

Date: September 16, 2021 Case/File Sweetwater Springs Triangular

No.: Parking Lot; PDS2021-STP-21-019;

PDS2021-ER-21-19-004

Place: County Conference Center Project: Site Plan Permit for Community Design

5520 Overland Avenue Review of a Fleet Storage Parking Lot San Diego, CA 92123

Time: 8:30 a.m. Location: 2500 Sweetwater Springs Boulevard,

Spring Valley

Agenda Item: #2 General High Impact Industrial (I-3)

Plan:

Appeal Status: Appealable to the Planning **Zoning:** High Impact Industrial (M58)

Commission

Applicant/Owner: Greenlaw / Rancho San Community: Spring Valley Community Plan Area

Diego Industrial Center

LLC,

Environmental: CEQA § 15183 Exemption **APNs:** 505-231-03-00

A. OVERVIEW

The purpose of this staff report is to provide the Zoning Administrator with the information necessary to make a finding that the mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPU EIR) will be adequate for a proposed Site Plan (STP) pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15183(e)(2).

CEQA Guidelines §15183 allows a streamlined environmental review process for projects that are consistent with the uses established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified. CEQA Guidelines §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.

CEQA Guidelines §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.

CEQA Guidelines §15183(e)(2) further requires the lead agency to make a finding at a public hearing when significant impacts are identified that could be mitigated by undertaking mitigation measures previously identified in the EIR on the planning and zoning action.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the project was evaluated to examine whether additional environmental review might be necessary for the reasons stated in §15183. As discussed in the attached Statement of Reasons for Exemption from Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist (15183 Findings) dated July 29, 2021 the project qualifies for an exemption from further environmental review.

The approval or denial of the proposed STP is a subsequent and separate decision made by the Director of Planning & Development Services (PDS).

B. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

1. Project Description

The Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot project (Project) consists of a Site Plan (STP) to construct and maintain a fleet storage parking lot which is intended to be used in conjunction with the adjacent industrial hub center. The vacant, 2.1-acre triangularly shaped Project site is located behind 2500 Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, approximately 850 feet north of the terminus of US Elevator Road (APN 505-231-03-00), in the Spring Valley Community Plan area within the unincorporated County of San Diego. Access to the site will be provided through a collective parking agreement with adjacent parcel APN 505-231-35-00 to establish access to Sweetwater Springs Boulevard and US Elevator Road, both public roads.

The Project will require 6,200 cubic yards of cut and 5,200 cubic yards of fill, with 1,000 cubic yards of exported material. The Project consists of sixty-nine (69) parking spaces, two (2) retaining walls with a maximum height of nineteen feet, one (1) six-foot tall wall for screening and safety purposes, and eight (8) twenty-five-foot-tall down facing light poles for safety and security. The Project site will not be gated making it accessible 24 hours per day 7 days per week. However, daily operations will consist of delivery vans leaving the property between 9:20 AM and 11:10 AM (morning departure) and returning between 7:10 PM and 9:10 PM (evening arrival). During the morning departure, delivery vans will head to the adjacent hub center to load commercial parcels for delivery and then leave within the morning departure window. The delivery vans will return to the parking lot during the evening arrival window and remain parked until the following morning's departure. Vehicles will have access to enter and exit the property 24 hours 7 days per week, however, expected peak hours will

be between 9:20 AM and 11:10 AM, and between 7:10 PM and 9:10 PM. The Project is intended to support the adjacent parcel by providing fleet storage in close proximity to the existing industrial building. The adjacent site was approved under a Site Plan in 2004 (STP-04-045) for a metal industrial building and in 2021 a minor deviation (PDS2021-STP-94-045M1) was approved for the industrial building to be utilized as an industrial hub center. The Project will create the opportunity for the delivery vehicles associated with the industrial hub center to be stored adjacent to the site as opposed to commuting to the site daily from a further location.

The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Village, Land Use Designation High Impact Industrial (I-3). Zoning for the site is High Impact Industrial (M58) with a "B" Special Area Designator for Community Design Review. The proposed use is consistent with the Zoning and General Plan Land Use Designation of the property established by the General Plan Update for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified by the Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2011 (GPU EIR).




Figure 1: Vicinity Map




Figure 2: Aerial Map




Figure 3: Site Plan

C. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

1. Key Requirements for Requested Actions

The Zoning Administrator should consider the requested actions and determine if the following findings can be made.

- a) The project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which the GPU EIR was certified.
- b) There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site.
- c) There are no project specific impacts which the GPU EIR failed to analyze as significant effects.

- d) There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.
- e) There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.

2. Project Analysis

a. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas analysis was prepared for the Project by RECON Environmental, Inc. dated July 28, 2021. The Project proposes industrial fleet storage and will require grading and surfacing of the lot for the parking of 69 delivery vans. Earthwork activities during construction of the Project will require 6,200 cubic yards of cut, 5,200 cubic yards of fill, and 1,000 cubic yards of export. The Project will contribute Particulate Matter (PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$), Nitrogen Oxides (NO_{X}), and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) emissions from construction/grading activities; however, it will not exceed the established screening-level thresholds (SLTs). In addition, construction activities will be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance and San Diego County Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD's) Rule 55 to reduce fugitive dust. Therefore, emissions generated during construction activities will be temporary and localized and will not result in a significant impact. The Project will generate PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$, and NO_{X} emissions during Project operations primarily from mobile sources (i.e., vehicle trips).

The hub center adjacent to the Project is already permitted and allows the use of vans during operation. The Project does not result in an increase in the permitted hub center operations and therefore will not generate additional mobile source emissions. The Project will result in 12 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year from energy use, area sources, and amortized construction emissions. In addition, the Project proposes industrial fleet storage which will be consistent with the General Plan land use designation, High Impact Industrial and density. Since the proposed Project is allowed under the General Plan land use designation, which is used in San Diego Association of Governments' (SANDAG's) growth projections, it is consistent with San Diego County Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD's) Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

The Project will have a less than significant impact for the reasons stated above. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it will not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

b. Biological Resources

Biological resources on the Project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources Letter Report prepared by RECON Environmental, dated July 20, 2021. The Project site was previously cleared, however, through forensic analysis it was determined the site had contained 1.41 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub and 0.52 acres of non-native grassland which will be mitigated for

through offsite preservation of habitat. No sensitive wildlife was identified on the site. As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts to sensitive habitats will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: offsite preservation of habitat, temporary fencing, preconstruction plant and Quino Checkerspot Butterfly surveys, implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), and breeding season avoidance to prevent brushing, clearing, and/or grading between January 15 and September 15. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio 1.6 and Bio 1.7.

As discussed above, the Project will have a less than significant impact with mitigation by incorporating the GPU EIR mitigation measures Bio-1.6 and Bio-1.7. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it will not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

c. <u>Transportation and Traffic</u>

The Project will provide fleet storage parking adjacent to a permitted hub center. The permitted hub center allows the use of delivery vans during operation. Employees will travel to the Project site to retrieve a delivery van, load the delivery van at the adjacent hub center and complete their delivery routes, and then return back to the Project site. The Project will not result in any increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Without construction of the Project, delivery vans would be parked off-site away from the adjacent hub center. However, the Project will allow fleet storage parking closer to the adjacent hub center.

The Project will have a less than significant impact for the reasons stated above. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it will not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

D. PUBLIC INPUT

During the 33-day public disclosure period, from July 29, 2021 to August 30, 2021, staff received three public comment letters. One letter requested additional information regarding the Community Planning Group meeting to be held on August 10, 2021. The second letter was from a mitigation/conservation bank noting that they were available to provide mitigation credits for the Project and the final letter was from the Sweetwater Authority requesting a condition be placed on the project to confirm that the project will comply with the Sweetwater Authority Resolution 84-8 As Amended. The project site is located entirely within the drainage basin of Sweetwater Reservoir and therefore will be conditioned to pay necessary urban runoff protection fees to support the Sweetwater Reservoir Urban Runoff Diversion System. Please see Attachment D for the comment letters and responses.

E. SPRING VALLEY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

The Project is located within the Spring Valley Community Planning Group (CPG) area. The Project was heard at two meetings in July and August 2021. At the July 13, 2021 meeting, the Spring Valley CPG recommended to not approve the Project design but continue consideration of the Project until the applicant addressed the CPGs major concerns including landscaping, lighting, graffiti and safety by a vote of 6-5-0-4 (6-Yes, 5-No, 0-Abstain, 4-Absent). The Project was heard again at the August 10, 2021

meeting at which the applicant identified the changes that had been made to increase landscaping, incorporate vining plants on retaining walls to discourage graffiti, provide additional lighting information to comply with lighting ordinance, and provide an additional 6-foot tall screening/barrier wall for visual and safety purposes. The Spring Valley CPG voted to approve the Project by a vote of 11-1-1-2 (11-Yes, 1-No, 1-Abstain, 2-Vacant/Absent).

The Spring Valley CPG meeting minutes are included in Attachment D, Public Documentation.

F. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Zoning Administrator adopt the Environmental Findings included in Attachment B, which includes a finding that the Project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to §15183 of CEQA.

Report Prepare	d Bv:
----------------	-------

Rachael Lindebrekke, Project Manager 619-323-7872

Rachael.Lindebrekke@sdcounty.ca.gov

Report Approved By:

Kathleen A. Flannery, Acting Director 858-694-2962

Kathleen.Flannery@sdcounty.ca.gov

AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:

ASHLEY SMITH, CHIEF

ATTACHMENTS:


Attachment A – Planning Documentation


Attachment B – Environmental Documentation


Attachment C – Site Plan, Preliminary Grading Plan, and Visual Simulations


Attachment D – Public Documentation

Attachment A – Planning Documentation

















Attachment B – Environmental Documentation



KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY ACTING DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
(858) 505-6445 General
www.SDCPDS.org

VINCE NICOLETTI ACTING ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

July 29, 2021 September 16, 2021

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

Project Name: Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot

Project Record Numbers: PDS2021-STP-21-019
Environmental Log Number: PDS2021-ER-21-19-004

APN(s): 505-231-03-00

Lead Agency Name and Address:

County of San Diego Planning and Development Services 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110 San Diego, CA 92123-1239

County Staff Contact:

Rachael Lindebrekke Rachel.lindebrekke@sdcounty.ca.gov (619) 323-7872

Project Location:

The proposed Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot project (Project) is located within the unincorporated community of Spring Valley in eastern San Diego County. The approximately 2.1-acre Project site is located southeast of the intersection of Jamacha Boulevard and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard. The site is located within the Spring Valley Community Plan Area. Industrial development within the unincorporated County abuts the Project site to the west and south, with vacant land to the east, and a residential mobile home community to the north.

Project Applicant Name and Address:

Greenlaw Partners 18301 Von Karman, Suite 250 Irvine, CA 92612 15183 Statement of Reasons

General Plan

Community Plan: Spring Valley Community Plan

Regional Categories: Village

Land Use Designations: High Impact Industrial (I-3)

Density: N/A
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) N/A

Zoning

Use Regulation: High Impact Industrial (M58)

Minimum Lot Size: 6000sf

Special Area Regulation: Community Design Review Area (B)

Description of Project:

The Project is a request for a Site Plan for a 69 automotive space parking lot and fleet storage. The property would not have gates or fences. The surface lot will have landscape and hardscape features including down facing light poles to provide safety and security. Water service would be provided for the proposed landscape. Vehicles are expected to enter and exit the property 24 hours 7 days per week, with peek am hours between 9:20 AM and 11:10 AM, and PM hours between 7:10 PM and 9:10 PM. No site or building signage will be required. The Project site is vacant, with an existing industrial complex on the adjacent property to the west. The Project would provide additional fleet storage to be used in conjunction with the adjacent industrial use. Access to the site would be provided through the adjacent lot under the same ownership.

Discretionary Actions:

Discretionary permits for the Project include a Site Plan for Community Design Review and a Certificate of Compliance to legalize the parcel in accordance with the Subdivision Map Act.

Overview of 15183 Checklist

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.

15183 Statement of Reasons

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 Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot Project is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the 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 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 would develop a fleet storage facility on a site zoned for High Impact Industrial uses, consistent with the use types envisioned for the site by the General Plan.
- 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.

15183 Statement of Reasons

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 industrial lots with associated accessory uses. 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 biological resources, cultural resources, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and wildfire. 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 Project is consistent with the density and use characteristics of the development considered by the GPU EIR. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the 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.

July holis	
	7/29/2021
Signature	Date
Rachael Lindebrekke	Project Manager
Printed Name	Title

 \bigcup

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

This checklist provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from the 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.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
 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 GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

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

As described in the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPU EIR; County of San Diego 2011), the County contains visual resources affording opportunities for scenic vistas in every community. Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) are identified within the GPU EIR and are the closest that the County comes to specifically designating scenic vistas. Many public roads in the County currently have views of RCAs or expanses of natural resources that would have the potential to be considered scenic vistas. Numerous public trails are also available throughout the County. New development can often have the potential to obstruct, interrupt, or detract from a scenic vista.

The Project site is located southeast of the intersection of Jamacha Boulevard and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard, within the Spring Valley Community Plan Area in the unincorporated County of San Diego. No RCAs established for protecting visual resources as identified by the County of San Diego General Plan or Spring Valley Community Plan exist within the vicinity of the Project site.

Additionally, no trail systems or public parks would provide topographically accessible views to the Project. The Project site is located 0.3 miles from the Jamacha Trail, which would provide minimal views of the Project site due to distance and intervening topography and land uses. Additionally, the Project is consistent with existing industrial land uses and

therefore the Project would not detract from existing views from an adopted County or State trail system.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on scenic vistas to be less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

1(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

The Project site is not within the vicinity of a State Designated Scenic Highway, however the County General Plan identifies roadways that are designated as scenic corridors within the Conservation and Open Space Element and have been included as part of the County Scenic Highway System. Designated scenic roadways located in the vicinity of the Project site include State Route 94, located 1.4 miles to the east of the Project site, and Avocado Boulevard, located 1.4 miles to the north of the Project site. Direct views to the Project site are minimal and brief, and would not substantially obstruct, interrupt, or detract from an existing scenic vista. Additionally, the Project would be consistent with surrounding industrial land uses.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on scenic resources to be less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

1(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers.

The Project site is within an industrial and high density residential of unincorporated Spring Valley, located southeast of the intersection of Jamacha Boulevard and Sweetwater Springs Boulevard. The existing visual character and quality of the Project surroundings are characterized as industrial and mobile home residential land use types with relatively flat to moderately sloped grades.

The proposed Project would not detract from, or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of the surrounding areas for the following reasons: consistency with the General Plan density allowance on-site, conformance with the Spring Valley Community Plan and location of the site within an industrially developed area. Additionally, the location, size, and design of the proposed use would be compatible with uses in the

immediate area. The proposed development is similar to surrounding industrial land use types.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on visual character or quality to be significant and unavoidable. However, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

1(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The proposed Project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 33 miles from the Mount Laguna Observatory and approximately 42 miles from Palomar Observatory. However, the Project will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the Project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209), including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights. The code was developed by the County in cooperation with the lighting engineers, astronomers, and other experts to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. Compliance with the Code would be required prior to issuance of a building permit. Thus, the proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from light or glare to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Aesthetics, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

	Significant Project	Impact not identified by GPU	Substantial New
	Impact	EIR	Information
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?

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

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?

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?

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

Discussion

resources, to non-agricultural use?

- 2(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. County agricultural specialist staff analyzed agricultural resources on the project site. Based on the County of San Diego Geographical Information System and aerial imagery, the site has been mapped "grazing land" by the Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) and is not considered an important agricultural resource. Adding no, FMMP mapped "Prime Soils", County Prime Soil Candidates, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Soil Candidates are underlain on the Project site. The following soils were identified on-site:
 - Friant rocky fine sandy loam, 30 to 70% slopes (FxG)

The site is not considered an important agricultural resource. To be considered an important agricultural resource under the LARA model, no primary factor (soil, climate, water) may be rated "low" since the site does not contain any prime soils or soils of statewide or local importance, the site would receive a soil rating of "low".

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from direct and indirect conversion of agricultural resources to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant direct and indirect impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR.

2(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The GPU The Project site is zoned M58, High Impact Industrial, which is not an agricultural zone. The Project site is not within an agricultural preserve or a Williamson Act Contract. The nearest lands under Williamson Act Contract are located 3.4 miles northeast and the nearest lands within an agricultural preserve are located approximately 3.0-miles north of the Project site. Due to distance, no land-use interface conflicts would occur. Additionally, the Project is for the development of industrial fleet storage, which is compatible with the

surrounding industrial use types. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from land use conflicts to be less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

2(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore Project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. The outer edge of the Cleveland National Forest is located approximately 10.2 miles to the east of the Project site. Thus, due to distance, the Project would have no impact on the Forest. In addition, the County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from direct and indirect conversion of agricultural resources (including forest resources), to be significant and unavoidable. However, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact to forest resources. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 2(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. As indicated in response 2(c), the Project site, or any off-site improvements, are not located near any forest lands. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 2(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. As mentioned above in responses 2(a) and 2(b), the site is undeveloped with no active agricultural use types. The Project site is zoned M58, High Impact Industrial. As mentioned above in response 2(a), the Project site would not be considered a viable agricultural resource due to the lack of water resources on site. No active agricultural operations exist within the vicinity of the Project site.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from direct and indirect conversion of agricultural resources (including forest resources) to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project determined impacts to agricultural resources to be less-than-significant. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Agricultural/Forestry Resources, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant

	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)?			
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			
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)?			
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			

Discussion

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas analysis was prepared for the Project by RECON Environmental, Inc. dated July 28, 2021.

