



MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

November 8, 2017

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

Project Title: Valley Center Rite Aid
Record ID: PDS2015-STP-15-022, LOG NO. PDS2015-ER-15-08-021
Plan Area: Valley Center Community Plan Area
GP Designation: General Commercial (C-1)
Zoning: General Commercial (C36)
Special Area Reg.: B-Designator (Site Plan Review)
Lot Size: 1.22 Acres
Applicant: Chris Peto, Chief Operating Officer, Halferty Development Company, LLC,
(626) 405-0956
Staff Contact: Benjamin Mills, Planning Manager, Planning & Development Services
(858) 495-5234
Benjamin.mills@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The proposed project is a Site Plan for a Rite Aid Pharmacy. The project consists of an 11,900 square foot commercial building and parking lot with 48 spaces. The 48 parking spaces include 39 standard, 3 ADA, and 6 clean air parking spaces. The proposed project is located at the intersection of Valley Center Road and Cole Grade Road in the Valley Center Community Planning Area, within unincorporated San Diego County. A portion of the project site is developed with an existing drive-thru restaurant that would be removed. Access would be provided by Valley Center Road and Cole Grade Road. Earthwork would consist of the cut of 1,275 cubic yards and fill of 739 cubic yards of material. Water and sewer would be provided by the Valley Center Municipal Water District.

The project site is subject to the Village General Plan regional Category, Land Use Designation General Commercial. Zoning for the project site is General Commercial (C36) with a B Special Area Designator (Design Review). The project is consistent with the requirements of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Overview

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary

to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

General Plan Update Program EIR

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The GPU applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and directs population growth and plans for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The GPU included adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. It also included a corresponding land use map, a County Road Network map, updates to Community and Subregional Plans, an Implementation Plan, and other implementing policies and ordinances. The GPU focuses population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA service area covers approximately the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the GPU.

The GPU EIR was certified in conjunction with adoption of the GPU on August 3, 2011. The GPU EIR comprehensively evaluated environmental impacts that would result from Plan implementation, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts.

Summary of Findings

The Valley Center Rite Aid Project (PDS2015-STP-15-022) is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures (see [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00 - Mitigation Measures 2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf) for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San

Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

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

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

The project is a Site Plan for a Rite Aid Pharmacy, which is consistent with the General Commercial (C-1) Land Use Designation established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.

2. There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.

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

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The project could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources and traffic. However, applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.

3. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.

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

4. There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, no new information has been identified which would result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

5. The project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR.

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

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Project Manager

Title

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

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

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

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

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

1. AESTHETICS – Would the Project:

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

☐☐☐

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

☐☐☐

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

☐☐☐

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

☐☐☐**Discussion**

1(a) The project site is visible from public roads because it is located at the intersection of Valley Center Road and Cole Grade Road. However, the site is not located within a viewshed of a scenic vista.

1(b) The project site is not within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property.

1(c) The project site would be consistent with existing community character. The project is located at the intersection of Valley Center Road and Cole Grade Road in an area characterized by commercial and industrial uses. A drive-thru restaurant is currently located on the project site, and would be replaced with the Rite Aid Pharmacy. The addition of the Rite Aid Pharmacy would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings.

1(d) Lighting associated with the commercial building would be required to conform with the County's Light Pollution Code. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Conclusion

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

2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources

– Would the Project:

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

☐☐☐

Significant
Project
Impact

Impact not
identified by GPU
EIR

Substantial
New
Information

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 2(a) The project site is not designated as Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, Prime Farmland, or Unique Farmland pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The majority of the project site has been developed for the existing drive-thru restaurant. Based on a review of aerial imagery by County staff, it appears the project site has not been used for any commercial agricultural use within the last 50 years. Therefore, the project site does not contain agricultural resources as defined by the County of San Diego's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources. Thus, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or agricultural resources to a non-agricultural use.
- 2(b) The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract or agriculturally zoned land.
- 2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the project site.
- 2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands.
- 2(e) The project site is located adjacent to existing commercial uses. The project site is not located adjacent to property that is considered Important Farmland or other agricultural resources. The proposed project would not result in changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses.

