand of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant cumulative impact associated with energy conservation.

## **5.2.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Because water is the medium by which land-based pollutants can be transported to other areas and contaminate other soils and/or water bodies, the area of projects that would be considered for the hazardous substances cumulative effects analysis is defined as the drainage area for the project site. The other cumulative projects in the study area would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact to

downstream water quality. However, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact associated with a contaminated soil or groundwater. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a significant cumulative hazardous materials impact.

The proposed project could result in a cumulative impact to the safety of people working or living in the vicinity of the project if it would result in a safety hazard to Gillespie Field or interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan. Implementation of mitigation measure Haz-1 would require coordination between the construction contractor and the Gillespie Field Airport Manager to ensure that appropriate actions are taken so that construction activities at the project site would not pose a hazard to air navigation. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts associated with this property to below a level of significance. Additionally, the project would have no effect on the implementation of an adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Therefore, it would not result in a significant cumulative safety hazard.

## **5.2.8 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY**

The geographic context for the cumulative impact analysis concerning hydrology and water quality is the San Diego Hydrologic Unit, within which the proposed project is located. This Hydrologic Unit is comprised of four hydrologic areas (HAs): Lower San Diego, San Vicente, El Capitan, and Boulder Creek. The following analysis accounts for all anticipated cumulative growth within this geographic area, including the proposed project, development anticipated under the surrounding planning documents, and known development projects within the San Diego Hydrographic Unit.

### **5.2.8.1 DRAINAGE AND HYDROLOGY**

Urban development within the San Diego Hydrologic Unit would increase impervious areas and consequently increase storm water runoff. These increases could result in flooding, drainage systems capacity issues, and erosion problems throughout the Hydrologic Unit. However, most future development projects in the San Diego region would be subject to NPDES Phase I and II regulations, which now require addressment of changes to hydrologic regime and mitigation for conditions of concern. All projects in the San Diego Region for which construction would affect more than one acre must obtain NPDES Construction Permit coverage, and all land use jurisdictions in the region must obtain and implement NPDES Municipal Water Quality Permits. The RWQCB is responsible for assuring that water quality control measures are uniformly applied through these permits and is responsible, along with the jurisdictions administering holding the permits, for the enforcement of the permit conditions.

No severe flooding issues were identified within the San Diego Hydrologic Unit to which the project drainage would contribute; however, there is no comprehensive study or resource available with this information. Similarly, there is no comprehensive resource depicting erosion problems within the unit; however, it is suspected that they do occur. Because it is likely that some erosion and possibly flooding problems do exist within the watershed, a potential significant impact could occur without appropriate drainage controls.

The proposed project would convert the project site from a mostly permeable surface to an impermeable surface, resulting in a potential increase in surface water runoff generated on site and the potential risk of flooding and/or exceedance of the capacity of the existing storm drain system. However, the on-site underground drainage basin would have a storage volume of at least 1.2 acre-feet, which would adequately reduce stormwater flows to pre-project conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts.

### **5.2.8.2 WATER QUALITY**

Urban development within the San Diego Hydrologic Unit would increase impervious areas and activities that generate pollutants, and consequently could result in additional impacts to receiving waters in the Hydrologic Unit. Most future development projects in the San Diego region would be subject to NPDES Phase I and II regulations, which would require that source control and nonpoint source BMPs be employed to control potential effects on water quality and that storm water quality control devices be incorporated into storm water collection systems to collect sediment and other pollutants. As discussed in the preceding section, these requirements are uniformly applicable throughout the San Diego Region.

Currently water quality impairments or problems within the San Diego Hydrologic Unit downstream of the proposed projects are described in Section 4.8.1, Hydrology and Water Quality. The proposed project has the potential to contribute to the water quality impacts downstream from the project site. However, construction activities associated with the project would conform with applicable RWQCB permit requirements and City regulations pertaining to water quality impacts associated with construction activity. Implementation of the proposed project would include compliance with the SWMitP prepared for the proposed project and included in Appendix G. Therefore, it is anticipated that the pollutant contribution resulting from the proposed project would not cause or contribute to water quality impairment and would not be cumulatively considerable.

The project's compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements would not be affected by surrounding projects and is therefore not cumulatively relevant. The only issue that is cumulatively relevant is the City's compliance with the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant waste discharge requirements. Development throughout the City of San Diego is also treated by this plant and therefore development throughout the City could also impact the capacity of this plant. However, because the City of San Diego manages the operations of the plant and provides for expansions and other measures when necessary, a significant and cumulatively considerable contribution is not expected to occur.

### **5.2.9 LAND USE**

The area of projects that would be considered for the land use cumulative effects analysis is defined as the El Cajon community planning area, described in the El Cajon General Plan, as well as the southern portion of the Santee planning area, described in the Santee General Plan. As discussed in Section 4.9, Land Use, the proposed project is consistent with the major policies of these plans. The project would require a GPA to change the land use designation of the areas designated as SDA-1, OS and PI on the project site to Industrial Park (IP). The IP land use designation would be consistent with the proposed project, which is the development of an industrial park. In addition, the existing County Operations Facility located in the southwest portion of the site would also be consistent with the IP designation because public institutions are allowed under this land use designation. Therefore, with the implementation of the proposed GPA, the project would be consistent with the land use designation of the site, as identified in the City of El Cajon General Plan. Furthermore, the cumulative projects identified in Table 5-1 would be consistent with the existing adopted plans, or require mitigation measures or design review to ensure consistency, in order for project approvals to occur. Therefore, the proposed project, along with the identified cumulative projects, would not result in a cumulative land use impact.