The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment was prepared for the Project by RECON Environmental, Inc. dated July 14, 2021. The General Plan designates the Project site as High Impact Industrial. The Project proposes industrial fleet storage. This would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation and density. Because the proposed Project is allowed under the General Plan land use designation, which is used in San Diego Association of Governments' (SANDAG's) growth projections, it is consistent with San Diego County Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD's) Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). As such, the Project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the construction and operational emissions from the Project would be below established screening-level thresholds (SLTs), as addressed under Question 3(b), and would not violate any ambient air quality standards.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on air quality plans to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

3(b) The GPU EIR concluded impacts to be significant and unavoidable. In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from area sources (landscaping and consumer products), energy (natural gas), transportation (on-road mobile sources), and short-term construction activities. The County of San Diego (County) has identified significance SLTs which incorporate SDAPCD's established air quality impact analysis trigger levels for all new source review (NSR) in SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and Rule 20.3. These SLTs identified in the County Guidelines can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g., stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. SLTs for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are based on the threshold of significance for VOCs from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which is more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin). The County's SLTs and SDAPCD's trigger levels were developed in support of State and federal ambient air quality standards that are protective of human health.

The Project proposes industrial fleet storage and would require grading and surfacing of the lot for the parking of 69 delivery vans. Construction of the Project is expected to begin early 2022 and be completed in mid-2022. The first year of full operations would be expected in 2023. Emissions generated during construction activities would be temporary and localized. Earthwork activities during construction of the Project would require 6,200 cubic yards of cut, 5,200 cubic yards of fill, and 1,000 cubic yards of export. Construction activities would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55 to reduce fugitive dust. To further reduce potential impacts generated during the construction phase, the Project would require all construction equipment used during grading and site preparation activities to employ EPA certified Tier 3 or better engines with diesel particulate filters (DPF). With the application of fugitive dust control measures, emissions of criteria air pollutants during construction activities would be below the County SLTs. According to the County of San Diego's Operational Phase Air Quality Study Trigger Criteria, the proposed Project would not result in development that would exceed the trigger level for an industrial land use for operational emissions and would not result in emissions that exceed the County's SLTs.

Project construction emissions associated with the proposed development are not anticipated to exceed the County's construction and operational SLTs, based on the analysis presented in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis. Therefore, the Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality violations. The Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and would not result in an impact that was not previously identified in the GPU EIR.

3(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively) for ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) and Particulate Matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when VOCs and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces.

dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

The Project would contribute PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$, NO_X , and VOC emissions from construction/grading activities; however, it would not exceed established SLTs (see Question 3(b) above). Additionally, grading and all other construction activities would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55, which require the implementation of dust control measures. The Project would generate PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$, and NO_X emissions during Project operations primarily from mobile sources (i.e., vehicle trips), and VOCs from area and mobile sources. However, the proposed Project does not exceed the County's Operational Phase Air Quality Study Trigger Criteria for operational emissions and therefore would not result in emissions that exceed the County's SLTs.

Cumulative impacts could occur if the most intensive phases of construction for the proposed Project occur simultaneously with other intensive phases of proposed projects in close proximity. The most intensive construction phase for the Project and for typical developments occurs during earthwork and grading activities. During these phases, the primary criteria air pollutant of concern would be PM₁₀. As discussed in the Air Quality Assessment (Appendix A), Project construction would be limited and would occur over a short-term, two-month period. Given the developed nature of the Project vicinity and the short duration of Project construction, it is unlikely that other major construction activities would occur in the same area at the same time. Project construction and operation would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

In addition, the Project's estimated emissions of criteria air pollutants would be relatively low compared to the County's SLTs during construction activities. Further, due to the highly dispersive nature of particulate matter, a cumulative impact during construction activities would only occur if a project adjacent to the proposed Project undergoes simultaneous grading/earthwork activities and emits significantly greater emissions than the Project. Because all projects developed within the County would be required to comply with the County Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55, this scenario is not anticipated to occur.

The Project is proposing development that is consistent with the County's General Plan, thus operational air emissions are considered to have been accounted for in the GPU EIR. The RAQS and SIP were prepared consistent with growth forecasts in the General Plan. Further, as described under Question 3(b), Project construction and operations would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants greater than the County's SLTs. Thus, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants for which the region is currently in non-attainment.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to non-attainment criteria air pollutants. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact to non-attainment criteria air pollutants for the reasons stated above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts or result in new impacts not identified within the GPU EIR.

3(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool – 12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, day-care centers, residences, or other facilities that may

house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The Project proposes industrial fleet storage for an existing industrial operation. The proposed Project would not be considered a point-source of significant emissions. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are existing mobile home residences to the north, adjacent to the Project site boundaries. The Project would generate construction emissions in the vicinity of sensitive receptors.

Diesel particulate matter (DPM) is the primary toxic air contaminant (TAC) of concern and is generated from fuel consumption in heavy construction equipment. The Project would incorporate the following project design features during construction activities:

Project Design Features

- The Project shall use Tier 3 or better construction equipment with diesel particulate filters
- Engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum size suitable for the required job
- Construction equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.
- The applicant shall not allow idling time to exceed 5 minutes unless more time is required per engine manufacturers' specifications or for safety reasons.

Additionally, abidance to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, SDAPCD Rule 55 and to a confined construction schedule would reduce emissions and exposure to construction emissions would be temporary and would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive concentrations of air pollutants. The County's SLTs for human health hazards were developed in support of State and federal ambient air quality strategies that are protective of human health.

As discussed in Question 3(b), according to the County of San Diego's Operational Phase Air Quality Study Trigger Criteria, the proposed Project would not result in development that would exceed the trigger criteria for operational emissions and would not result in emissions that exceed the County's SLTs or health risk. Furthermore, as indicated in Question 3(b), NAAQS and CAAQS would not be exceeded due to Project contributions for both operations and construction and would not expose sensitive receptors to an incremental health risk.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to sensitive receptors. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact to sensitive receptors. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project could produce objectionable odors during the construction phases of paving and painting activities which would require bitumen and solvents from the placement of hot asphalt and architectural coating. Exhaust from construction equipment may also generate odors. However, due to the dispersive nature of odors, these short-term impacts would be fairly short-lived and would not cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Furthermore, the Project would be subject to SDAPCD Rule 51, Nuisance Rule, which prohibits emissions of any material that causes nuisance to a considerable number of persons or endangers the comfort, health, or safety of any person. The Project is for industrial fleet storage for an existing industrial operation. Thus, the Project would not

create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people during construction activities or operations.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined less than significant impacts from objectionable odors. As the Project would have a less than significant impact from objectionable odors for the reasons stated above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Air Quality, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant

4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
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?			
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?			
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?			
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?			

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?		

Discussion

A Biological Resources Letter Report was prepared for the Project by RECON Environmental dated July 2021.

Biological resources on the Project site were evaluated in a Biological Resource Letter 4(a) Report prepared by RECON Environmental, dated July 2021. The site contains Diegan coastal sage scrub, non-native grassland, eucalyptus woodland, and urban/developed habitat. One special status plant species, ashy spike-moss (Selaginella cinerascens), was observed within the Project site. Three other special status plant species, Otay tarplant (Deinandra conjugens), San Diego barrel cactus (Ferocactus viridescens), and California adolphia (Adolphia californica), have a moderate potential to occur. No special status wildlife species were observed on the Project site. Nine special status wildlife species -Crotch's bumble bee (Bombus crotchii), Quino checkerspot butterfly (Euphydryas editha quino), Blainville's horned lizard (Phrynosoma blainvillii), Belding's orange-throated whiptail (Aspidoscelis hyperythra beldingi), San Diegan tiger whiptail (Aspidoscelis tigris steinegeri), Cooper's hawk (Accipiter cooperi), coastal California gnatchatcher (Polioptila californica californica), southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (Aimophila ruficeps canescens), and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (Lepus californicus bennettii) - have a moderate potential to occur within the Project site. The site is located within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) but is not designated as a Pre-approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) or a Biological Resource Core Area (BRCA).

As considered by the GPU EIR, Project impacts to sensitive habitat and/or species will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures include offsite purchase of 1.41 acres of Tier II or higher tier habitat and 0.26 acres of Tier III or higher tier habitat within a BRCA in the MSCP. To avoid impacts to Otay tarplant, San Diego barrel cactus, and California adolphia, a preconstruction survey will be conducted to determine whether any plants have regrown within the Project footprint. If the survey is negative, no additional measures will be required. If any of these species are detected, additional consultation with County staff will be required to determine any additional mitigation measures required. In-kind preservation at a mitigation ratio of 1:1 to 3:1 would be required per the County BMO for Otay tarplant, San Diego barrel cactus, and California adolphia. Habitat-based mitigation is proposed for impacts to ashy spike-moss, a County List D species. Habitat-based mitigation will serve to mitigate for potential direct impacts to avian and non-avian species, including Crotch's bumble bee, Blainville's horned lizard, Belding's orange-throated whiptail, San Diegan tiger whiptail, and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit. Mitigation for impacts to avian and raptor species and the Quino checkerspot butterfly include preconstruction surveys to determine presence of these species and consultation with the Wildlife Agencies and County to determine appropriate measures if these species are present.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to special status species as significant and unavoidable. The Project impacts were also determined to be potentially significant. However, the proposed Project would incorporate the GPU EIR mitigation measures Bio-1.6 and Bio-1.7 for a less than significant impact with mitigation. Therefore,

the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

4(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Based on the Biological Resource Letter Report, no wetlands or jurisdictional waters were found onsite or offsite. The following sensitive habitats were identified on the site: Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland habitat. As detailed in response a) above, direct, and indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in the RPO, NCCP, Fish and Wildlife Code, and Endangered Species Act are mitigated.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities as significant and unavoidable. The Project impacts were also determined to be potentially significant. However, the proposed Project would incorporate the GPU EIR mitigation measures Bio-1.6 and Bio-1.7 for a less than significant impact with mitigation. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 4(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; therefore, no impacts will occur. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to federally protected wetlands as less than significant with mitigation. The Project determined impacts to federally protected wetlands to be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 4(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Based on a GIS analysis, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Letter Report, it was determined that the site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor as identified on MSCP maps nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The site would not assist in local wildlife movement as it lacks connecting vegetation and visual continuity with other potential habitat areas in the general Project vicinity.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to wildlife movement corridors as significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

4(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project is consistent with the MSCP, BMO, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) with the implementation of mitigation. The Project will 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. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Biological Resources, the following findings can be made:

- 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 (Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7) would be applied to the Project.

5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project:	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?			
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?			
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?			
d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?			
e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			

Discussion

A Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report was prepared for the Project by Carmen Zepeda-Herman dated June 18, 2021.

5(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County approved archaeologist, Carmen Zepeda-Herman, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the Project site. The results of the survey are provided in an historical resources report titled, "Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot Project" (Zepeda-Herman, June 18, 2021).

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on historic resources to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project determined impacts on historic resources to be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

5(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. No archaeological resources were found on the property during the archaeological survey. In addition, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a Sacred Lands File (SLF) check and the results were positive. A Kumeyaay Native American Monitor (Alyssa Soto) was part of the survey, and she did not have any concerns. Existing conditions indicate that the entire APE has been disturbed in the past by grading for the former airport and adjacent commercial, as well as by vegetation grubbing. The potential for intact buried cultural resources is considered low, as such, the Project would not have a significant impact on cultural resources.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul 2.5. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to archaeological resources as less than significant with mitigation. The Project determined impacts to archaeological resources as potentially significant. However, the Project would incorporate the GPU EIR mitigation measure Cul-2.5 for a less than significant impact with mitigation. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

5(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The 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.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on unique geologic features as less than significant. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impacts for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

5(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. 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 geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Proposed grading would include more than 2,500 cubic yards of excavation. As such, paleontological monitoring by a qualified paleontologist will be made a condition of approval.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: grading monitoring by a qualified paleontologist. If resources are encountered, the qualified paleontologist will evaluate the resources in conformance with the County's Paleontological Resource Guidelines. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul-3.1.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on paleontological resources would be less than significant with mitigation. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impacts with the incorporation of GPU EIR mitigation measure Cul-3.1 for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

5(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. 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. Also see section 5(b) above for mitigation measures for inadvertent discoveries.

As previously discussed, the GU EIR determined impacts to human remains as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project determined impacts to human remains as less than significant. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of cultural/paleontological resources, the following findings can be made:

- 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 (Cul-2.5, Cul-3.1), would be applied to the Project.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
6. Energy Use – Would the Project:			
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			

Discussion

Energy use was not specifically analyzed within the GPU EIR as a separate issue area under CEQA. At the time, Energy Use was contained within Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines and since then has been moved to the issue areas within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. However, the issue of energy use in general was discussed within the GPU and the GPU EIR. For example, within the Conservation and Open Space Element of the GPU, Goal COS-15 promotes sustainable architecture and building techniques that reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and GHGs, while protecting public health and contributing to a more sustainable environment. Policies, COS-15.1, COS-15.2, and COS-15.3 would support this goal by encouraging design and construction of new buildings and upgrades of existing buildings to maximize energy efficiency and reduce GHG. Goal COS-17 promotes sustainable solid waste management. Policies COS-17.1 and COS-17.5 would support this goal by reducing GHG

emissions through waste reduction techniques and methane recapture. The analysis below specifically analyzes the energy use of the Project.

The Project would increase the demand for electricity and natural gas at the Project site, and gasoline consumption in the Project area during construction and operation relative to existing conditions. CEQA requires mitigation measures to reduce "wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary" energy usages (Public Resources Code Section 21100, subdivision [b][3]). Neither the law nor the State CEQA Guidelines establish criteria that define wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use. Compliance with the California Code of Regulations 2019 Title 24 Part 6 Building Code and 2019 Energy Efficiency Standards would result in highly energy-efficient buildings. However, compliance with building codes does not adequately address all potential energy impacts during construction and operation. It can be expected that energy consumption, outside of the building code regulations, would occur through the transport of construction materials to and from the site during the construction phase and the use of vehicles by employees of the existing industrial operation.

Grading and Construction

During the grading and construction phases of the Project, the primary energy source utilized would be petroleum from construction equipment and vehicle trips. To a lesser extent, electricity would also be consumed for the temporary electric power for asnecessary lighting and electronic equipment. Activities including electricity would be temporary and negligible; therefore, electricity use during grading and construction would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Any natural gas that may be consumed as a result of the Project construction would be temporary and negligible and would not have an adverse effect; therefore, natural gas used during grading and construction would also not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

The energy needs for the Project construction would be temporary and is not anticipated to require additional capacity or increase peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. Construction equipment use and associated energy consumptions would be typical of that associated with the construction of industrial projects of this size in an industrial setting. Additionally, The Project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Thus, the Project's energy consumption during the grading and construction phase would not be considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

Operational

Operation of the Project would be typical of industrial fleet storage land uses requiring natural gas for landscape maintenance activities. The Project would meet the California Code of Regulations Title 24 Standards and Energy Efficiency Standards for energy efficiency that are in effect at the time of construction. The Project would also comply with the County's Landscape Ordinance and the water use application using prescriptive compliance option to reduce overall water use onsite.

Over the lifetime of the proposed Project, fuel efficiency of vehicles is expected to increase as older vehicles are replaced with newer, more efficient models. As such, the amount of petroleum consumed as a result of vehicle trips to and from the Project site during operation would decrease over time. State and Federal regulations regarding standards for vehicles (e.g. Advanced Clean Cars Program, CAFÉ Standards) are designed to reduce wasteful, unnecessary, and inefficient use of fuel. The coupling of various State policies and regulations such as the Zero-Emission Vehicles Mandate and Senate Bill 350

would result in the deployment of electric vehicles which would be powered by an increasingly renewable electrical grid.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR did not analyze Energy as a separate issue area under CEQA. Energy was analyzed under the GPU and GPU EIR and has been incorporated within General Plan Elements. The Project would not conflict with policies within the GPU related to energy use, nor would it result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, as specified within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

- 6(b) Many of the regulations regarding energy efficiency are focused on increasing the energy efficiency of buildings and renewable energy generation, as well as reducing water consumption and reliance on fossil fuels. The proposed Project includes the following energy conservation measures:
 - Compliance with County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance, demonstrating a 40% reduction in outdoor use which would reduce energy required for water conveyance.

In addition, the Project would be consistent with energy reduction policies of the County General Plan including policies COS-14.1 and COS-14.3. Additionally, the Project would be consistent with sustainable development and energy reduction policies such as policy COS-15.4, through compliance with the most recent Title 24 standards Energy Efficiency Standards at the time of Project construction. Therefore, the proposed Project would implement energy reduction design features and comply with the most recent energy building standards consistent with applicable plans and policies. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR did not analyze Energy as a separate issue area under CEQA. Energy was analyzed under the GPU and GPU EIR and has been incorporated within General Plan Elements. The Project would not conflict with policies within the GPU related to energy use or conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency as specified within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Energy, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

7. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:	Significant Project	Impact not identified by	Substantial New
	Impact	GPU EIR	Information

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: (i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, (ii) strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, (iii) liquefaction, and/or (iv) 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 where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?		

Discussion

- 7(a)(i) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project 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 Hazard Zones in California, or located on any known active, potentially active, or inactive fault traces. The nearest Alquist-Priolo fault to the Project site is located approximately 5 miles to the east of the site.
- 7(a)(ii) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project is for the development of industrial fleet storage and would not result in the development of any buildings. The Project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code would ensure that the Project would not result in a significant impact.
- 7(a)(iii)The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified by the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that liquefaction potential at the site is low. Additionally, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill nor is it located within a floodplain. Therefore, impacts from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant. To ensure no impacts would occur, a geotechnical report would be required prior to ground disturbance activities as a standard condition of approval. The GPU EIR identified the standard condition of a geotechnical report within section 2.6.3.1, Federal, State and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes, Liquefaction.

Conditions of Approval

The following list includes the Project conditions of approval:

Geotechnical Report

- A California Certified Engineering Geologist shall complete a final soils report specific
 to the preliminary design of the proposed development and submit the final soils report
 to PDS. The findings shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of the County
 Department of Planning and Development Services or designee.
- 7(a)(iv)The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards and is considered to be Generally Susceptible. The Project site is relatively flat to moderately sloped and risks associated with ground movement hazards are low.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined less than significant impacts from exposure to seismic-related hazards and soil stability The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with the incorporation of Project conditions for a geological soils report, as a standard condition of approval. The GPU EIR identified the standard condition of a geotechnical report within section 2.6.3.1, Federal, State and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes, Liquefaction. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

7(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The soils on-site have been identified as mollisols that have a soil erodibility rating of severe. However, the Project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the Project would be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the Project will not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not significantly alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the Project would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) per the Priority Development Project Storm Water Quality Management Plan to prevent fugitive sediment.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from soil erosion and topsoil loss to be less than significant. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

7(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. As indicated in response (a)(iv), the site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards and is considered to be Generally Susceptible. The Project site is relatively flat to moderately sloped and risks associated with ground movement hazards are low.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from soil stability to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons listed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

7(d) The GPU EIR determined impacts from expansive soils to be less than significant. The Project site is not underlain by expansive soils, however as a standard Project condition, the Project would be required to submit a Soils Engineering Report by a California Certified Engineering Geologist prior to grading. The soils report is required to include a surficial stability analysis with design recommendations. All geotechnical recommendations

provided in the soils report would be followed during grading and construction of the Project.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from expansive soils to be less than significant. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impact with the incorporation of standard Project conditions, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

7(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project would not require the use of septic systems. As such, the Project would not place septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems on soils incapable of adequately supporting the tanks or system.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to wastewater disposal systems to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Geology and Soils, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant by adhering to the Project conditions of approval, which are consistent with the GPU EIR.

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

Analysis

8(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Amendments to Section 15064.4 of the CEQA Guidelines were adopted to assist lead agencies in determining the significance of the impacts of GHG emissions. Section 15064.4 specifies that a lead agency "shall make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of

greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project." Section 15064.4 also provides lead agencies with the discretion to determine whether to assess those emissions quantitatively or to rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards.

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

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

Utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) model, which is the model commonly used to evaluate GHG impacts in CEQA, the Project is estimated to generate -4- 12 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂e) per year during operations. Construction emissions are estimated to result in 1 MTCO₂e per year when amortized over a 30-year timeframe (consistent with methodology from the SCAQMD). With construction, annual Project GHG emissions were estimated to be 5 MTCO₂e.

In addition, a screening threshold was used to illustrate that impacts from the Project would be less than significant for GHG emissions. In response to Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) white paper titled "CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act," provides a methodology used for jurisdictions across the state to identify a screening level for GHG emissions (CAPCOA 2008). The CAPCOA guidance states that projects should be screened to determine if their associated GHG emissions exceed 900 MTCO2e. Since adoption of this threshold, Senate Bill (SB) 32 was passed to set a revised statewide reduction target to reduce emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by year 2030.

As compared to similar mass emissions thresholds adopted by other regional air districts the CAPCOA 900 MTCO₂e threshold is relatively conservative and could be used to support cumulative impact determination beyond 2020. In April 2020, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) published updated project screening levels and determined that projects estimated to generate less than 1,100 MTCO₂e per year would not result in a significant, cumulative impact. This threshold was developed to demonstrate compliance with the statewide reduction targets in 2030.

Thus, the CAPCOA threshold of 900 MTCO₂e represents a more stringent screening level than has been approved by other air districts in compliance with 2030 statewide reduction targets. Also, as State legislative requirements such as Building Energy Efficiency Standards and transportation-related efficiency measures become increasingly more stringent over time, future Project GHG emissions would be reduced helping to meet State

emission reduction targets. As described previously, the Project would generate a total of 5 MTCO₂e per year, which is well below both screening thresholds. However, the Project does not rely on the screening level thresholds to determine impact significance, rather to illustrate that the Project would not cause a significant direct or cumulative impact from GHG emissions due to the relatively small amount of GHG emissions during operation and construction.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project is consistent with the GPU EIR and would generate a minimal amount of GHG emissions. As the Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

8(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. 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 GHG reductions.

The Project is consistent with the County's General Plan land use designation of High Impact Industrial. Through its goals, policies, and land use designations, the County's General Plan aims to reduce countywide GHG emissions. Furthermore, the County's General Plan growth projections informed the development of the San Diego Association of Governments' (SANDAG's) San Diego Forward: the 2015 Regional Plan which is the region's 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy (RTP/SCS). SANDAG's Regional Plan is the region's applicable plan for reducing GHG emissions and is consistent with State GHG emissions reductions goals set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) under SB 375. Because the proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan land uses, it is also consistent with State GHG emission reduction targets as identified in the SANDAG RTP/SCS.

Because the Project's proposed land uses are consistent with the County's General Plan land use designation, the Project would not conflict with the General Plan or SANDAG's Regional Plan and would not result in growth beyond what was assumed in the regional growth forecasts. Therefore, the Project's impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to applicable regulation compliance to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Global Climate Change, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
9. 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?			
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			
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?			
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?			
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?			
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			
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?			
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?

Discussion

9(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or 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.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials and accidental release of hazardous materials to be less than significant. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact. Thus, for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project is not within one-quarter mile of an existing school, and the Project does not propose any hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials or substances. substances. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from hazards to schools to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 9(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. Based on a site visit and 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.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from existing hazardous materials sites to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

9(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Additionally, 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. Therefore, the Project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on public airports to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 9(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

- 9(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.
- 9(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The Project is not located along the coastal zone.
- 9(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.

9f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The Project is not located within a dam inundation zone. Additionally, the development would not constitute a "Unique Institution" such as a hospital, school, or retirement home pursuant to the Office of Emergency Services included within the County Guidelines for Determining Significance, Emergency Response Plans. Therefore, the proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted dam evacuation plan.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from emergency response and evacuation plans to be less than significant with mitigation. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

9(g) The GPU EIR concluded this impact as significant and unavoidable. The proposed Project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the Project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the Project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 16 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Major Grading Permit and/or building permit process. Therefore, based on the location of the Project and review of the Project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and through compliance with the San Diego County Fire Authority, the Project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the Project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from wildland fires to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

9(h) The GPU EIR concluded this impact as less than significant. The Project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the Project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Therefore, the Project will not substantially increase exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined less than significant impacts with mitigation from vectors. The proposed Project would also have a less-than-significant impact. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant by adhering to the Project conditions of approval, which are consistent with the GPU EIR.

10. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?			
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?			
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?			

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)?		
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?		
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?		
g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?		
h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		
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?		
j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?		
k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?		
I) 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?		
m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		

Discussion

The following Technical Studies were prepared for the Project related to hydrology and water quality:

- 1. A Preliminary CEQA Drainage Study prepared by Ware Malcomb dated July 27,2021
- 2. A Priority Development Project Stormwater Quality Management Plan (PDP SWQMP) prepared by Ware Malcomb dated July 27, 2021.

10(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Development projects have the potential to generate pollutants during both the construction and operational phases. For the Project to avoid potential violations of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, storm water management plans are prepared for both phases of the development Project.

During the construction phase, the Project would prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would implement the following typical erosion control BMPs: hydraulic stabilization and hydroseeding on disturbed slopes; County Standard lot perimeter protection detail and County Standard desilting basin for erosion control on disturbed flat areas; energy dissipater outlet protection for water velocity control; silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel and sand bags, storm drain inlet protection and engineered desilting basin for sediment control; stabilized construction entrance, street sweeping and vacuuming for offsite tracking of sediment; and measures to control materials management and waste management.

The SWPPP would be prepared in accordance with Order No. 2009-009-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Order CAS000002 Construction General Permit (CGP) adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) on September 2, 2009. During the post-construction phase, as outlined in the PDP SWQMP, the Project would implement site design, source control and structural BMPs to prevent potential pollutants from entering storm water runoff. The PDP SWQMP has been prepared in accordance with the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual (2019) and SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (2013), as adopted by the RWQCB on May 8, 2013.

The Project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements of both the CGP and MS4 storm water permits listed above ensures the Project would not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts and addresses human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to water quality standards and requirements. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact to water quality standards through ordinance compliance as detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

10(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project site lies in the Sweetwater (909.21) hydrologic unit within the Jamacha hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act section 303(d) list, a portion of this watershed is impaired. Constituents of concern in the Sweetwater Reservoir watershed include dissolved oxygen. 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 structural BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to water quality standards and requirements. However, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact to water quality standards with the implementation of Project conditions listed in 10(a). The conditions are consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures Hyd-

- 1.2 through Hyd-1.5. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 10(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. As stated in responses 10(a) and 10(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that Project impacts are less than significant.
 - As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to water quality standards and requirements and groundwater supplies and recharge. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than significant impact to water quality standards and requirements and groundwater supplies and recharge with the implementation of Project conditions listed in 10(a). The conditions are consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 10(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project is within the service area of the Otay Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs and other imported sources. The Project will not use groundwater for its potable water supply and adequate groundwater resources exist to support the use of an existing well for common-area irrigation. In addition, the Project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
 - As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact to groundwater recharge. Therefore, the Project would not be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 10(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site because storm water quality management plans are prepared for both the construction and post-construction phases of the development Project. During the construction phase, the Project would prepare and implement a SWPPP. The SWPPP would implement the following typical erosion control BMPs: hydraulic stabilization hydroseeding on disturbed slopes; County Standard lot perimeter protection detail and County Standard desilting basin for erosion control on disturbed flat areas; energy dissipater outlet protection for water velocity control; silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel and sand bags, storm drain inlet protection and engineered desilting basin for sediment control; stabilized construction entrance, street sweeping and vacuuming for offsite tracking of sediment; and measures to control materials management and waste management.

Due to the Project proposing additional fleet storage for an existing industrial operation on the adjacent parcel under the same ownership, onsite flows with be managed across both parcels and are referred to as the "combined site" for the remainder of Section 10(e).

Existing drainage pattern for the combined site consists of four drainage areas. The southwest portion of the onsite, including the southern half of the largest existing building, sheet flows northerly before discharging at a 10-ft wide concrete channel that drains into a drain inlet along the northern boundary. The northeast portion of the onsite, including the northern half of the largest existing building, sheet flows westerly and eventually discharges at the concrete channel. There is approximately 12.60 acres of offsite area

that impacts the combined site from the east. 9.06 acres of offsite area discharges into an existing brow ditch that is conveyed along the eastern boundary that confluences with an additional 1.98 acres which includes a portion of the proposed Project site, APN: 505-231-03. The 11.04 acres of combined offsite area and a portion of the proposed Project site ultimately discharge to the existing 10 ft wide concrete Channel.

Runoff from the proposed Project will be captured and conveyed to underground detention systems. Both underground detention systems will be used as upstream storage as well as pretreatment. The underground detention systems will discharge into biofiltration BMPs for treatment and ultimately into the existing concrete channel.

Offsite runoff will be retained through proposed retaining walls along the eastern onsite boundary. Drainage ditches will convey the offsite runoff northerly where it is captured through proposed storm drain and conveyed to the existing concrete channel. Offsite runoff will bypass the underground detention system and biofiltration BMPs.

The SWPPP would be prepared in accordance with Order No. 2009-009-DWQ, NPDES Order CAS000002 CGP adopted by the SWRCB on September 2, 2009. During the post-construction phase, as outlined in the Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) dated July 27, 2021, the Project would implement site design, source control and structural BMPs to prevent potential pollutants from entering storm water runoff. The SWQMP has been prepared in accordance with the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual (2019) and SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (2013), as adopted by the RWQCB on May 8, 2013.

The SWPPP and SWQMP specify and describe the implementation process of all BMPs that would address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream receiving waters. The Department of Public Works would ensure that these Plans are implemented as proposed.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to erosion or siltation. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact to erosion or siltation with the implementation of Project conditions, consistent with GPU mitigation measures (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5). Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

10(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Preliminary Hydrology Study prepared by X Engineering & Consulting dated July 27, 2021 determined that the proposed Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. See response 10(e) for further discussion on on-site drainage patterns.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to flooding as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with regards to flooding with design features and improvements consistent with GPU mitigation measures (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5). Therefore, the Project would not be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

10(g) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Pursuant to the Preliminary Drainage Study prepared for the proposed Project by X Engineering & Consulting dated July 27, 2021 and as described above in 10(e) and 10(f), the Proposed project would maintain the existing pre-development on-site drainage pattern. Post development drainage would be at or below pre-development rates of discharge.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to exceed capacity of stormwater systems as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with regards to exceeding the capacity of stormwater systems with mitigation (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5). Therefore, the Project would not be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

10(h) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs as indicated in response 10(a) would be employed such that potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determine impacts to water quality standards and requirements as significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact to water quality standards with the implementation of project conditions listed in 10(a). The conditions are consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5. Therefore, the Project would not be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

10(i) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. No FEMA or County-mapped floodplains were identified on the Project site or off-site improvement locations. Additionally, the Project does not propose any housing. Therefore, the Project would not place housing within a County or federal floodplain or flood way.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

10(j) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. No FEMA or County-mapped floodplains were identified on the Project site or off-site improvement locations. Additionally, the Project does not propose any housing. Therefore, the Project would not place housing within a County or federal floodplain or flood way.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

10(k) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project does not propose development within any identified special flood hazard area. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from housing within a 100-year flood hazard area and emergency response and evacuation plans as less than significant

with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

10(I) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The County Office of Emergency Services maintains Dam Evacuation Plans for each dam operational area. These plans contain information concerning the physical situation, affected jurisdictions, evacuation routes, unique institutions, and event responses. If a "unique institution" is proposed, such as a hospital, school, or retirement home, within dam inundation area, an amendment to the Dam Evacuation Plan would be required. The Project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from dam inundation and flood hazards and emergency response and evacuation plans as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

10(m)(i) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation.

SEICHE: The Project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.

10(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The Project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.

10(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 7(a)(iv).

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from seiche, tsunami and mudflow hazards to be less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Hydrology and Water Quality, the following findings can be made:

- 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 (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5) would be applied to the Project. The mitigation measures, as detailed above, requires the Project applicant to comply with the guidelines for determining significance for Hydrology and Water Quality as well as for Dam Inundation, the Watershed Protection Ordinance, Stormwater Standards Manual, and the Resource Protection Ordinance.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
11. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project:			
a) Physically divide an established community?			
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			

Discussion

11(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area. The Project is industrial fleet storage and is consistent with the County of San Diego General Plan.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR concluded physically dividing an established community as less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

11(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project would develop a lot for industrial fleet storage, which is consistent with the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR. The discretionary actions for the Project include a site plan and certificate of compliance.

The Project site is zoned High Impact Industrial (M58) and has a General Plan land use designation of High Impact Industrial. As stated in response 11(a), the Project would be consistent with the General Plan allowed density and has been anticipated in the GPU EIR.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to conflicts with land use plans, policies, regulations as less than significant. As the Project would have a less-than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Land Use and Planning, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
12. 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?			
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?			

12(a) The GPU EIR determined that impacts to mineral resources would be significant and unavoidable. The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) required classification of land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs). The Project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of "Potential Mineral Resource Significance" (MRZ-3). However, the Project site is surrounded by densely developed land uses including high density residential and industrial, 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, implementation of the Project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to mineral resources to be significant and unavoidable. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

12(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands, nor is it located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this Project. The Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Mineral Resources, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
13. Noise – Would the Project:	•		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			
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?			
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?			

Discussion

A Noise Report prepared by Recon Environmental, Inc. and dated July 28, 2021 was prepared for the Project.

12(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The area surrounding the Project site consists of residences and industrial uses. The Project will not 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 – Noise Element: Policy 4b 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). The proposed Project consists of 69 automotive space parking lot and fleet storage within a High Impact Industrial (M58) zone.

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. A noise report prepared by Recon and dated July 1, 2021 was submitted for PDS2021-STP-21-019, Sweetwater Triangle Land, which demonstrated that the proposed Project complies with the Noise Ordinance. The Project site as well as adjacent parcels to the west and southwest are zoned High Impact Industrial (M58), which are subject to the noise levels of a one-hour average of 75 at the property line. The surrounding parcels to the north and east are zoned residential and therefore is subject to the arithmetic mean one-hour average noise level limit of 62.5 dBA daytime and 60 dBA nighttime. The property to the east is identified as a biological open space easement, which is subject to 60 dBA Leq. The Project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410: 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. However, that eastern boundary of the Project site is coincident with the boundary of an open space preserve, the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge. The site is located within the Metro-Lakeside Jamul Segment of the South County MSCP Subarea Plan. The habitat is suitable for the coastal California gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica californica). The construction noise levels at the adjacent habitat are projected to exceed 60 dB(A) Leq, therefore, impacts to nesting coastal California gnatcatchers would be potentially significant during the breeding season without mitigation. An avoidance measure would be required to reduce potential construction noise impacts at the adjacent habitat. The Biological Resources Letter Report prepared for the Project outlines the following avoidance measure (RECON 2021). This avoidance measure is discussed above in section 4(a) and 4(b).

Further, blasting is not anticipated for the proposed project; however, should blasting occur, then monitoring would be required if done within 225 feet from an occupied noise sensitive land use. Each blast shall be monitored and recorded with an airblast overpressure monitor and groundborne vibration accelerometer that is located outside the closest residence to the blast. Where potential exceedance of the County Ordinance is identified, the applicant shall not continue any blasting activities until the blast drilling and monitoring plan is prepared and submitted to the County, which identify mitigation measures shown to effectively reduce noise and vibration levels

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from excessive noise levels to be less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with the incorporation of Bio-16. And Bio-1.7 as well as standard ordinance compliance measures. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

12(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project does not propose residential uses which are sensitive to low ambient vibration. 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. In addition, the Project does not propose construction equipment that would produce groundborne vibration.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from excessive groundborne vibration to be less than significant with mitigation. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

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. Also, the Project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from permanent increase in ambient noise levels to be significant and unavoidable. However, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

12(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The 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 8hours during a 24-hour period. However, that eastern boundary of the Project site is coincident with the boundary of an open space preserve, the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge. The site is located within the Metro-Lakeside Jamul Segment of the South County MSCP Subarea Plan. The habitat is suitable for the coastal California gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica californica). The construction noise levels at the adjacent habitat are projected to exceed 60 dB(A) Leq, therefore, impacts to nesting coastal California gnatcatchers would be potentially significant during the breeding season without mitigation. An avoidance measure would be required to reduce potential construction noise impacts at the adjacent habitat. This avoidance measure is discussed above in section 4(a) and 4(b).

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from temporary increase in ambient noise levels to be less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with the incorporation of Bio-16. And Bio-1.7. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 12(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation The Project 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. The nearest airport is the Gillespie Airport, which is approximately 6.25 miles from the Project site. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 12(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed Project

would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Noise, the following findings can be made:

- 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 (Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7) would be applied to the Project.

14. Population and Housing – Would the Project:	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
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)?			
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			

Discussion

14(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project site is designated in the General Plan as High Impact Industrial. The Project is for industrial fleet storage and is consistent with the density and use types allowable under the general plan, and thus would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area as development of the site was accounted for within the GPU. In addition, the Project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in the area.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from population growth to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

14(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project would not displace significant numbers of existing housing. The Project would develop industrial fleet storage for an existing industrial operation. The Project would not displace any existing housing, nor would replacement housing would not be required elsewhere.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from displacement of housing to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

14(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project would not displace a substantial number of people. The Project would develop industrial fleet storage for an existing industrial operation. The Project would not result in the displacement of people, nor would replacement housing would not be required elsewhere.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from displacement of people to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Population and Housing, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

15. Public Services – Would the Project:	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
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?			

Discussion

15(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation for the exception of school services, which remained significant and unavoidable. The proposed Project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Water service would be provided by the Otay Water District. The Project is for the development of industrial fleet storage and would not require the use of sanitation systems.

Fire and emergency protection would be provided by the San Miguel Fire Protection District. The nearest fire station is San Miguel Fire Protection District Station #15, located at 2850 Via Orange Way. This station is approximately 0.5 miles from the Project site and has sufficient capacity to serve the Project.

Based on the discussion above, the Project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impact to fire protection services, police protection services and other public services as significant with mitigation while school services remained significant and unavoidable. However, as the Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons stated above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Public Services, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
16. 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?			
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?			

Discussion

16(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project is for industrial fleet storage and would not result in increased use of existing parks and other recreational facilities.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts related to deterioration of parks and recreational facilities to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

16(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact from the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts related to construction of new recreational facilities to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Recreation, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

17. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project:	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
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?			
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?			
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?			

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		
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?		

Discussion

17(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The County of San Diego previously adopted "Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Transportation and Traffic" in 2006, with revisions and modifications approved in 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011. Revisions and modifications focused primarily on metrics related to vehicle delay through Level of Service (LOS). These Guidelines presented an evaluation of quantitative and qualitative analyses and objective and predictable evaluation criteria and performance measures for determining whether a land development project or a public project like a community plan has a significant traffic impact on the environment pursuant to the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as well as a determination of the required level of CEQA analysis.

Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) was signed into law on September 27, 2013 and changed the way that public agencies evaluate transportation impact under CEQA. A key element of this law is the elimination of using auto delay, LOS, and other similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion as a basis for determining significant transportation impacts under CEQA. The legislative intent of SB 743 was to "more appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions." According to the law, "traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment" within CEQA transportation analysis.

In response, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) updated CEQA Guidelines to establish new criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts. Based on input from the public, public agencies, and various organizations, OPR recommended that Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) be the primary metric for evaluating transportation impacts under CEQA. VMT measures the number of vehicle trips generated and the length or distance of those trips.

SB 743 does not prevent a city or county from continuing to analyze delay or LOS as part of other plans (i.e., General Plan), studies, congestion management and transportation improvements, but these metrics may no longer constitute the basis for transportation impacts under CEQA analysis as of July 1, 2020. For example, in the County, the General Plan identifies LOS as being a required analysis, and even though it will no longer be a requirement of CEQA, unless the General Plan is amended, LOS will continue to be analyzed as part of project review.

The County of San Diego published Transportation Study Guidelines dated May 2020 which were formally adopted by the County Board of Supervisors on June 24th, 2020. The Board voted to adopt a significance threshold for Projects producing VMT of 15% below

the unincorporated County VMT average. Using this threshold, projects are not required to conduct additional VMT analysis if the Project site is located within a VMT Efficient Area. A VMT Efficient Area is an area on County VMT maps that modelling data already shows is at least 15% below the unincorporated County VMT average per resident. The unincorporated County VMT average per resident is 32.54. A VMT rate that is 15% below the average is 27.66 VMT per resident.

Per OPR guidance and Pub. Resources Code, § 21083, subd. (b)(2); see CEQA Guidelines, § 15064, subd. (h)(1).), "a project that falls below an efficiency-based threshold that is aligned with long-term goals and relevant plans has no cumulative impact distinct from the project impact". Therefore, according to the traffic experts at OPR, the VMT efficiency threshold used herein is the threshold for both a direct transportation impact and cumulative transportation impact.

The Project site has a VMT average of 23.18 and is located within a VMT Efficient Area. No significant direct or cumulative VMT impact would occur, and mitigation measures are not required. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and impacts would be less than significant.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to unincorporated County traffic and LOS standards. The proposed Project determined impacts to be potentially significant. The Project would have a less-than-significant impact therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

17(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The designated congestion management agency for the County is the San Diego Association of governments (SANDAG). In October 2009, the San Diego region elected to be exempt from the State CMP and, since this decision, SANDAG has been abiding by 23 CFR 450.320 to ensure the region's continued compliance with the federal congestion management process.

Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines details new regulations, effective statewide July 1, 2020 that sets forth specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. Generally, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. VMT refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. Except as provided regarding roadway capacity, a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact. The Project site has a VMT average of 23.18 and is located within a VMT Efficient Area. No significant direct or cumulative VMT impact would occur, and mitigation measures are not required.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program and would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

17(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project site is not located within an Airport Influence Area, Airport Safety Zone, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Area, Avigation Easement, or Overflight Area. Therefore, the Project

would have a less than significant impact to air traffic patterns. The Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

17(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The proposed Project would not substantially 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. The Project will provide adequate sight distance from the proposed private access road.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on rural road safety to be significant and unavoidable. However, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact with no mitigation required for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

17(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The Project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code. In addition, consistent with GPU EIR mitigation measure Tra-4.2, the Project would implement the Building and Fire codes to ensure emergency vehicle accessibility.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on emergency access as less than significant with mitigation. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of project conditions of approval for adherence to the building and fire codes, consistent with GPU EIR Mitigation Measure Tra-4.2. The Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

17(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. 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.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on alternative transportation and rural safety as less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Transportation and Traffic, the following findings can be made

- 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 would be applied to the Project. The mitigation measures, as detailed above, would require the Project applicant to comply with the County Public Road Standards, Guidelines for Determining Significance, coordinate with other jurisdictions to identify appropriate mitigation and implement the Building and Fire Codes to ensure adequate services are in place.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
18. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project:			
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			
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?			
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?			
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			
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?			
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			

18(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project does not propose to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on wastewater treatment requirements as less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

18(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. As indicated in response 18(a), the Project does not propose to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems.

Additionally, Project requires water service from the Otay Water District, and adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the Project would have sufficient water supplies available, and would not require substantial pipeline extensions to serve the Project. Thus, the Project would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to adequate water supplies be less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

18(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project involves new storm water drainage facilities, however, these extensions would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on sufficient stormwater drainage facilities to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 18(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would receive water from the Otay Water District which has adequate water to serve the Project. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to adequate water supplies be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 18(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project would not require wastewater service; therefore, the Project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

 As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to adequate wastewater facilities be less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 18(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. 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. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

18(g) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Utilities and Service Systems, the following findings can be made:

- 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. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

19. Wildfire – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts in the environment?			
d) Expose people or structures to significant risk, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes?			

Discussion

Wildfire was analyzed within the GPU EIR within Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The guidelines for determining significance stated: the proposed General Plan Update would have a significant impact if it would 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. In 2019, the issue of Wildfire was separated into its own

section within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines to incorporate the four issue questions above. The GPU EIR did address these issues within the analysis; however, they were not called out as separate issue areas. Within the GPU EIR, the issue of Wildland Fires was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

19(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The site is located within the Very High fire hazard severity zone (FHSZ). The Project site is within the authority of the San Miguel Fire Protect District and is located approximately 0.5 miles from the nearest fire station. The nearest fire station is Sam Miguel Fire Protection District's Fire Station #15, located at 2850 Via Orange Way. The expected emergency travel time to the proposed Project would be 0 to 5 minutes. This would meet the response time required for the Project by the County of San Diego General Plan Safety Element of 5 minutes. Access lanes within the development would also be constructed to County standards and include adequate turning radius to facilitate fire apparatus turn movement.

As previously stated, Wildfire was analyzed within the GPU EIR within Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials and was determined to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

19(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project is within the Very High fire hazard severity zone (FHSZ). and within the Urban-Wildlife Interface Zone. The Project would comply with regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code. Additionally, the Project is for the development of industrial fleet storage and would not involve any permanent occupancy. Implementation of these fire safety standards would occur during the building permit process and is consistent with GPU mitigation measure Haz-4.3. In addition, the Project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and the density established under the County of San Diego General Plan. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the Project would not be expected to experience exacerbated wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing, winds or other factors.

As previously stated, Wildfire was analyzed within the GPU EIR within Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials and was determined to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of GPU EIR mitigation measure Haz-4.3 for compliance with the building and fire codes. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 19(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would require paving for an industrial fleet storage lot. All infrastructure associated with the Project has been incorporated within this analysis. Therefore, no additional temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment related to associated infrastructure would occur that have not been analyzed in other sections of this environmental document.
 - As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from Wildfire to be significant and unavoidable. However, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above.
- 19(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. As previously stated in 19(b), the Project would comply with regulations relating to emergency access,

water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code. The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards and is considered to be Generally Susceptible. The Project is for fleet storage and does not proposed the development of any buildings. The Project would also be required to complete a Final Drainage Study, as indicated in 10(f) and 10(g) to final engineering specification and detail consistent with the hydrology and hydraulic design manuals ensuring that the surface runoff would not result in flooding on-or of-site. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the project site would not expose people or structures to significant risk, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes.

The GPU EIR concluded significant and unavoidable impacts associated with Wildfire under Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Wildfire, the following findings can be made:

- 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 (Haz-4.3) would be applied to the Project. These mitigation measures, as detailed above, require the Project applicant to comply with the building and fire codes.

Appendices

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

15183 Exemption Checklist

Appendix A

The following is the list of Project specific technical studies used to support the Project's environmental analysis. All technical studies are available on the website here https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/Current_Projects.html#par_title or hard copies are available at the County of San Diego Zoning Counter, 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110, San Diego, 92123:

RECON Environmental, Inc, (July 14, 2021), Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis

RECON Environmental, Inc, (July 2021), Biological Resources Letter Report

RECON Environmental, Inc, (July 1, 2021), Noise Report

Ware Malcomb, (July 27 2021), Preliminary CEQA Drainage Study

Ware Malcomb, (July 27, 2021), Stormwater Quality Management Plan for Priority Development Projects

Zepeda-Herman, Carmen, (June 18, 2021), Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report

References

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.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS Aug2011/EIR/FEIR 5.00 - References 2011.pdf

15183 Exemption Checklist

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.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU FEIR Summary 15183 Reference.pdf

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS

SWEETWATER SPRINGS TRIANGULAR PARKING LOT PDS2021-STP-21-019 PDS2021-ER-21-19-004 SEPTEMBER 16, 2021

- 1. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines section 15183, find the project is exempt from further environmental review for the reasons stated in the 15183 Statement of Reasons dated September 16, 2021 because the project is consistent with the General Plan for which an environmental impact report dated August 2011 on file with Planning & Development Services as Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-001 (GPU EIR) was certified, there are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, there are no project impacts which the GPU EIR failed to analyze as significant effects, there are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate, there is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR, and that the application of uniformly applied development standards and policies, in addition to feasible mitigation measures included as project conditions would substantially mitigate the effects of the project, as explained in the 15183 Statement of Reasons dated September 16, 2021.
- 2. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines section 15183(e)2, the Zoning Administrator, at a duly noticed public hearing on September 16, 2021, found that feasible mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update EIR will be undertaken.
- 3. Find that the proposed project is consistent with the Resource Protection Ordinance (County Code, section 86.601 et seq.).
- 4. Find that plans and documentation have been prepared for the proposed project that demonstrate that the project complies with the Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (County Code, section 67.801 et seq.).
- 5. Find that the project is consistent with the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP), the County Subarea Plan and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (County Code, section 86.501 et seq.) as explained in the MSCP Conformance Statement dated July 20, 2021 on file with Planning & Development Services as Environmental Review Number PDS2021-ER-21-19-004.

REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot, PDS2021-STP-21-019

July 26, 2021

			<u>EE</u> – Does the proposed project conform to the Ordinance findings?
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT □
Discussion:			
the Multiple Spec	cies Conserva	ation Progra	rovements are located within the boundaries of m. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat Loss dings is not required.
II. MSCP/BMO - Program and Bio			ct conform to the Multiple Species Conservation nce?
`	∕ES I	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
Discussion:			
within the boun conforms with th	daries of the e Multiple Sp	e Multiple ecies Cons	provements related to the proposed project are Species Conservation Program. The project ervation Program and the Biological Mitigation dings dated July 20, 2021.
III. GROUNDWA the San Diego C			es the project comply with the requirements of nance?
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT □
Discussion:			
			nents of the San Diego County Groundwater will not have a significant adverse impact on

groundwater quantity because the total project demand will be less than 20,000 gallons per day and the project complies with the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance.

[July 26, 2021]

IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with:

The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Sections 86.604(a) and (b)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Sections 86.604(c) and (d)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Steep Slope section (Section 86.604(e))?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Section 86.604(f)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Section 86.604(g)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT

Discussion:

Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(a) and (b) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it near a watercourse plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map.

Steep Slopes:

Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are no steep slopes defined by the RPO on the property. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(e) of the RPO.

Sensitive Habitats:

Sensitive habitat lands include unique vegetation communities and/or habitat that is either necessary to support a viable population of sensitive species, is critical to the proper functioning of a balanced natural ecosystem, or which serves as a functioning wildlife corridor. No sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Section 86.604(f) of the RPO.

- 3 -

[July 26, 2021]

Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

The property has been surveyed by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Carmen Zepeda-Herman, and it has been determined that the property does not contain any archaeological/ historical sites. As such, the project complies with the RPO.

<u>V. STORMWATER ORDINANCE (WPO)</u> - Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?

YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
\boxtimes		

Discussion:

The Project Storm Water Quality Management Plan has been reviewed and is found to be complete and in compliance with the WPO.

<u>VI. NOISE ORDINANCE</u> – Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan and the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance?

YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE

Discussion:

The proposal would not expose people to nor generate potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit because review of the project indicates that the project is not in close proximity to a railroad and/or airport. Additionally, the County of San Diego GIS noise model does not indicate that the project would be subject to potential excessive noise levels from circulation element roads either now or at General Plan buildout.

Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.

MULTIPLE SPECIES CONSERVATION PROGRAM CONFORMANCE STATEMENT For Sweetwater Triangle Land PDS2021-STP-21-019 APN(s) 505-231-03-00

July 20, 2021

I. Introduction

The project proposes to develop an automotive and equipment fleet storage for the parking of approximately 62 delivery vans. No structures will be constructed, and no building signage will be required. The project site is located southeast of the intersection of Sweetwater Springs Boulevard and Jamacha Boulevard. The project is also located within the Metro-Lakeside-Jamul Segment of the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The site does not qualify as Biological Resource Core Area (BRCA).

Biological resources on the site were evaluated in a Biological Resource Letter Report (RECON, July 2021). The site was previously cleared for fuel modification purposes and a forensic analysis was conducted to determine what vegetation communities were previously present on the site. The forensic analysis determined that the site contained 1.41 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub, 0.52 acres of non-native grassland, 0.07 acres of eucalyptus woodland, and 0.04 acres of developed habitat. One special status plant species, ashy spike-moss (Selaginella cinerascens), was observed on the project site. Three other special status plant species, Otay tarplant (Deinandra conjugens), San Diego barrel cactus (Ferocactus viridescens), and California adolphia (Adolphia californica), have a moderate potential to occur on the project site. No special status wildlife species were observed. Nine special status wildlife species—Crotch's bumble bee (Bombus crotchii), Quino checkerspot butterfly (Euphydryas editha quino), Blainville's horned lizard (Phrynosoma blainvillii), Belding's orange-throated whiptail (Aspidoscelis hyperythra beldingi), San Diegan tiger whiptail (Aspidoscelis tigris steijnegeri), Cooper's hawk (Accipiter cooperi), coastal California gnatchatcher (Polioptila californica californica), southern California rusfous-crowned sparrow (Aimophila ruficeps canescens), and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (Lepus californicus bennettii)—have a moderate potential to occur on the project site. The project will impact 1.41 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub, 0.52 acres of non-native grassland, 0.07 acres of eucalyptus woodland, and 0.04 acres of developed habitat.

Mitigation measures for impacts to vegetation communities will include offsite purchase of 1.41 acres of Tier II or higher tier habitat and 0.26 acres of Tier III or higher tier habitat within a BRCA in the MSCP. To avoid impacts to Otay tarplant, San Diego barrel cactus, California adolphia, and ashy spike-moss, a pre-construction survey will be conducted to determine whether any plants have regrown within the project footprint. If the survey is negative, no additional measures will be required. If any of these species are detected, additional consultation with County staff will be required to determine any additional mitigation measures required. In-kind preservation at a mitigation ratio of 1:1 to 3:1 would

MSCP Conformance Findings July 20, 2021

be required per the County Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO) for Otay tarplant, San Diego barrel cactus, and California adolphia. Habitat-based mitigation proposed for impacts to sensitive vegetation will serve as mitigation for any impacts to ashy spikemoss, a County List D species. Habitat-based mitigation will serve to mitigate for potential direct impacts to non-avian species, including Crotch's bumble bee, Blainville's horned lizard, Belding's orange-throated whiptail, San Diegan tiger whiptail, and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit. Mitigation for impacts to avian and raptor species and the Quino checkerspot butterfly include preconstruction surveys to determine presence of these species and consultation with the Wildlife Agencies and County to determine appropriate measures if these species are present.

Table 1. Impacts to Habitat and Required Mitigation

Habitat Type	Tier Level	Existing On-site (ac.)	Proposed Impacts (ac.)	Mitigation Ratio	Required Mitigation
Diegan Coastal Sage					
Scrub	II	1.41	1.41	1:1	1.41
Non-native Grassland	III	0.52	0.52	0.5:1	0.26
Eucalyptus Woodland	IV	0.07	0.07		
Disturbed	IV	0.00	0.00		
Urban/Developed	N/A	0.04	0.04		
Total:		2.05	2.05		1.67

The findings contained within this document are based on County records and the Biological Resource Letter Report (RECON, July 2021). The information contained within these Findings is correct to the best of staff's knowledge at the time the findings were completed. Any subsequent environmental review completed due to changes in the proposed project or changes in circumstance shall need to have new findings completed based on the environmental conditions at that time.

The project has been found to conform to the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan, the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO) and the Implementation Agreement between the County of San Diego, the CA Department of Fish and Wildlife and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Third Party Beneficiary Status and the associated take authorization for incidental impacts to sensitive species (pursuant to the County's Section 10 Permit under the Endangered Species Act) shall be conveyed only after the project has been approved by the County, these MSCP Findings are adopted by the hearing body and all MSCP-related conditions placed on the project have been satisfied.

II. Biological Resource Core Area Determination

The impact area and the mitigation site shall be evaluated to determine if either or both sites qualify as a Biological Resource Core Area (BRCA) pursuant to the BMO, Section 86.506(a)(1).

A. Report the factual determination as to whether the proposed Impact Area qualifies as a BRCA. The Impact Area shall refer only to that area within which

MSCP Conformance Findings July 20, 2021

project-related disturbance is proposed, including any on and/or off-site impacts.

The Impact Area does not qualify as a BRCA since it does not meet any of the following BRCA criteria:

i. The land is shown as Pre-Approved Mitigation Area on the wildlife agencies' Pre-Approved Mitigation Area map.

The land is not shown as Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) on the wildlife agencies' Pre-Approved Mitigation Area map. Therefore, the project site does not meet this requirement.

ii. The land is located within an area of habitat that contains biological resources that support or contribute to the long-term survival of sensitive species and is adjacent or contiguous to preserved habitat that is within the Pre-Approved Mitigation Area on the wildlife agencies' Pre-Approved Mitigation Area map.

While the land is located adjacent to preserved habitat to the east, the land does not contain habitat that contains biological resources that support or contribute to the long-term survival of sensitive species and the site is surrounded by development to the north, south, and west. Therefore, the project site does not meet this requirement.

- iii. The land is part of a regional linkage/corridor. A regional linkage/corridor is either:
 - a. Land that contains topography that serves to allow for the movement of all sizes of wildlife, including large animals on a regional scale; and contains adequate vegetation cover providing visual continuity so as to encourage the use of the corridor by wildlife; or
 - b. Land that has been identified as the primary linkage/corridor between the northern and southern regional populations of the California gnatcatcher in the population viability analysis for the California gnatcatcher, MSCP Resource Document Volume II, Appendix A-7 (Attachment I of the BMO.)

The land has not been identified as part of a regional linkage/corridor and is surrounded by development to the west, north, and south. Therefore, the project site does to meet this requirement.

iv. The land is shown on the Habitat Evaluation Map (Attachment J to the BMO) as very high or high and links significant blocks of habitat, except that land which is isolated or links small, isolated patches of habitat and land that has been affected by existing development to create adverse edge effects shall not qualify as BRCA.

MSCP Conformance Findings July 20, 2021

The land is shown on the Habitat Evaluation Map as developed and does not link significant blocks of habitat due to development surrounding the site on the north, south, and west. Therefore, the project site does not meet this requirement.

v. The land consists of or is within a block of habitat greater than 500 acres in area of diverse and undisturbed habitat that contributes to the conservation of sensitive species.

The land is located adjacent to a block of habitat greater than 500 acres in area of diverse and undisturbed habitat to the east. However, the land is surrounded by development to the north, south, and west and does not provide any connectivity or linkage to the undisturbed habitat to the east. Therefore, the project site does not meet this requirement.

- vi. The land contains a high number of sensitive species and is adjacent or contiguous to surrounding undisturbed habitats, or contains soil derived from the following geologic formations which are known to support sensitive species:
 - a. Gabbroic rock;
 - b. Metavolcanic rock;
 - c. Clay;
 - d. Coastal sandstone

Available data indicates that the project site contains Friant rocky fine sandy loam. While the land is adjacent to undisturbed habitats, these soils are not known to contain a high number of sensitive species. Therefore, the project site does not meet this requirement.

B. Report the factual determination as to whether the Mitigation Site qualifies as a BRCA.

The project will mitigate for impacts through an offsite mitigation bank located within a BRCA in the MSCP.

III. Biological Mitigation Ordinance Findings

A. Project Design Criteria (Section 86.505(a))

The following findings in support of Project Design Criteria, including Attachments G and H (if applicable), must be completed for all projects that propose impacts to Critical Populations of Sensitive Plant Species (Attachment C), Significant Populations of Narrow Endemic Animal Species (Attachment D), Narrow Endemic Plant Species (Attachment E) or Sensitive Plants (San Diego County Rare Plant List) or proposes impacts within a Biological Resource Core Area.

1. Project development shall be sited in areas to minimize impact to habitat.

MSCP Conformance Findings July 20, 2021

The entire project site will be impacted by project development. This will include impacts to ashy spike-moss, a County List D plant species, and sensitive plant species with a moderate potential to occur. The project site is not considered a BRCA and more suitable for development. Therefore, offsite mitigation for impacts to vegetation communities, County List D plant species, and special status wildlife species is more appropriate than onsite preservation. The project will also conduct preconstruction surveys for special status plant species with moderate potential to occur and will implement appropriate mitigation if species are found onsite.

2. Clustering to the maximum extent permitted by County regulations shall be considered where necessary as a means of achieving avoidance.

Due to the project site's small size and shape, the entire site is considered impacted and no areas are proposed for conservation. Therefore, clustering was not considered as a means of achieving avoidance.

3. Notwithstanding the requirements of the slope encroachment regulations contained within the Resource Protection Ordinance, effective October 10, 1991, projects shall be allowed to utilize design that may encroach into steep slopes to avoid impacts to habitat.

Steep slopes, as defined by the Resource Protection Ordinance, do not occur on the project site. As such, encroachment into steep slopes could not be applied to further reduce impacts.

4. The County shall consider reduction in road standards to the maximum extent consistent with public safety considerations.

Minimum private road standards have been applied to the onsite proposed private roads. No reduction in road standards are necessary.

5. Projects shall be required to comply with applicable design criteria in the County MSCP Subarea Plan, attached hereto as Attachment G (Preserve Design Criteria) and Attachment H (Design Criteria for Linkages and Corridors).

The project site is not located within the Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) or designated as Preserve land. The project site is also not located within a regional linkage or corridor and is surrounded on three sides by development. Therefore, the Preserve Design Criteria from Attachment G and the Design Criteria for Linkages and Corridors from Attachment H do not apply.

B. Preserve Design Criteria (Attachment G)

In order to ensure the overall goals for the conservation of critical core and linkage areas are met, the findings contained within Attachment G shall be required for all

MSCP Conformance Findings July 20, 2021

projects located within Pre-Approved Mitigation Areas or areas designated as Preserved as identified on the Subarea Plan Map.

The project is not located within the Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) or areas designated as Preserve land. Therefore, the Preserve Design Criteria from Attachment G does not apply.

C. Design Criteria for Linkages and Corridors (Attachment H)

For project sites located within a regional linkage and/or that support one or more potential local corridors, the following findings shall be required to protect the biological value of these resources:

The project site is not located within a regional linkage or corridor. Therefore, the Design Criteria for Linkages and Corridors from Attachment H does not apply.

IV. Subarea Plan Findings

Conformance with the objectives of the County Subarea Plan is demonstrated by the following findings:

1. The project will not conflict with the no-net-loss-of-wetlands standard in satisfying State and Federal wetland goals and policies.

The project site does not contain jurisdictional wetlands or waters. Therefore, this criterion does not apply.

2. The project includes measures to maximize the habitat structural diversity of conserved habitat areas including conservation of unique habitats and habitat features.

Due to the project site's small size and shape, the entire site is considered impacted and no areas are proposed for conservation. The loss of 1.41 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub and 0.52 acres of non-native grassland will be mitigated by the preservation of Tier II and Tier III habitat within a BRCA in the MSCP. These measures will contribute towards maximizing diversity by preserving habitat in areas known to have unique habitats and habitat features.

3. The project provides for conservation of spatially representative examples of extensive patches of Coastal sage scrub and other habitat types that were ranked as having high and very high biological values by the MSCP habitat evaluation model.

The project site does not include extensive patches of Coastal sage scrub or other habitat types that were ranked as having high and very high biological values. Impacts to 1.41 acres of coastal sage scrub and 0.52 acres of non-native grassland will be mitigated by the preservation of Tier II and Tier III habitats within a BRCA in the MSCP. This will provide for the conservation of spatially representative examples of

MSCP Conformance Findings July 20, 2021

extensive patches of Coastal sage scrub and other habitat types that were ranked as having high and very high biological values.

4. The project provides for the creation of significant blocks of habitat to reduce edge effects and maximize the ratio of surface area to the perimeter of conserved habitats.

Due to the project site's small size and shape, the entire site is considered impacted and no areas are proposed for conservation. In addition, this site is surrounded by development to the north, west, and south. The land to the east supports an extensive open space preserve and the only area that could be subject to edge effects. In order to reduce potential edge effects to this preserve, additional measures will be implemented. These include Best Management Practices (BMPs), fugitive dust management, temporary fencing installation, lighting installation directed away from the preserve, and design of the project to direct run-off away from the preserve.

5. The project provides for the development of the least sensitive habitat areas.

Due to the project site's small size and shape, the entire site is considered impacted and no areas are proposed for conservation. The loss of 1.41 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub and 0.52 acres of non-native grassland will be mitigated by the preservation of Tier II and Tier III habitat within a BRCA in the MSCP.

6. The project provides for the conservation of key regional populations of covered species, and representations of sensitive habitats and their geographic sub-associations in biologically functioning units.

No threatened, endangered, narrow endemic species were detected on the project site. Developing the site will not eliminate highly sensitive habitat or impact key populations of covered species.

7. Conserves large interconnecting blocks of habitat that contribute to the preservation of wide-ranging species such as Mule deer, Golden eagle, and predators as appropriate. Special emphasis will be placed on conserving adequate foraging habitat near Golden eagle nest sites.

No wide-ranging species are expected to occur onsite due to adjacent development and surrounding land uses. Offsite purchase and preservation of high-quality habitat to mitigate for impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland will occur within a BRCA. This will contribute to the development of large interconnecting blocks of habitat that support wide ranging species.

8. All projects within the San Diego County Subarea Plan shall conserve identified critical populations and narrow endemics to the levels specified in the Subarea Plan. These levels are generally no impact to the critical populations and no more than 20 percent loss of narrow endemics and specified rare and endangered plants.

MSCP Conformance Findings July 20, 2021

No critical populations or narrow endemic species were detected on the site. The project proposes mitigation measures for potential impacts to sensitive plant and wildlife species with a moderate potential to occur.

9. No project shall be approved which will jeopardize the possible or probable assembly of a preserve system within the Subarea Plan.

While the project site is located adjacent to preserved habitat to the east, the small size and shape of the site and the development surrounding the site to the north, west, and south does not aid in conservation or wildlife dispersal. Therefore, the project will not jeopardize the possible or probable assembly of a preserve system within the Subarea Plan.

10. All projects that propose to count on-site preservation toward their mitigation responsibility must include provisions to reduce edge effects.

The proposed project does not propose to count onsite preservation towards their mitigation responsibility. Therefore, this criterion does not apply.

11. Every effort has been made to avoid impacts to BRCAs, to sensitive resources, and to specific sensitive species as defined in the BMO.

The project site does not qualify as a BRCA. No threatened, endangered, or narrow endemic species were detected on the project site. Due to the surrounding development, the project site is suitable for development with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures will include the offsite preservation of Tier II and Tier III habitats within a BRCA in the MSCP, preconstruction surveys to determine the presence of sensitive plant and wildlife species, and consultation with the Wildlife Agencies and County to determine appropriate measures if species are found to be present. Every effort has been made to avoid impacts to BRCAs, to sensitive resources, and to specific sensitive species as defined by the BMO.


Kendalyn White, Planning & Development Services July 20, 2021


MSCP Conformance Findings July 20, 2021


MSCP Designation





Attachment C – Site Plan and Preliminary Grading Plan














SWEETWATER DIB 2 - TRIANGULAR LOT

LANDSCAPE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS

2500 SWEETWATER SPRINGS BLVD. SPRING VALLEY, CA

AS SHOWN AS SHOWN 1" = 20" 1" = 20' LANDSCAPE IRRIGATION LEGEND & CALCULATIONS PROJECT TEAM FOR SPECIFICATIONS, SEE SEPARATE BOOKLET SHEET INDEX LANDSCAPE COVER SHEET IRRIGATION DETAILS PLANTING DETAILS IRRIGATION PLAN WARE MALCOMB ARCHITECTS as 11 SOFEMENTO WALEY BLUD. #120 SAN DIEGO, CA 92121 CONTACT: SANUEL BELLOMO EMAL: SANUEL BELLOMO EMAL: SANUEL BELLOMO PH; (858) 638-727. PLANTING PLAN ARCHITECT 14 - 15 12-13 7 - 11 SCALE: NOT TO SCALE AUST INCLUDE: A VARIOURLY SHOWN THE LANGESTER PROTESCOW, WERE CRECKOON EXPENDED WHITE AND A VARIOURLY STATE AND A VARIOURLY SHOWN THE LANGESTER OF THE PROTECTION FROM THE PROTECTION FROM THE PROTECTION FROM THE PROTECTION FROM THE WORLD THE WERE CHARLEST OF THE WAS THE DESCRIPTION FROM THE WORLD THE WERE CHARLEST OF THE WAS THE WA FINAL REQUIREMENTS I Fire (1) 10th Planet Spring (2) 10th Valley Jiu Jitsu VICINITY MAP I AME FAMIL LAR WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION PLANCE FOR CONTINUED IN CHAPTER IT 136 OF THE LE LANDON MINDINGHAL CODE. WHATE PRESPARED THESE PLANS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THOSE REQUIATIONS AND THE LE ACMON LANDSCAPE DESIGNAMMALAL CERTET THAT THE PLAN MINEL MEETER THAT THE SERVICE REGILATIONS TO PROVIDE REFLICIENT USE OF WATER. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE ABBREVIATIONS UNDERGROUND SERVICE ALET TOLL FREE 811 TWO WORKING BAYER BEFORE YOU DID PROVIDE FACILITIES FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN ACCORDANCE WITH C.A.C. TITLE 2. REQUIRED BY THE LATEST VERSION OF THE CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE. VERIFY ALL PROPERTY LINES OR OTHER LIMIT OF WORK LINES PRIOR TO COMMENCING WORK. GENERAL NOTES A PROTECTION FENCE SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED AND MAINTAIN CONFORMING TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE BUILDING CODE.



SECTION 4296/4217 OF THE GOVERNMENT COCE RECURSES A DIG ALENT DENTHICATION MANGER BE ISSUED BETORE A "PERMIT TO EDCAMATE" WILL BE WILLD, FOR YOR AND ALENT DENTHICATION MANIET CALL, UNDERSOCKED STRING, ALLEY,

PROVIDE THE OWNER WITH ALL WARRANTIES, GUARANTEES, AND INSTRUCTION MAI EQUIPMENT, APPLIANCES, FIXTURES, ETC. AS DESCRIBED IN THE SPECIFICATIONS.

REPAIR OR REPLACE ANY DAMAGE TO ADJACENT AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO THE OWNER.











 SHET COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 15 1 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS SHEET	LANDSCAPE COVER SHEET	1200X SWETWATER SPRINGS BLVD.	CALIFORNIA COORDINATE INDEX 202-1779	APPROVED FOR WILLIAM P. MORDAL. DIGINATES OF WORK.	OPPLIANT LINES		erc Rode Date	GRACHEN WE PDS2021—LDGRMJ—XXX
BY: LUKE A. CORSBIE DATE:	R.C.E. 72588 EXPIRES: 06-30-22	BENCH MARK	DESCRIPTION: 3.25" BRASS DISK STAMPED "SAN DIEGO COUNTY	SURVEYOR, SURVEY CONTROL, SWRF4, 2013"	LOCATION: TOP OF CURB INLET ON E'LY SIDE OF JAMACHA BLVD.	RECORD FROM: SURVEY NO. 22057 AND GEOID MODEL 12B	ELEVATION: 518,044 USSF DATUM: NAVD 1988	DATUM:
	NGES	DATE:						
	D CH	APPROVED BY:						
	COUNTY APPROVED CHANGES). DESCRIPTION:						
	1	ġ.						

PRIVATE CONTRACT
SHET | DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

RECORD PLAN

waremaicomb.com	:TIMWE	11	//7/-oco(oco)	'ON	ZNOHA

SYMBOL			
	MANUFACTURE / MODEL, NO. / DESCRIPTION	DETAIL	SHEET
	BURED NOW-PRESSURE LATENAL LINE P IPE: NAMALA PROFIDE FOR SESSES AN" TO A TITE. NAMALA PRESSUE SESSES AN" SEE LATENAL SPER PLAN.	×	0
	SCHOOLED PRESSIVE REFUGATION AWARGATION AWAILER). SCHOOL OF DOPE FOR MANUE RESIZES (1.17" AND SAMILER). CLASS 315 PVC PRE FORMANUE SIZES (7" AND LARGER).	×	
NO SYMBOL	AS APPROVED. CONCRETE THRUST BLOOCS CONSISTING OF MINIMUM (1) ONE CLBIC FOOT OF CONCRETE (2000 PS) SHALL BE INSTALLED FOR ALL INNNE, NE. 2-17 ON GREATERATELBOWS MAD AT PORTY OF CHANGE IN DIRECTION.	>	\$
0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000	SLEEVING - SCH 40 PV.C PIPE, EXTEND 12" BEYOND EDGE OF HARDSCAPE, SLEEVE SHALL BE MINIMUM TWICE THE DIAMETER OF THE PIPE OR WIRE BUINDLE CARRIED, MINIMUM 2" SIZE.	Z	5
emmunus en en e	CONTROL WIRE CONDUIT - SCH. 40 PVC PIPE, INSTALL UNDER PAVED / HARD SCAPE AREAS. CONDUIT SHALL BE MINIMUM TWICE THE DIAMETER OF WIRE BUNDLE CARRIED, MINIMUM 2" SIZE.	Z	5
	AS APPROVED - SCH 40. GALVANIZED STEEL PIPE SLEEVE FOR ALL V-DITCH CROSSINGS.	AA	10
NO SYMBOL	PANGE RECYBER TO 7702 AT BLANK OLS CONDUCTOR NAVA CABLE. IL GALGE, ENVIRE CABLE FOR CABLE ACK PACT WITH HIS FOR CANTED, PERREL MACKETED WRIEF ENRA WHEE MATH INSTALL ALL 2 WHITE CABLE MITH IN 14 FOR CONDULT CONNECT TO CONTROLLER PERRANALFACTURERS 2 WHITE CABLE MACKET AND CABLE AND CA	P, Q, R, BB, CC	8 6 9
NO SYMBOL	3M - DBRIY-6 DIRECT BURIAL WIRE CONNECTORS FOR USE ON ALL WIRE CONNECTIONS.	88	9
NO SYMBOL	K.B.I. KSC.S SWING CHECK VALVE, LINE SIZE, INSTALL ONE DOWNSTREAM OF EACH RCV WHEN RCV IS LOWER THAN THE SPRINKLERS. INSTALL VALVE WITHIN 6" ROLIND PLASTIC VALVE BOX.	N/A	Α×
NO SYMBOL	K.B.1. KGS SPRING CHECK VINE, LINE SEZ, RISPILL, CHE DOWNSTREEM OF EACH ROV. REMOUNTED, ABONE REST LATERAL, LEE TEE, WHEN ROVI'S HICHER THAN THE SPRINKLERS. RESTALL NALE, WETHING TO REMOUND SALFTIC VALUE EON, SHEVEN RECURED TO PREVENT LOW. RESTALL NALE, WETHING TO REMOUND LASTIC CANADAGE ALLOWED.	N/A	ž
*	AS APPROVED - TRANSTION PROM BELOW GRADE LATERAL LINE PVC PIPE TO CNAGRADE ULTRA-VIOLET RESISTANT (UVR) SCH 40 PVC PIPE.	N/A	N/A
	O GAGAGE HORRESINSE, IL TARRA, LIKE PEE, LA GAGAGE PEE GH. "ZI LATERA, LINEES NET MALE DO GAGAGE CONTROL STATEMENT AND CANAGE TREES NET MALE AND CANAGE TREES TREE TREES TO THE CANAGE AND CANAGE TREES TREE TREES TO THE CANAGE STATEMENT AND CANAGE TREES TREES TO THE CANAGE STATEMENT AND CANAGE TREES TREES TREES TO THE CANAGE TREES	8. I	5 =

AL, HIME REAL SHALL BE PLACEDWITHER ALSTONIANE ON WHEE SPECES MIST BE TWEETED WITH
WIRE CONSTRUCTOR.
WHE CONSTRUCTOR.
WHE CONSTRUCTOR.
WHE CONSTRUCTOR.
WHE CONSTRUCTOR.
WHE SPECES MIST ENGENE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CONSTRUCTOR WHE SPECES WE SPECES WE SHALL WE CONSTRUCTOR.
WHE SPECES WE THE NEEDEN OF SPECES WE SPECES ON SPECES WE SPECES

	IRRIGATION 2-WIRE EQUIPMENT LEGEND		
SYMBOL	MANUFACTURE / MODEL NO. / DESCRIPTION	DETAIL	SHEET
3	PAUNBIRO - LES-TREF, LINE SURGE PROTECTOR WITH GROUNDING ROD OR PLATE, PLACED WITHIN TO TROUD VIAIL PER SECK, LINE SURGE PROTECTOR SHALL BE SERVED EVER'S EGHT (8) DECODES OR SOMEWARKING BOTHAGE OF THE AWARE PAYED MOUNT ALL DEAD EM SURS.	., ., ≥ ., ≤	0
NO SYMBOL	RAIN BIRD - FD-101TURE, SINGLE VALVE, 2-WIRE, FIELD DECODER, ONE (1) DECODER REQUIRED PER REMOTE CONTROL VALVE, INSTALL PER MANUFACTURE RECOMMENDATIONS.	N, 0, 0, P,	00 OD
NOTE			

UNE. TOTAL GRAM LOVERN CANATITIS AND PROVIDE ONE SINGE PROTECTION AND GROUND ROD REPROFICED TO A CHARLES AND A CHARLES AND A CHARLES AND A CHARLES TO A CHARLES AND A CHARLES AND

FOR CONTINUED IRRIGATION LEGEND REFER TO SHEET 10

ŝ	SYMBOL	,	recratering obtains to the sandown and rate was received	PLOW	RATE	FLOW RATE GPM	1000	010000	PREC.	11 Table	-	5
ø	Ξ	L.	AWIND PACTURE / MODEL NO. / DESCRIPTION	ø	Η	F	20	WDIUS	RATE		SHEE	1
	П		12" POP-UP ROTOR HEAD WITH CHECK VALVE AND PRESSURE REGULATION	PRE SSU	RE RE	GULA"	NO.				П	į
Θ	0	0	HUNTER - PGP-12-CV, ULTRA SERIES, 12" POP-UP SHRUB ROTOR HEAD W/ NOZZLES Q-50 SR/H-1.0S R/F-2.0SR	.43	96	1.7	18	16 FT	0.46	1, EE	® Q	i
0	0	0	HUNTER - PGP-12-CV, ULTRA SERIES, 12" POP-UP SHRUB ROTOR HEAD W/ NOZZLES Q75 SP/H-1.55 RF-3.0SR	8	1.3	2.7	18	20 FT	0.46	1, EE	∞ ₽	1
0	@	0	HUNTER - PGP-12-CV, ULTRA SERIES, 12" POP-UP SHRUB ROTOR HEAD W/ NOZZLES Q-1.5 / H-2.5 / F-5.0	1.4	2.1	3.5	18	25 FT	0.46	1, EE	∞ ≎	
9	⊜	⊜	HUNTER - PGP-12-CV, ULTRA SERIES, 12" POP-UP SHRUB ROTOR HEAD W/ NOZZLES Q-2.0 / H-3.0 / F-6.0	1.7	2.7	5.6	8	30 FT	0.46	1, EE	® £	
0	8	0	HUNTER - PGP-12-CV, ULTRA SERIES, 12" POP-UP SHRUB ROTOR HEAD W/ NOZZLES Q-2.5 / H-4.0 / F-8.0	2.1	3.5	2.0	8	35 FT	0.46	1, EE	® Q	
9	6	9	HUNTER - PGP-12-CV, ULTRA SERIES, 12" POP-UP SHRUB ROTOR HEAD W/ RED NOZZLES Q-8 / H-10 / F-12	3.7	6.0	10.5	18	40 FT	0.46	1, EE	∞ ≎	
Θ	0	0	HUNTER - PGP-00, ULTRA SERIES, SHRUB ROTOR HEAD ON RISER W/ NOZZLES Q-5GSR/H-1.0 SRF-2.0SR	43	98	1.7	18	16 FT	0.46	K, EE, FF	® £	8
•	6	0	HUNTER - PGP-00, ULTRA SERIES, SHRUB ROTOR HEAD ON RISER W/ NOZZLES Q-75SR/H-15SRF-3.05R	88	1.3	2.7	18	20 FT	0.46	K, EE,	® £	Š <
0	0	0	HUNTER - PGP-00, ULTRA SERIES, SHRUB ROTOR HEAD ON RISER W/ NOZZLES Q-1,5/H-2,5/F-5.0	1.4	2.1	3.5	18	25 FT	0.46	K, EE.	® Q	
(2)	0	₿	HUNTER - PGP-00, ULTRA SERIES, SHRUB ROTOR HEAD ON RISER W/ NOZZLES Q-2, 0 / H-3, 0 / F-6.0	1.7	2.7	5.6	18	30 FT	0.46	K, EE,	∞ ₽	œi
⊜	⊜	⊜	HUNTER - PGP-00, ULTRA SERIES, SHRUB ROTOR HEAD ON RISER W/ NOZZLES Q-2.5 / H-4.0 / F-8.0	2.1	3.5	7.0	18	35 FT	0.46	K, EE,	® £	
(2)	⊜	0	HUNTER - PGP-00, ULTRA SERIES, SHRUB ROTOR HEAD ON RISER W/ RED NOZZLES Q-8 / H-10 / F-12	3.7	6.0	10.5	18	40 FT	0.46	K, EE,	® Q	
TON	T ASS	NTEF	NOTE: HUNTER LLITRA SERIES ROTOR REQUIRE THE INSTALLATION OF THE HUNTER HS.1-0 (3W") MODEL COMMERCIAL SWING JOINT AS SEMBLY WITH EACH HEAD.	TER HSJ	-0 (344	J MOD	EL CC	MMERC	IAL SN	ING		o o
NOT	NOTE: NOZZI NUMBERS: N THE LEGEND	ZZLE!	NOTE: NOZZLES NUMBERS WITHI THE ROTOR HEJJO SMBOLS DO NOT EXACTLY CORRESPOND TO THE HUNTER NOZZLE MINIBERSEN, NOZZLE MUMBERS FOR GURFTER, HALF, AND FLL HEJJOS APE, SHOW WITHIN THE HEJJO MODEL MUMBER AS SHOWN IN THE LEGEND.	CORRE	SPON	EAD!	HEH	NTERN.	OZZLE RASS	HOWN	z	
NOTE BOUL SERI	MDAR ES 34	RUB F	OVITE: SHRIB BOTOR HEADS NET ALLED RAFHER THENEN IN DEET FROM PANNI, CHIRES, SDEWALKS, STEPS, TIJRF SODINDAMERS OF OTHER FERSTERMANESS MIVE BE NISTALED AS A HAINTER ROPOUSHUB ROTOR ON RISER WIHUNTER HON SERES SWEWTHORAIN OFFICE VALVE WITH NOZIZE AS SHOWN.	VING, CL GP-00 SI	JRBS, HRUB	SIDEM	ALKS CON F	STEPS,	HUM	ER 'HCV		ď

	IRRIGATION TREE BUBBLER LEGEND							
70	MANUFACTURE / MODEL NO. / DESCRIPTION	GPM	PSI RAI	RADIUS	PREC. RATE	ADIUS PREC. DETAIL S	SHEET	
	RAINBIRD - 1806-SAM-PRS, WI HUNTER MSBN-25Q, MULTI-STREAM BUBBLER NOZZLE, SYMBOL REPRESENTS TWO (2) PER TREE.	25(.50) 30		Ē	1.8	_	00	
	RAIN BIRD - RWS-8-1401-RWS-SOCK DEEP WELL BUBBLER, EACH SYMBOL REPRESENTS TWO (2) PER TREE.	25(.50) 30	8	N/N	1.8	-	Ξ	
	NOTE: PLACE BUBBLERS AT EDGE OF ROOTBALL ON OPPOSITE SIDES OF TREE WITHIN TREE WELL TYPICAL	E WITH	IN TR	EE WELL	. TYPIC,	VI.		
						l		

OW FLLL CIRCLE ROTOR HEADS ON SLOPE SHALL BE INSTALLED 6% - 6%, OFF-SET UP SLOPE FROM CENTER TO OVERAGE AT TOP OF SLOPE WITH NO OVERSPRAY AT BOTTOM OF SLOPE. WITH EENATON CHARGES OF 10 FEET OR GREATER FROM MOHEST HEAD INZONE OR HEADS WITH CONTINUOUS CONTINUOUS STATEMENT OF A SPIRIGHTRE ANTIDIAN OF EXPRINGING THE MITTIDIAN OF EXPRINGING STATEMENT OF THE WITH DRAW OF THE WATHER WAT

Θ	NAIN BIND - 1805-SAN-PHS, WI HUN IEM MISSH-2502, MULTI-S INE-AM BUBBLER NOZZLE, SYMBOL REPRESENTS TWO (2) PER TREE.	18 (190) 97	8	_	2	_	10
0	RAIN BIRD - RWS-8-1401-RWS-SOCK DEEP WELL BUBBLER, EACH SYMBOL REPRESENTS TWO (2) PER TREE.	25 (.50) 30	8	N/A	1,8	-	Ξ
	NOTE: PLACE BUBBLERS AT EDGE OF ROOTBALL ON OPPOSITE SIDES OF TREE WITHIN TREE WELL TYPICAL	SEE WITH	IN THE	EE WELL	TYPIC	AL.	
			П		П	П	П
	IRRIGATION EQUIPMENT LEGEND	П	П	П	П	П	П
SYMBOL	MANUFACTURE / MODEL NO. / DESCRIPTION					DETAIL SHEE	SHEET
I	NIBCO - T-680-70-66, BRONZE BALL VALVE WITH STAINLESS STEEL STEMAND HANDLE NUT. LINE SIZE PER MAINLINE.	D HANDL	S S			M	00
0	RAIN BIRD - PEB-PRS-D, SERIES (1" OR 1-1/Z") PLASTIC REMOTE CONTROL VALVE, SIZE AS SHOWN	ALVE, SIZ	EAS	SHOWN		N, DD	8, 10
25	Assistance of the rest of the resistance of the state of the resistance of the resis	APACITY REGULAT FILTER A Z'VALVE	EMBL SCRE OR. ND P.	Y, SIZE A SEN FILTE SI-H40X-1 SY150-S.	S. E. S.	O, DD	8, 10
6	DAIN BIDD. 300 DC 30 COLON COUDI ED VALVE MITTUL COVINC CONED				Ī	000	0

	IN-LINE DRIP IRRIGATION LEGEND						
SYMBOL	MANUFACTURE / MODEL NO. / DESCRIPTION	GPH PS	SI RA	PSI RADIUS P	PREC.	DETAIL	SHEET
	RAIN BRD - XFS-CV4-12, XFS SUB-SURFACE "COPPER SHELD" SERIES TOTM: 1,2" OC 6. EMITTER REPRESSURE COMPENSATING, ANT SEMON OHECK VALVE AND COPPER SHIELD FOOT INTRUSION PROTECTION EMITTER, 10" MAX.MILM.ROW SPACING.	0.61	8	N/N	0.73	A, B,	~
10 H	RAIN BIRD - DRIPLINE CONNECTIONS SHALL BE ANDE USING "XE SERIES" 17mm DRIPLINE INSERT HTTINGS. INSTALL STAINLESS STEEL CLAMP S ON FITTINGS FOR ANY SYSTEM THAT EXCEEDS 50 PSI.	MTHAT EX	NEIN	SERT IS 50 P.	- Si	ш	-
8	HUNTER - ECO-II, POPUP ECO-ANDICATOR WITH YELLOW STEAL DRIP SYSTEM COMBINATION DRIP RODICATOR I EUSH VALUE, INSTALL WITH "GPF BRIGATION PRODUCTS MODEL AGGIN, SERES ELUSH WOZZLE.	M COMBIN	4ATIO AGDFP	z		L.	h-
22	RAIN BIRD - ARV-050, 1/2" AIR/VACUUM RELIEF VALVE. LOCATE AT ENDS AND OR HIGHEST POINT OF THE DRIPLINE ZONE, INSTALL INSIDE A G"ROUND VALVE BOX 16" FROM PAVING.	OR HIGHE	STP	90 TNIC		9	-
6	METPARIA - TIBOV, MANUAL SHITT-OFF FLUSH VALVE INSTALL RILISH VALVEWITH STANLESS STEEL CRAIP CAMPE SISTER, A UT FICAND VALVE BOX 18 FROM PAVING. LOCATE AT END OF DRIPZONE IN ENO DIBECTION, MAINLAIN THO PER ZONE.	WITH STA	NLES DRIP	S STEE	23	Ξ	~

INFALL SERVER THE THAN LOAD MAN OF PROMISE THE DIGGS OF CONTROOTED SERVER THE PROMISE OF THE PRO

FOR SLOPE RESECUTIVED SHALL ANNY STILLAND AND ROTTER LINE INSIGN OPAULE. TO GONED INSIGN TOWN. WITH STILL SHALL ANNY STILLAND STILLAND SHALL SHALL AND STILLAND SHALL AND STILL SHALL SHAL

П	ı	ı	IRRIGATION ROTATOR HEAD SPRINKLER LEGEND	ER L	EGE	9	П		П	l	П
ω,	SYMBOL	Ļ	TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	FLOW RAT	RATE	EGPM	100	01 = 04 0	PREC.	- VALUE	
σ	Ξ	u.	MANUFACTURE / MODEL NO. / DESCRIPTION	o	Ξ	u.	200	KADIUS	RATE	DETAIL	SHEE
			SHRUB ROTATOR HEADS WITH CHECK VALVE AND PRESSURE REGULATION	ESSUF	RERE	GULA	NO.				
8			RAIN BIRD - 1812-SAM-P46, WI HUNTER ROTATOR SERIES MP CORNER NOZZLE.	4.		-	9	8-12 FT	\$	I, EE	8 0
₩	Ø	9	RAIN BIRD - 1812-SAM-P46, WI HUNTER ROTATOR SERIES MP 1000 NOZZI. E.	8-	8	8	8	8-12 FT	8	I, EE	∞ £
0			RAIN BIRD - 1812-SAM-P46, WI HUNTER ROTATOR SERIES MP 2000 NOZZLE.	85	.63	1.27	40	13-17 FT	92	I, EE	e 0
8		8	RAIN BIRD - 1812-SAM-P46, WI HUNTER ROTATOR SERIES MP 3000 NOZZLE.	74	1.84	3.15	40	19-27 FT	92	I, EE	e 0
			RAIN BIRD - 1812-SAM-P45, WI HUNTER ROTATOR SERIES MP MPLCS515/MPRCS515/MPSS530 NOZZLE.	.19	.19	38	40	4x14 FT 4x28 FT	46	I, EE	8 01
н			HUNTER - MP ROTATOR SERIES CORNER NOZZLE ON PVC RISER WITH PROS-00-PRS40 SHRUB ADAPTER.	.17		-1	40	8-12 FT	46	J, EE, GG	10,11
₩	HE	Ю	HUNTER - MP ROTATOR SERIES 1000 NOZZI, E ON PVC RISER WITH PROS-00-PRS40 SHRUB ADAPTER.	.18	32	99	40	8-12 FT	99	J, EE, GG	° t,0
40	HE	10	HUNTER - MP ROTATOR SERIES 2000 NOZZLE ON PVC RISER WITH PROS-00-PRS40 SHRUB ADAPTER.	8	8	1.27	9	13-17 FT	92	J. EE.	° £
18	ю	нВ	HUNTER - MP ROTATOR SERIES 3000 NOZZLE ON PVC RISER WITH PROS-00-PRS40 SHRUB ADAPTER.	.74	1.84	3.15	40	19-27 FT	46	J, EE, GG	8 11,0
н	н		HUNTER - MP ROTATOR SERIES MPLCSS15 / MP RCSS15 / MPSSS30 NOZA E ON PVC RISER WITH PROS-00-PRS40 SHRUB ADAPTER.	₽.	8	88	9	4x14 FT 4x28 FT	\$	J, EE, GG	10,1
AB BB	TE: MU JNDAR	MTH WITH	NOTE, MALTISTREAM ROTARY SPRINGERS, MST'ALLED FARTHER THAN FOE (8) FEET FROM PAVING, CARRS, SDEWLAG, STERS, TUPF ADADYTER, WITH PEDESTRAW, REALEAM WE BIRSTLED ON RESERV. THATTER PROSCO, PRESSURE REGULATED SHRUB, ADADYTER, WITH HAITER HAZY, ESTESS ANTI-DRAW, OF JECKY VALVE WITH NAZZLE AS SHOUM.	ROM P PROS	AVING 00-PR	S40, PI	3S, SII	JEWALKE UREREG	STEP	S, TURF SHRUB	
NO NO	RISER VE. AL	P-UP	NOTE: POP-LIP SPRINKLER HEADS WITH ELEVATION CHANGES OF 10 FEET OR GREATER FROM HIGHEST HEAD IN ZONE OR SPRINKL BR VAN RISER WITH ARM POTEMING OF CON HEAD DEAGAGE WIL REQUIRE THE INSTALLATION OF A SPRING-TYPE ANTIDRAIN CHECK VAN VE. ABSOLITET VIOLOW HEAD DRAINGE ALLOWED	(TER F	NOM OF	HIGHE A SPI	ST HI	EAD IN ZO	THD RA	SPRIN	X ER

FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND AND CALCULATIONS - SEE SHEETS 2 - 3
FOR IRRIGATION PLAN - SEE SHEETS 4 - 5
FOR IRRIGATION NOTES - SEE SHEETS 4 - 5
FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS - SEE SHEETS 7 - 11
FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS - SEE SHEETS 7 - 11
FOR LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS - SEE SEPARATE BOOKLET

COUNTY APPROVED CHANGES R.C.E. 72888 R.C.E. 7	SHEET DO	PRIVATE CONTRACT COUNTY EN ENCY COUNTY EN ENCY COUNTY C FOR ENCY FO
DATUM:		PDS2021-LDGRMJ-)

DIGAUF	X	
	BB41 RESEARCH DR	IRVINE - CA 92618 949.387.1323
		₹ Z
CHOCKE L. B. W.	K	

_						
	WARE MALCOMB		CIVIL ENGINEERING	3391 somento valley blvd, suite 120, san diego, ca 92121	p 858.638.7277 waremalcomb.com	
	DIGALERT	X	2		10	
		41 RESEARCH DR	ITE 200	/INE - CA 92618	9.387.1323	MCFLA COM

| MARIE OF SERVICES OF STATE O

SA 6 Tree Subbler 52.2

> DIB2 Sweetwater Parking Area spiration Rate (Eto) 52.2*

ESTIMATED TOTAL WATER USE (FIWU) WORKSHEET Lihe Hydrozone Numbers (1-6 Below10 complete oil hydrozones)
3
1 Shrub Shrub Dip Shrub
Dirpine Emit. Rotant
1 \$2.2 \$2.2 \$2.2

.

SHONE NO: (828)638-7277 // EMAIL:

SCHEDULE Cocket May Day	THESE	200000	M TIMES A	SREQUIREDT	TO PROVIE	DE APPROF	PRIATE WAT	TER FOR EACH \	ALVE CIRCUIT.	MULTIPLE CYCL	ES MAY BE REON	JIRED TO
SEASONALIBRIGATION SCHEDULE Content to C	SHALL	ADJUST RUL	AND DIR			THOU SELECT	0					
State Stat	MINIM	Dail Carlo	NAC NO.	TO LOS		TO WEST		00000				
Contain Funding Apres Cont						SEASC	ONAL IRRI	GATION SCH	HEDULE.			
	Project N	ame: DIB2 \$	Sweetwate	r Parking Area							Cycles Per Day:	-
Minches Section Sect	Meler Nu	mber: #1									Days Per Week:	7
10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Evapoka	Ispiration Ra	des:							Imagine Efficia	ency (%):	
Window Station Stati	Bo Histori	cal:		52.22							Rolors:	0.75
0.00 0.1				Winder	Spring						Spray Heads:	0.71
7.5 144 177 153 150	So Per Do	Λt		90.0	0.16	0.19	0.14				Bubbler Heads:	0.77
Design Control Contr	So Per Se	uospi		7.5	14.8	17.7	12.3				Drip Line:	0.81
March Color Colo											Drip Emiller:	0.81
Micros part (see) Micros	Sun Time:	(Minutes pe	or Day) = (60 x Elo x PF) 0	(PR x IE)	x (RD) + (C)					Steam Rolary:	0.75
Indicate per No.27 Indicat	Bo = Dail	y Evapoltan	spiration R	ale							Micro Spray	0,75
The charges per feat) The charges The	E = Imiga.	Son Efficienc	À									
Profit P	R = Prec	ipilation Rate	e (Inches	Der Hour)						Precipitation Ra	de (in/hr)	
Service 14 co.	D = Run	days (Seaso	(lalo] Iolal)								Rolors:	0.45
Delabel Hones, 180 Delabel	= Cycle	hs per Day									Spray Heads:	1.60
Dip Line 2013 Dip Line	F = Plant	Factor (Kc)									Bubbler Heads:	1.80
Widter President Project President Project President Project President Project President Pre	O = Con	version to mi	inules								Drip Une:	0.73
Window W											Drip Emiller:	0.25
Widely Founds Profite Fig. Widely Spore America Spore 0.4.1 Bar Types Shellow Shello											Stream Rolary:	0.45
Window W											Micro Spray:	0.61
Has have a support process of the support pro	Valve			Infootion Type		8	ū	Winter	Spring	Summer	Fall	
Control Notice Cont	Quantity	-	2	add Hombin			4	(Dec, Jan, Feb)	(Mar, Apr. May) (Jun, Jul, Aug)	(Sep. Oct. Nov)	
Constraint Notes Constraint Constrai	4	low	Shrub	Drip Line	0.20	0.73	0.81	2	en	4	en	Min. Per Day
Command Section Command Comm	2	Low	Shrub	Rolary	0.20	0.45	0.75	60	9	7	40	Min. Per Day
Low Teach Displayer So 12 24 23 20 20 Mod Min Ret Day Low	15	low	Shrub	Rolor	0.20	0.45	0.75	m	9	7	20	Min. Per Day
Low New Budder 0.00 150 0.77 1 2 3 2 Min Per Doy Mod New Budder 0.04 150 0.77 2 4 5 4 Min Per Doy 21 Subbabil Ious from 87 Days Per Week 1.4 2.8 3.4 2.4 Min Per Doy New Budder of EXTO, Comparing To Comparing To Comparing To Comparing Comparing To	2	Low	Shrub	Drip Emt	0.50	0.25	0.81	12	24	29	20	Min. Per Day
Model Mode	-	Low	Tree	Bubbler	0.30	1.80	0.77	-	2	60	73	Min. Per Day
24 Subduct from then fines 67 Days her Week 1.4 2.8 3.4 2.4 Number of EXTCO Concernently 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2	Mod	Tree	Bubbler	0.60	1.80	0.77	7	4	2	4	Min. Per Day
Number of RCV's Operating Concurrently 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Valves		26	Sublotal Hou	r Run Time	es @ 7 Days	Per Week	1.4	2.8	3.4	2.4	
20 21		No	mber of R	CV's Operating	Concume	vine		-	-	-	-	
200		Toh	Hours of	Run Time @ 7	Dave Per W	Wook		1.4	28	3.4	2.4	Hours Per Day

CHORENGE INFOLVED WARE NE SHOWN FOR FERRENCE ON A POTECTE IN FACE, FEB JAH ANY DANIGED DE TO CHORENGE INFOLVED WAS ANY DANIGED DE TO CHORENGE AND ANY DESCRIPTION AND ANY DESCRIPTION OF ANY DANIES AND ANY DESCRIPTION OF ANY DESCRIPT

CONNECTION OF NEW MANALINE AND CONTROL WIRES TO EXISTING IRRIGATION SYSTEM. VEREY MANILINE SIZE, CUMANTYOF WHEE REQUIRED, INCLUDING SPARE WIRES, AND EXACT.

Meler No:	-
HGL:	836 FT
Elevation of Meter.	506 FT
Static Water Pressure PSI:	143 psi
Valve No:	23
Valve Demand	20 GPM
Maximum System Demand Elevation Change P.O.C. to Highest Head:	70 GPM 50 FT
Losses:	
2" Water Meter	3.7 psi
2" Service line	2.5 psi
2" RP Backflow Device	12.0 psi
2" Wye Strainer	1.5 psi
2" Master Valve	2.5 ps
2" Flow Sensor	1.3 psi
Isolation Valves	2.0 ps
1-1/2" R.C.V.	3.9 psi
150 Feet of 2-1/2" Mainline CL 315	0.3 psi
1250 Feet of 3" Mainline CL 200	4.6 ps
Fiffing Loss 10%	3.4 psi
Lateral Line Loss 10%	4.0 psi
Loss to Highest Head	21.7 psi
Total Losses:	63 psi
Head Operating Pressure:	40 ps
Total Pressure Required:	103 ps
Skalic Pressure Available:	143 psi
Residual Pressure:	40 psi
Recidual % of Static Preceure:	28%

0.6 62 37.2 0.85 43.8

nt Factor (PF)** (0.2 - 0.8) kazone Area (HA) - in square fe e 4 x Line Sj on Efficiency (IE)*** AL all Line 8 + SLA) 6 + Line 7)

ine 1 x Line 2)

Meter No:	-
HGL:	836 FT
Elevation of Meter.	506 FT
Slatic Water Pressure PSI:	143 psi
Volve No:	23
Valve Demand	20 GPM
Maximum System Demand	70 GPM
Elevation Change P.O.C. to Highest Head:	
OSSES:	L
Water Meter	3.7 psi
Service line	2.5 DSI
RP Backflow Device	12.0 psi
2" Wye Strainer	1.5 psi
2" Master Valve	2.5 psi
2" Flow Sensor	1.3 psi
solation Valves	2.0 psi
1-1/2" R.C.V.	3.9 psi
150 Feet of 2-1/2" Mainline CL 315	0.3 psi
250 Feet of 3" Mainline CL 200	4.6 psi
Fiffing Loss 10%	3.4 psi
Lateral Line Loss 10%	4.0 psi
Loss to Highest Head	21.7 psi
folal Losses:	63 psi
Head Operating Pressure:	40 psi
folal Pressure Required:	103 psi
Static Pressure Available:	143 psi
Residual Pressure:	40 psi
ual % of Sh	28%
Cal Descripto Description	***

FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND AND CALCULATIONS - SEE SHEETS 2 - 3 FOR IRRIGATION PLAN - SEE SHEETS 4 - 5 FOR IRRIGATION NOTES - SEE SHEETS 4 - 17 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS - SEE SHEETS 7 - 11 FOR IRRIGATION BOTALLS - SEE SHEETS 7 - 11 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS - SEE SHEETS 7 - 11 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS - SEE SHEETS 7 - 11 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS - SEE SHEETS 7 - 11

PRIVATE CONTRACT	SHET COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 15 3 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS SHETS	IRRIGATION LEGEND & CALCULATIONS	12xxx SWETWARDS BLVD.	CALIFORNIA COORDI	AMPRIONED FOR WILLIAM P. MORGAN. COCKRYT DIGBACTO.		W. RGE: DATE	GRUGOS FERMINS PDS2021-LDGRMJ-XXXXX
RECORD PLAN	BY: LUKE A. CORSBIE DATE:	R.C.E 72588 EXPIRES: 06–30–22	BENCH MARK	DESCRIPTION: 3.25" BRASS DISK STAMPED "SAN DIEGO COUNTY	SURVEYOR, SURVEY CONTROL, SWRF4, 2013	LOCATION: 10F OF CORRESPONDED ON ELL SIDE OF JAMPAGES BLOG. RECORD FROM: SURVEY NO. 22057 AND GEOID MODEL 12B	FI FVATION: 518.044 LISSE DATUM: NAVD 1988	
		ANGES	DATE:					
		ED CH	APPROVED BY:					
		COUNTY APPROVED CHANGES	DESCRIPTION:					
		Ĺ	Š.					




MAWA 707,145


MAXIMUM APPLIED WATER USE (MAWA) calculation: $MAWA = [E10] \times [0.62] \times [[0.42 \times LA] + [0.58 \times SLA]]$

Total

Line 3 x Line 9. Estimated Total Water UseFRWI (calcater Ref very)
Jahof not exceed AMANA below
"the-levaporerepredientine" 8.2.2
Awargo coloculosidos per values in
State hodel Water Efficiency
States hodel Water Efficiency







2. THE CONTROLLED SHALL BE RESPONDED AS LONG HEAD CONTROLLED AND ADDRESS AND A

IRRIGATION SYSTEM MAINTENANCE SCHEDULE

VIERDA, THE REAL MANDAND SPRINGER HEADS AS RECESSARY TO AND SPRAY B. COKAGE.

***REFELY AND THE ELACY CONTRY, AND A FED SERVE SPRAYERS FOR PROPER COFFAGOR MAND OFFENDING MAND AND MAND AND A FED SERVE AND CORRECT AND A FED SERVE AND A FED SERVE AND CORRECT AND A FED SERVE AND A FED SERVE AND CORRECT AND CORRECT AND A FED SERVE AND A

COMTINGE THE DISCUSSION OF THE STORES NOTES AND THE PISTERS TO ENSIRE PROPER WITER DISCUSSION OF THE STORES AND THE DISCUSSION OF THE DISC

EQUIPAENT REPLACEMENT FREPLACE ANY RREGATION VALVES, SPRINKLERS, DRIP LINE OR OTHER COMPONENTS WITH PERPLACEMENT OF THE EXACT TYPE, GPM AND MANUFACTURE AS CALLED FOR IN THE ORIGINAL IRRIGATION PLANS. EDITED THE ENDER A MATCH TO AND THE SHRUB AREAS TO ANOID THE STATE SHAPE HAS TO ANOID THE SHRUB AREAS TO ANOID THE SHAPE HAS TO ANOID THE SHAPE SHAPE

MADOSTERE STORY ON SERVICE OF WHICH CONNOTE IS HANDED BY ROUTHE MANTENANCE. THEY SHOULD BE SHOUGHT TO THE STORY OF SHOULD BE S

ANDSCAPE HRRGATION ALIDIT SCHEDLIE. LANGOSCAPE HRRGATION LAUDIOS SMALL EE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STATE OF CLALEDORIN WAT FER MAN GERKET FROGRAM AS DESCRIBED IN THE "LANGSCAPE IRRIGATION

KEEPING OF RECORDS THE CONTRACTOR SHALL KEEP PERMANENT RECORDS OF ALL PERF

TO DALL WATER USAGE AND CHANGES IN THE CONTROLLER TIMING, INCLUDING OFF TRAINS IN. JURNG RANFRALL
RECORD ALL ACTIVITIES PERFORMED DIRING THE QUARTERLY REVIEW
RECORD ALL PROPOSED AND EXECUTED REPAIRS.
RECORD ALL TIMES WHEN THE RIRGATOR'S YSTEMS ARE NOT OPERABLE.
RECORD ALL TIMES WHEN THE RIRGATOR'S YSTEMS ARE NOT OPERABLE.
RECORD ALL DIRECTORNED RRIGATION SYSTEMS

OVERHEAD IRRIGATION SHALL NOT BE PERAITITED WITHIN 24 INCHES OF ANY NON-PERAIGEBE SURFACE, (PERS STATE OSDIOMANCE AB 1881,) ABSOLUTELY NO WORNERSPRAY OR LOWHEAD DRAMAGEIS ALLOWED.

ALL SPENG AND WIRE SHALL BE SLEEVED UNDERPAYING THARDSCAPE. ALL SLEEVES TO BEE MINIMALM SY DIMINETER OF PIPE SLEEVES. ALL MAINLINE SHALL BE ACCOMPANIED WITH A MINIMALM 2-84CH DAMETER WIRE SLEEVE. SLEEVING TO EXTEND MINIMALM 12 INCHES BEYOND TANNO.

SEGUENTA MASSE RESIGNEDADA LA LIGAMANITINA, DAM SEGUENTIA, LA LIBRICATOR DE EGUINERALI, SERMELES AND PER PART DE REVISALLED NI ANDSOLATEO NEA, NO SEGUENTO LA LIBRICATOR SALVEL ES RESIGNADA LA LIBRICATOR SALVEL DE AND CHIEF ROMAN WHITE NA PROPERTO OF SERVEN NO CHIEF HOUSE SALVEL SERVEN NA LIS AND CHIEF ROMAN WHITE NA PROPERTO OF SERVEN NO CHIEF AND SALVEL SERVEN NA LIS MANURES SONOW WHITE NA PROPERTO SERVEN NO CHIEF AND SALVEL SERVEN NA LIS COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE TABLE SERVEN NA CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE COCATION TO SE ANNIMIN OF THE CHIEF AND THE COSTICLES THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT

THE SHAND THAN CONTINUES TO THE SHAND THE SHAN

WHEN RADIUS OF SPRINKLER HEADS, REQUIRED FOR PROPER COVERAGE, IS LESS THAN RADIUS SHOWN ON LEGEND, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL EQUIP SPRINKLER HEAD WITH A RANN BIRD. TYCS: PRESSURE COMPENSATING SCREEN FOR LOW FLOW FLOW AND RADIUS CONTROC.

CONTROLLER CERTIFICATION SHALL INCLUDE VERFICATION FROM IMMUFACTURES / DISTRIBUTIOR'S REPRESENTATION. THAT CONTROLLERS RECOVER, W. 1°ET MODE. THE FOLLOWING PRAMETERS SHALL BE PROGRAMMED INTO THE CONTROLL BY PROBY TO STATCHE 50 DAY MANITEMENCE PERSON. (FOR EACH O'SOTHROLLER VALVE SIX THAT USE SO DAY MANITEMENCE PERSON.) (FOR EACH O'SOTHROLLER VALVE SIX THAT USE SIX THAT CHARLING.)

USE ADJUSTABLE ARC NOZZLES FOR ALL HE ADS LOCA TED BY AREAS WHERE A STANDAF ARC PATTERN OVER SPRAYS ONTO BULDINGS, WALLS OR PAINIG. ADJUSTABLE ARC NOZZLE SHOULD HAVE THE SAME RADJUS OF THROW AS THE NOZZLE BEING REPLACED

RRIGATION SLEVES SHOWN FOR MALDR STREET AND DRIVENAY CROSSINGS PROFILENGE TO MALL PAYING, HARDSO, ELGART YOM, CONTINGENCY SHALL INSTILL SLEPINGS BELOWALL PAYING, HARDSO, ETC. AND AS DRECTED BY OWNERS AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE.

RESEACTION WAS LIGHT NOTICE.

COLUM COMMA LOUR ALOTER ALOTER NOTICE.

COLUM COMMA LOUR ALOTER ALOTER

COLOGOMENTIVICE:

LOUND AND THE AUTOMATIC CONTROLLER SHALL CONSIST OF ANEITLY DRAWN IT'NT

LAMBATE DISCUSSION THE AUTOMATIC CONTROLLER SHALL CONSIST OF ANEITLY DRAWN SHALL BE: COLOR

LAMBATE COLOR CONTROLLER CONTROLLER CONTROLLER SHALL SHAL


THE SCHEDLLE SHALL PROVIDE FOR LANDS CAPE BRICATION ALDITS TO BE CONDUCTED BY A QUALIFED BY AND CONDUCTED BY A QUALIFED MINDY/DIAL, OTHER THAN THE DESCRETE OR BY STALLEDED BY THE DISCORD TLEAST CANCE, OTHER FOR THE COLNITY.


FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND AND CALCULATIONS - SEE SHEETS 2 - 3 FOR IRRIGATION PLAN - SEE SHEETS 4 - 5 FOR IRRIGATION PLAN - SEE SHEETS 7 - 11 FOR LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS - SEE SEPARATE BOOKLET FOR LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS - SEE


PRIVATE CONTRACT	SHEET COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 15 6 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS SHEETS		IRRIGATION NOTES	1200 SWETWATER SPRINGS BLVD.	CALIFORNIA COORDINATE INDEX 202-1779	APPROVED FOR WILLIAM P. MORGOM. ENGREEDS OF WORKS	COUNTY DISABEDRA		erc. Rolls patts	PDS2021-LDGRMJ-XXXXX
RECORD PLAN	BY: LUKE A. CORSBIE DATE:	R.C.E 72588	EXPIRES: 06-30-22	BENCH MARK	DESCRIPTION: 3.25" BRASS DISK STAMPED "SAN DIEGO COUNTY	SURVEYOR, SURVEY CONTROL, SWRF4, 2013"	LOCATION: TOP OF CURB INLET ON E'LY SIDE OF JAMACHA BLVD.	RECORD FROM: SURVEY NO. 22057 AND GEOID MODEL 12B	ELEVATION: 518,044 USSF DATUM: NAVD 1988	DATUM:
		I	ANGES	DATE:						
			ED CH	APPROVED BY:						
			COUNTY APPROVED CHANGES	DESCRIPTION:						
		Į	_	ė,						





























Attachment D – Public Documentation



County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services

COMMUNITY PLANNING OR SPONSOR GROUP PROJECT RECOMMENDATION

ZONING DIVISION

Record ID(s): PDS2021-STP-21-019
Project Name: SWEETWATER TRIANGLE LAND
Planning/Sponsor Group: Spring Valley Community Planning Group
Results of Planning/Sponsor Group Review
Meeting Date: AUGUST 10 2021
A. Comments made by the group on the proposed project. THE GROUP COMMENDED THE DEVELOPUL FOR MAKING CHANGES TO THE PLANS ADDRESS INTO CONCERNS EXPRESSI AT DUR JULY 13, 2021 MEETING
B. Advisory Vote: The Group Did Did Not make a formal recommendation, approval or denial on the project at this time.
If a formal recommendation was made, please check the appropriate box below:
MOTION: Approve without conditions Approve with recommended conditions Deny Continue
VOTE: ['l Yes No Abstain 2 Vacant/Absent
C. Recommended conditions of approval:
Reported by: Position: LHAIR Date: 08/16/3024
Please email recommendations to BOTH EMAILS; Project Manager listed in email (in this format): Firstname.Lastname@sdcounty.ca.gov and to CommunityGroups.LUEG@sdcounty.ca.gov
5510 OVERLAND AVE, SUITE 110, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123 • (858) 565-5981 • (888) 267-8770 http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds
PDS-534 (Rev. 09/04/2013)

Δ

From: cgvale@aol.com
To: Lindebrekke, Rachael

Subject: [External] SWEETWATER SPRINGS TRIANGLE LOT; LOG NO. PDS2021-ER-19-004

Date: Friday, July 30, 2021 5:25:16 PM

Hi Rachel.

I received a letter from the County about a hearing on this project. The letter doesn't say where the hearing is being held.

Also, if I have a comment, where can I submit it if I cannot go to the meeting?. I live just down the street from this project.

Thank you,

Cinthia Germek

В

From: Leslee Tipping
To: Lindebrekke, Rachael
Cc: Michael Crews

Subject: [External] Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot Project - Brook Forest Conservation/Mitigation Bank

Date: Monday, August 9, 2021 1:14:28 PM

Attachments: <u>image001.png</u>

Scott Murray, Greenlaw Partners Rachael Lindebrekke, County of San Diego

RE: Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot Project

Brook Forest Conservation/Mitigation Bank in Valley Center, CA is recognized by the USACE, CDFW and RWQCB. We are available to offer mitigation credits for the Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot Project. We have read the <u>Biological Resources Letter Report</u>, specifically Page 16. We understand the mitigation needs for this project. We are interested in speaking with you to discuss the required mitigation and would appreciate the opportunity to speak with you regarding your project.

Please contact Michael Crews for more information: 760-535-6165.

Thank you for your time, Leslee for Michael Crews

 $\frac{https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/ceqa/STP-21-019/Biological%20Resource%20Letter%20Report.pdf}{}$

Page 16

н	labitat/Vegetation Co	Table 2 mmunities,	Impacts, and I	Mitigation	
Habitat/	Existing On-site	Impacts	Mitigation	Mitigation	Preserved On-site
Vegetation Community	(acres) ¹	(acres)1	Ratio ²	Required (acres)	(acres) ¹
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub, including disturbed (Tier II)	1.41	1.41	1:1	1.41	0
Non-native Grassland (Tier III)	0.52	0.52	0.5:1	0.26	0
Eucalyptus Woodland (Tier IV)	0.07	0.07	N/A	N/A	0
Disturbed Land (Tier IV)	0.00	0.00	N/A	N/A	0
Urban/Developed (no tier)	0.04	0.04	N/A	N/A	0
TOTAL	2.05	2.05		1.67	0

¹Rounded to nearest tenth of an acre. Any discrepancies in totals are due to rounding.

²Mitigation ratio is based on impacted land not meeting BCRA status and off-site mitigation meeting BCRA criteria. Mitigation assumed to be completed through purchase of off-site credits.

The **Brook Forest Conservation/Mitigation Bank** includes approximately 224 acres of conserved land located in Valley Center, California within San Diego's North County MSCP. The Bank consists of a large, contiguous block of biologically-rich land supporting a diversity of habitats and native species, including 237 species of plants and 104 species of animals. The site supports an exceptionally rich avifauna, with 67 species of birds residing on the Bank property. The Bank has been preserved in perpetuity for the long-term benefit of these sensitive habitats and species.

2 - 114

Available mitigation/conservation credits:

- Wetland Waters of both the US & the State (Re-establishment, Rehabilitation)
- Wetland Waters of the State (Re-establishment and Enhancement)
- Non-native Grassland
- Mafic Southern Mixed Chaparral
- Disturbed Mafic Mixed Chaparral
- Open Engelmann Oak Woodland
- Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest
- Coastal Sage Scrub
- Native Grassland
- Engelmann Oak Trees (Covered Species)

Leslee Tipping for **Michael Crews**

760-749-1919 ex. 102 * <u>leslee@michaelcrews.com</u>

Brook Forest Conservation/Mitigation Bank www.brookforestmitigationbank.com

Michael Crews: 760-535-6165 michaelc@michaelcrews.com

C



SWEETWATER AUTHORITY

505 GARRETT AVENUE
POST OFFICE BOX 2328
CHULA VISTA, CALIFORNIA 91912-2328
(619) 420-1413
FAX (619) 425-7469
www.sweetwater.org

GOVERNING BOARD

HECTOR MARTINEZ, CHAIR
ALEJANDRA SOTELO-SOLIS, VICE CHAIR
JOSIE CALDERON-SCOTT
STEVE CASTANEDA
PAULINA MARTINEZ-PEREZ
JOSE PRECIADO
MONA RIOS

JENNIFER H. SABINE INTERIM GENERAL MANAGER

August 24, 2021

Rachael Lindebrekke County of San Diego Planning and Development Services 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110 San Diego, CA 92123

Subject:

COMMENTS ON SWEETWATER SPRINGS TRIANGULAR PARKING LOT

APN 505-231-03-00 PDS2021-STP-21-019

SWEETWATER RESERVOIR WATERSHED PROTECTION

Dear Ms. Lindebrekke,

Thank you for providing Sweetwater Authority (Authority) with copies of the application, and supporting documents for the Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot Project. We understand that the proposed project consists of a site plan permit to construct a fleet storage parking lot on 2.1 acres of vacant land located behind 2500 Sweetwater Springs Boulevard.

Sweetwater Authority is a publicly-owned water agency in the South Bay area of San Diego County serving approximately 189,000 people residing in National City, the western and central portions of Chula Vista, and the unincorporated community of Bonita. The Authority operates Sweetwater Reservoir and Loveland Reservoir to store local and imported water for its customers and utilizes the Sweetwater River to transfer water from Loveland Reservoir to Sweetwater Reservoir. The project site is located entirely within the drainage basin of Sweetwater Reservoir, as shown on the enclosed Figure 1.

The following comments are based on the current application for Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot:

1. Sweetwater Authority requests that a condition be placed on PDS2021-STP-21-019 to require the owner to submit satisfactory evidence to the County of San Diego stating that the owner has complied with Sweetwater Authority Resolution 84-8 As Amended. Requested timing for condition compliance is prior to issuance of any building or other permit pursuant to this Site Plan. On May 8, 1985, the San Diego County Board of Supervisors took action to require the County to place conditions on development proposals within a designated area of the Sweetwater River Watershed to the satisfaction of Sweetwater Authority, as provided in Sweetwater Authority Resolution 84-8. Since the Board of Supervisors action, discretionary project approvals within the designated watershed area have complied with this condition. The resolution provides for the collection of urban runoff protection fees from all developments within the lower Sweetwater Reservoir drainage basin to pay for a portion of the Sweetwater Reservoir Urban Runoff Diversion System.

C1

C2

Rachael Lindebrekke

Re: COMMENTS ON SWEETWATER SPRINGS TRIANGULAR PARKING LOT STP-21-019

SWEETWATER RESERVOIR WATERSHED PROTECTION

August 24, 2021

Page 2

2. During and after the construction phase of the development, the Authority requests that the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), the Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP), and Emergency Response Plan include provisions for notifying the Authority via its 24-hour emergency telephone number (619) 409-6800 in the event of any hazardous material spill.

C3

3. Please continue to include Sweetwater Authority on the County's distribution list for Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot. The Authority requests copies of all permit applications, supporting documents, maps, public review notifications, and hearing notices for the project.

C4

Sweetwater Authority appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions, please contact Cindy Pino at 619-409-6805 or cpino@sweetwater.org.

Sincerely,

SWEETWATER AUTHORITY


Justin Brazil

Director of Water Quality

Enclosure: Figure 1

cc: Jim Custeau, Spring Valley Community Planning Group

Israel Marquez, Environmental Project Manager, Sweetwater Authority



MEMORANDUM

TO: File

FROM: Rachael Lindebrekke, Project Manager

SUBJECT: Response to Comments; Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot Project

PDS2021-STP-21-019, PDS2021-ER-21-19-004

DATE: September 2, 2021

The following are staff's responses to comments received during the public disclosure period for the checklist prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15183 dated July 29, 2021, for the Sweetwater Springs Triangular Parking Lot Project (Project). The CEQA 15183 Checklist was circulated for public disclosure from July 29, 2021 through August 30, 2021, and three comment letters were received during that time.

Response to comments received from Cinthia Germek (July 30, 2021):

A1. The commenter states they live down the street from the Project site and requests information regarding attending the Community Planning Group meeting and how to provide comment.

The Community Planning Group meeting was held on August 10, 2021. Information on how to participate in the meeting and provide comments was provided to the commentor. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the 15183 Checklist; therefore, no changes were made to 15183 Checklist as a result of this comment and no further response is required.

Response to comments received from the Brook Forest Conservation/Mitigation Bank (August 9, 2021):

B1. The comment states the Brook Forest Conservation/Mitigation Bank is recognized by the USACE, CDFW and RWQCB and is available to offer mitigation credits for the Project.

Comment noted. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the 15183 Checklist; therefore, no changes were made to 15183 Checklist as a result of this comment and no further response is required.

Response to comments received from Sweetwater Authority (August 24, 2021):



- C1. The comment generally summarizes the proposed project and thanks the County for including them in the review process.
 - Comment noted. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the 15183 Checklist; therefore, no changes were made to 15183 Checklist as a result of this comment and no further response is required.
- C2. The comment requests that a condition be placed on the project to require the owner comply with Sweetwater Authority Resolution 84-8 As Amended, requiring payment of urban runoff protection fees from all developments within the lower Sweetwater Reservoir drainage basin.
 - Comment noted. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the 15183 Checklist; therefore, no changes were made to 15183 Checklist as a result of this comment, however, the requested condition has been added to the Site Plan Decision as the Urban Runoff Fee condition.
- C3. The comment requests that the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP), and Emergency Response Plan include a provision for notifying Sweetwater Authority via its 24-hour emergency telephone number (619) 409-6800 in the event of any hazardous material spill.
 - Comment noted. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the 15183 Checklist; therefore, no changes were made to 15183 Checklist as a result of this comment, however, grading notes will include the requirement for Sweetwater Authority to be notified in the event of any hazardous material spill during construction and operation of the facility.
- C4. The comment requests that Sweetwater Authority be included in distribution of materials for the subject project and summarizes contact information for the Authority.
 - Comment noted. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the 15183 Checklist; therefore, no changes were made to 15183 Checklist as a result of this comment and no further response is required.