Conclusion

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

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

Discussion

- 3(a) The project proposes commercial development that was anticipated and considered by San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below screening levels, and would not violate any ambient air quality standards.
- 3(b) Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening level criteria established by County air quality guidelines for determining significance. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. The project site has an existing drive-thru restaurant which generates approximately 624 Average Daily Trips (ADT). The proposed Rite Aid would result in an increase of 447 ADT. Therefore, the vehicle trips generated from the project would result in 1,071 ADT. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants.
- 3(c) The project would contribute PM₁₀, NO_x, and VOCs emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening thresholds (see question 3(b) above)).
- 3(d) The project would not introduce additional residential units or other sensitive receptors. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of

sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and would not place sensitive receptors near any carbon monoxide hotspots.

- 3(e) The project could produce objectionable odors during construction and operation; however, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m³).

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 4(a) Based on a review of County GIS data and aerial imagery of the project site, it has been determined the project site includes development and disturbed habitat. Mature trees are present on the project site. Potential impacts to migratory birds would be avoided through

breeding season avoidance measures during construction. Other than migratory birds, sensitive wildlife or plant species do not have a potential to occur on the site.

- 4(b) Based on a review of County GIS data and aerial imagery of the project site, it has been determined the project site primarily includes development and disturbed habitat. There are existing native oak trees on site. The oak trees would be either retained or relocated within landscaped areas on the project site. No other sensitive habitats were identified on the project site.
- 4(c) Based on review of County GIS data and aerial imagery of the project site, County staff has determined no wetlands or jurisdictional waters occur within the project site. The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, therefore, no impacts will occur.
- 4(d) Based on a review of County GIS data and aerial imagery of the project site, it was determined that the site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor as identified in the draft MSCP North County Plan nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The project site is surrounded by existing commercial uses. Although the project site is not within an established wildlife corridor, there are existing native and non-native trees within and immediately adjacent to the project site. In order to ensure compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code, and the Endangered Species Act, breeding season avoidance measures will be required as a condition of approval. Impacts to migratory songbirds and raptors are considered less than significant with this breeding season avoidance requirement.
- 4(e) The project site is located within the draft Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) North County Plan area. The project site is not located within the draft Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA). The project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources. The project is consistent with the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO).

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 5(a) Based on an analysis of records and prior archaeological surveys, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site.
- 5(b) Based on an analysis of records and prior archaeological surveys, no archaeological resources were identified within the project site. Although no resources were identified, there is the potential for the presence of subsurface deposits.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to unknown cultural resources will be mitigated through compliance with the Grading Ordinance and through conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The project will be conditioned with archaeological monitoring (Cul-2.5) that includes the following requirements:

- Pre-Construction
 - Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.
- Construction
 - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor are to be onsite during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor will evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources
 - If cultural resources are identified:
 - Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
 - The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist.
 - The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
 - Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation.
 - Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Luiseno Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.
 - If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to

preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).

- Human Remains.
 - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
 - Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin.
 - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
 - The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
 - Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.
- Rough Grading
 - Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, the Pechanga Band of Temecula Luiseno Indians, and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
- Final Grading
 - A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center, the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, the Pechanga Band of Temecula Luiseno Indians, and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
 - Disposition of Cultural Material.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

5(c) The project site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

5(d) A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on Quaternary Alluvium

formations that have a low potential to contain unique paleontological resources. As such, paleontological grading monitoring by a standard monitor will be required.

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

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?

☐
☐
☐

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

☐
☐
☐

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?

☐
☐
☐

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

☐
☐
☐

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems

☐
☐
☐

Significant
Project
Impact

Impact not
identified by
GPU EIR

Substantial
New
Information

where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Discussion

- 6(a)(i) The project site is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides.
- 6(a)(ii) To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.
- 6(a)(iii) The project site is located within a Potential Liquefaction Area. However, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain, and in-situ soil densities are expected to be sufficiently high to preclude liquefaction.
- 6(a)(iv) The site is located in a landslide susceptibility area considered to be marginally susceptible to land sliding. However, based on the absence of significant slopes on or within the vicinity of the project site, the potential for slope failures can be considered negligible.
- 6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Placentia sandy loam (PeC) that have a severe soil erodibility rating. However, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns, and would not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.
- 6(c) The project site is located within a Potential Liquefaction Area. However, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain, and in-situ soil densities are expected to be sufficiently high to preclude liquefaction. In addition, there are no significant slopes on or within the vicinity of the project site which eliminates the potential for slope failures. The project will be required to comply with the WPO and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils and will not develop steep slopes.
- 6(d) The project is underlain by Placentia Sandy Loam (PeC), which is considered to be an expansive soil as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). However, the project would not result in a significant impact because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.
- 6(e) The project would rely on public sewer for the disposal of wastewater. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