## 5.2.10 NOISE

Traffic noise impacts associated with Horizon Year (2030) buildout within the project area would incrementally increase noise levels along roadways and could potentially subject noise-sensitive land uses to noise exceeding City standards. Traffic noise increases associated with Horizon Year (2030) buildout are shown on Table 5-2, and are based upon traffic data provided by LLG (2009). Model results indicate that the largest increase in noise due to Horizon Year traffic increases would be an increase of 2 dBA CNEL along Cuyamaca Street between Prospect Avenue and Weld Boulevard, assuming buildout of development identified in the traffic study for Horizon Year 2030. According to FICON thresholds (discussed in detail in Section 4.10, Noise), for roadways that have an existing ambient noise level greater than 65 dBA CNEL, an increase of over 1.5 dBA is considered a significant impact. Therefore, the noise increase along Cuyamaca Street, between Prospect Avenue to Weld Boulevard, would be a potentially significant cumulative impact because the ambient noise level is 69 dBA and the change in noise level due to future growth is 2 dBA.

**Table 5-2. Horizon Year<sup>(1)</sup> Traffic Noise Levels (dBA CNEL)**

Roadway Segment	Existing	Horizon Year	Change in Existing Noise Level Due to Future Growth	Horizon Year + Project	Change in Horizon Year Noise Level Due to Project
Weld Blvd, Gillespie Way to Cuyamaca St	65	66	+1	67	+1
Weld Blvd, Fanita Dr to Gillespie Way	65	66	+1	66	0
Cuyamaca St, Prospect Ave to Weld Blvd.	69	71	+2	72	+1
Cuyamaca St, Weld Blvd. to Bradley Ave	70	71	+1	71	0

Noise levels are given at 50 feet from roadway centerline. Noise levels are based upon traffic data provided by LLG (2009). See Appendix I for data sheets.

<sup>(1)</sup> Horizon Year conditions include development that would be constructed in the year 2030.

Source: PBS&J, 2009b

The proposed project would contribute to the noise increase along this roadway; however, the project's contribution would only account for 1 dBA of the increase, and thus would not be significant because it would not exceed the 1.5 dBA threshold. Therefore, the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

Cumulative development would be required to comply with the City of El Cajon's Noise Ordinance, which restricts the level of noise that can be generated on a property according to the designated zone. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance would ensure an acceptable noise environment for City residents. In addition, development surrounding Gillespie Field could conform to the Gillespie Field Land Use Plan, which would minimize potential future noise impacts.

## 5.2.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

The area of projects that would be considered for the public services cumulative analysis is defined by the service areas for the El Cajon Police Department (PD) and the El Cajon Fire Department (FD). In conjunction with past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future development as listed in Table 5-1, the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to an increased demand for police and fire services by

adding a new industrial park to the area. However, this growth has been anticipated by the public service providers and has been accounted for in the City's General Plan, which designates commercial/industrial uses for a portion of the project site through the SDA-1 land use designation. The project site is located in an area that is currently served with police protection services and fire protection services by the PD and FD, respectively. These service providers would not have to construct new facilities, or expand existing ones, in order to serve the project and would be responsible for requesting mitigation for cumulative projects as required. In the absence of such requests, cumulative impacts to public services would not be considered significant.

## **5.2.12 TRAFFIC**

Section 4.12, Traffic, addresses both Near-Term and Future (2030) traffic scenarios. The near term analysis takes into account the cumulative projects identified in Table 5-1 above. The traffic analysis also analyzed future traffic conditions for the year 2030, which took into account the cumulative projects and regional growth. As discussed in Section 4.12, the proposed project would have a significant cumulative impact to one unsignalized intersection in 2030 (Fanita Drive/Grossmont College Drive). Mitigation would be implemented to reduce this impact to below a level of significance. The results of the analyses are briefly restated here since they also address cumulative traffic impacts.

### **5.2.12.1 ROADWAY SEGMENTS**

Significant cumulative project impacts were not calculated on any of the analyzed roadway segments under the Near-Term or Future scenarios.

### **5.2.12.2 INTERSECTIONS**

The project would result in a significant cumulative traffic impact to one unsignalized intersection in the study area.

The following unsignalized intersection is projected to operate at LOS E or worse with the addition of the project traffic and cumulative projects traffic.

- Fanita Drive/Grossmont College Drive intersection would operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour

With implementation of the recommended intersection mitigation measure identified in Section 4.12.3.3 of this EIR, impacts to the intersection listed above would be reduced to below a level of significance.

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts associated with an increase in hazards or emergency access because it would be designed in accordance with the City's requirements and would not be incompatible with surrounding uses. In addition, the project would provide adequate parking spaces on site to meet the City's parking requirements and would not result in a significant impact associated with parking capacity. Therefore, a cumulatively considerable impact associated with traffic circulation would not occur.

## **5.2.13 UTILITIES**

The area of projects that would be considered for the public services cumulative analysis is defined by the El Cajon planning area, because this is the area where there would be utility extensions and an increase in future utility demand and generation. Utilities include water, wastewater, storm water, energy (natural gas and electricity), communications, and solid waste facilities. In conjunction with past, present and

reasonable foreseeable future development as listed in Table 5-1, the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to an increased demand for these utilities services through the introduction of a new industrial park. However, this growth has been anticipated by the utility service providers and has been accounted for to some degree in the City's General Plan, which designates commercial/industrial uses for a portion of the project site. The project site is located in an area that is currently served with water, wastewater, storm water, energy (natural gas and electricity), communications, and solid waste facilities. In addition, the proposed project would not require upsizing or expansion of any existing utilities in order to serve the project. Therefore, cumulative impacts to utilities would not be significant.

This page is intentionally left blank.