Conclusion

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

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

Discussion

7(a) The proposed project would produce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through construction activities and vehicle trips. The annual 900 metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO₂e) screening level referenced in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) white paper is used as a conservative screening criterion for determining which projects require mitigation measures with regards to GHG emissions. The project falls below the screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that would have less than cumulatively considerable GHG emissions. The screening criteria is based on various land use densities and project types. Projects that meet or fall below the screening thresholds are expected to result in 900 MT/year of GHG emissions or less and would not require additional analysis.

The project proposes the development of an 11,900 square foot Rite Aid Pharmacy. For projects of this size, it is presumed that the construction and operational GHG emissions would not exceed 900 MT CO₂e per year, and there would be a less-than cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact due to greenhouse gas emissions.

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

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 8(a) The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. The project proposes to demolish the existing drive-thru restaurant within the project site. The building is not older than 50 years; therefore, lead and asbestos are not anticipated to be encountered during demolition. As a condition of approval for the proposed project, a Demolition Permit shall be obtained which requires appropriate measures to avoid impacts from hazardous materials.
- 8(b) The project site is located adjacent to a preschool/daycare facility. However, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.
- 8(c) Based on a comprehensive review of regulatory databases, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.
- 8(d) The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.
- 8(e) The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip.
- 8(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.
- 8(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.
- 8(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project is not located along the coastal zone.
- 8(f)(iv) EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN: The project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.
- 8f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.
- 6(g) While the proposed project is immediately adjacent to developed commercial properties, wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires exist in the surrounding area. A Fire Protection Plan (April 2016) for the proposed project was prepared by Wynn Engineering. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project would comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code, as described in the approved Fire Protection Plan. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated April 26, 2017 has been received from the Valley

Center Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be 2 minute, which is within the maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element.

- 6(h) The project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that would produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 9(a) The proposed project would require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Priority Development Project Stormwater Quality Management Plan (PDP SWQMP) prepared by Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc. (dated July 3, 2017) which demonstrates that the project would comply with all requirements of the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO). The project would be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures would enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).
- 9(b) The project lies within the San Luis Rey Escondido Watershed. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of this watershed is impaired. Constituents of concern in the San Luis Rey watershed include coliform bacteria, nutrients, sediment, lowered dissolve oxygen, and trace metals. The project could contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the project would comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) The project would obtain its water supply from the Valley Center Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources.

- 9(e) As outlined in the project's PDP SWQMP, the project would implement source control and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.
- 9(f) A portion of the project site is currently developed with a drive-thru restaurant. A Drainage Study (July 3, 2019) was prepared by Tory R Walker Engineering, Inc. for the proposed project. The proposed project would convey drainage to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities. While the proposed project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces within the project site, the project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns or substantially increase the rate or amount of runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.
- 9(g) The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.
- 9(h) The proposed project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs would be implemented such that potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- 9(i) No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site.
- 9(j) No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site.
- 9(k) The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area.
- 9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(m)(i) SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.
- 9(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.
- 9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

Conclusion

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

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

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

Discussion

- 10(a) The project does not propose any roadways or other improvements that would physically divide the community.
- 10(b) The proposed project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

Conclusion

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

Discussion

12(a) The project does not propose a noise sensitive land use that would expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the General Plan, Noise Ordinance, or other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – The Noise Element addresses noise sensitive areas and requires projects to comply with a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Projects which could produce noise in excess of 60 dB(A) are required to incorporate design measures or mitigation as necessary to comply with the Noise Element. Based on a review of the County's noise contour maps, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of 60 dB(A). Additionally, the project is for a proposed Rite Aid building which does not include the proposal of noise sensitive land uses.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404: Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned commercial (C36) that has a one-hour average sound limit of 60 dBA daytime and 55 dBA nighttime. The adjacent properties to the west, east, and south are also zoned C36. Noise sources associated with the project would be from vehicular traffic, loading area activities, and mechanical equipment. The project incorporates noise control features comprised of 6-foot high CMU walls located along the

southern and eastern property lines. These walls would reduce noise generating operations associated with the Rite Aid building. Additionally, the building would include a roof top parapet wall design that would screen roof top mechanical equipment. Based on the design features proposed as part of the project, noise generating activities associated with the proposed Rite Aid building are anticipated to comply with the County Noise Ordinance. Therefore, the project does propose any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-409: The project will not generate construction noise in excess of Noise Ordinance standards. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

12(b) The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels:

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

12(c) As indicated in the response listed under Section 12(a), the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of any applicable noise standards. The project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to direct noise impacts over existing ambient noise levels.

12(d) The proposed project does not involve any operational uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the Noise Ordinance. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, the project will not operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24 hour period.

12(e) The project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

12(f) The project site is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip.

Conclusion

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

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

Discussion

13(a) The project does not propose new homes; however, the project does propose a new Rite Aid commercial structure. The proposed Rite Aid is anticipated to serve existing residences in the Valley Center community, thus the project would not induce substantial population growth in the area.

13(b) There is no existing housing on the project site, therefore the project would not displace existing housing.

13(c) The proposed project would not displace a substantial number of people because the site does not contain residences.

Conclusion

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

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

Discussion

14(a) Based on the project's service availability forms, the project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
15. Recreation – Would the Project:			
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

15(a) The proposed project is a Rite Aid Pharmacy. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities could occur.

15(b) The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that could have a potential adverse effect on the environment.

Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
16. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 16(a) A Traffic Impact Study dated June 2017, prepared by Dawn Wilson, was completed for the proposed project. As described in the study, the project site currently has a drive-thru restaurant which results in approximately 624 average daily trips (ADT). The proposed project would replace the drive-thru restaurant with a Rite Aid Pharmacy, which is forecasted to result in an increase of 447 ADT. The project site is located at the intersection of Valley Center Road and Cole Grade Road. The intersection is forecasted to operate at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) during peak hours with the addition of project traffic. Valley Center Road and Cole Grade Road are Circulation Element roadways which were analyzed under the County of San Diego Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program for cumulative impacts to County roadway facilities located within the Valley Center community. As identified within the GPU EIR as Tra 1.7, the project will be required to participate in the County of San Diego Traffic Impact Fees (TIF) Program and will pay the current County TIF Fees at the time building permits are issued.

The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative projects, would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

- 16(b) The proposed project would result in a total of 1,071 ADT, which does not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG.
- 16(c) The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public use airport.
- 16(d) The proposed project would not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.

- 16(e) The Valley Center Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project and its Fire Protection Plan and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.
- 16(f) The project would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant cumulative impacts to traffic; however, all impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. Further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. Although cumulative impacts associated with the Agricultural Promotion Program were not analyzed in the GPU EIR, impacts would be less than significant as described above in 16(a).
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR under Tra-1.7 will be applied to the project.

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

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? ☐ ☐ ☐
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ☐ ☐ ☐

Discussion

- 17(a) The proposed project would discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project Service Availability Form dated May 23, 2016 has been received from the Valley Center Municipal Water District that indicates that there is adequate capacity to serve the project.
- 17(b) The proposed project involves connections from the project site to the existing water and wastewater pipelines within the Valley Center Road right of way. These connections would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(c) The project proposes new storm water drainage facilities. However, these facilities would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(d) A Service Availability Letter from the Valley Center Municipal Water District dated May 23, 2016 has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.
- 17(e) A Service Availability Letter from the Valley Center Municipal Water District dated May 23, 2016 has been provided, which indicates that there is adequate wastewater capacity to serve the project.
- 17(f) Implementation of the project would generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted, active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the project.
- 17(g) The project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility.

Conclusion

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

Attachments:

Appendix A – References

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

Appendix A

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

Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., Tory R. Walker (July 3, 2017). CEQA-Level Preliminary Drainage Study for Rite Aid Valley Center Valley Center, California.

Tory R. Walker Engineering, Inc., Tory R. Walker (July 3, 2017). County of San Diego Priority Development Project (PDP) SWQMP, Rite Aid #6750 PDS2015-STP-15-022.

Wilson, Dawn, PE TE (June 2017). Valley Center Rite Aid Traffic Impact Study.

Wynn Engineering, Gary Wynn (April 12, 2016). Fire Protection Plan-Short Form for: Valley Center Rite Aid Site Plan.

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

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

Appendix B

A Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067 is available on the Planning and Development Services website

at: http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf