



# County of San Diego

**KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY**  
ACTING DIRECTOR

**PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123  
(858) 505-6445 General (858) 694-2705 Codes  
(858) 565-5920 Building Services  
[www.SDCPDS.org](http://www.SDCPDS.org)

**VINCE NICOLETTI**  
ACTING ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

**October 7, 2021**

## **AN ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (SCH 2002111067)**

### **FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF THE CAMPO ROAD CORRIDOR REVITALIZATION SPECIFIC PLAN; PDS2021-GPA-21-006, PDS2021-SPA-21-002, PDS2021-REZ-21-003, PDS2021-ER-21-00-004**

**CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(a) states that an Addendum to a previously certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) may be prepared if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 or 15163 calling for the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred.**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 applies to the Campo Road Corridor Revitalization Specific Plan (Specific Plan). There are some changes and additions which need to be included in an Addendum to the previously certified Program EIR for the County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164. These modifications would not involve a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects identified in the Program EIR for the County of San Diego General Plan Update and would not create new potentially significant impacts that would require new mitigation.

#### **Background**

On August 3, 2011, the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors adopted a comprehensive update to the County of San Diego General Plan. The General Plan provides a framework for land use and development decisions in the unincorporated County, consistent with an established community vision, which included all of the Community Plans, such as the Valle de Oro Community Plan. The General Plan Land Use Maps set the Land Use designations, and corresponding densities, for all of the land in the unincorporated County. A Program EIR for the County's General Plan Update, Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-001, State Clearinghouse Number 2002111067, was certified by the Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2011.

## **Project Changes**

The Campo Road Corridor Revitalization Specific Plan (“Specific Plan” or “Corridor”) arealies within the boundaries of the Valle de Oro Community Plan. The Valle de Oro Community Plan (part of the County of San Diego General Plan) was adopted in 1977 and last updated in 2011. The Community Plan covers the Casa de Oro, Mount Helix, and Rancho San Diego communities and supplements the General Plan, establishing the framework for future development in the Valle de Oro area through the identification of specific goals, policies, and recommendations.

The Campo Road Corridor (Corridor) is the commercial and civic center of the Casa de Oro community. The County of San Diego General Plan applies the Regional Category of “Village” to the Corridor. Villages are intended to accommodate the “highest intensities and the greatest mix of uses” (General Plan Land Use Element, p. 3-6). Lands located directly on Campo Road have a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial (C-1) with a floor area ratio (FAR) designation of 0.7. However, the General Plan states that “Community Plans may specify specific areas where [this FAR] may be exceeded” (General Plan Land Use Element, p. 3-11).

Pursuant to California Government Code Sections 65450 to 65457, a local government may adopt specific plans to specify the extent, intensity, land use, and/or supporting infrastructure in a given area. The proposed Specific Plan is intended to establish the long-term vision, goals, and objectives; implementing regulations; implementation plan, including specific actions, priorities, and responsible parties; and potential funding sources to achieve the vision. Specific plans may be adopted by ordinance and amended as often as necessary. The Specific Plan is required to be consistent with the County of San Diego General Plan. Additionally, California Government Code Section 65451 requires specific plans to include text, diagrams, and a statement that detail the relationship of the specific plan to the General Plan.

The proposed Specific Plan is a community-based plan aimed at improving the urban form, quality of life, and public safety along the Corridor in the Casa de Oro community. The County of San Diego initiated the plan with a grant from the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) in order to further smart growth principles by creating an active and accessible community center in East San Diego County. The proposed Specific Plan facilitates and directly implements these recommendations. While the proposed Specific Plan may contain standards that are not anticipated in the Community Plan, the overall vision of a core commercial area and residential uses is consistent with the Community Plan. Further, the proposed Specific Plan is consistent with the County’s vision of concentrating growth in existing urbanized communities in the unincorporated County and directly implements the County’s goal of concentrating new housing and commercial growth in areas with access to public transit, services, and amenities.

As proposed, the Specific Plan represents a planning document that would change development standards for the Corridor and allow additional future residential development to occur over time. Depending on the ultimate mixture of residential and retail uses proposed by landowners in the Corridor, it is estimated that from 600 to a maximum of 1,450 new residential dwelling units could be developed with buildout of the Specific Plan. The difference in the number of residential uses ultimately constructed would be influenced by the amount of retail use (i.e., less retail square footage would allow for greater residential use). The maximum of 1,450 residential dwelling units is based upon a presumed 30 percent reduction in the amount of existing retail space as part of future redevelopment.

Additionally, the Land Use Element of the General Plan will be amended to change the land use designation of the Specific Plan Area from General Commercial to Specific Plan. The Specific Plan effectively implements the relevant goals and policies of the General Plan and the Valle de Oro Community Plan.

The Mobility Element of the County's General Plan identifies Campo Road as a Boulevard Series Road. Boulevards are 4-lane "roadways with a lower design speed and a wider parkway that should be used in Villages or similar locations where higher traffic volumes are combined with on-street parking, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit activities." As a part of the Specific Plan, it is recommended that this segment of Campo Road be redesignated as a Minor Collector, which is appropriate for "areas within a Village with heavy non-motorized circulation and transit activities" (Mobility Element, p. 4-9). The Minor Collector designation is suitable for Villages and consistent with the Mobility Element's goals and policies to provide safe and efficient road networks that prioritize travel within community planning areas (Policy M-1.1). The reconfigured Campo Road would also implement Policy M-4.1, which encourages walkable, multimodal roads in Villages and compact residential areas.

### **Finding**

The Final Program EIR for the County of San Diego General Plan Update, as analyzed by this Addendum and the Environmental Review Checklist, may be used to fulfill the environmental review requirements of the Campo Road Corridor Revitalization Specific Plan. Because the changes to the General Plan and the proposed Specific Plan meet the conditions for the application of CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, a preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR is not required.

October 7, 2021

**Environmental Review Update Checklist Form  
for Projects with Previously Approved Environmental Documents  
For Purposes of Consideration of the  
Campo Road Corridor Revitalization Specific Plan Project;  
PDS2021-GPA-21-006, PDS2021-SPA-21-002, PDS2021-REZ-21-003,  
PDS2021-ER-21-00-004**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164 set forth the criteria for determining the appropriate additional environmental documentation, if any, to be completed when there is a previously adopted Negative Declaration (ND) or a previously certified environmental impact report (EIR) covering the project for which a subsequent discretionary action is required. This Environmental Review Update Checklist Form has been prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(e) to explain the rationale for determining whether any additional environmental documentation is needed for the Campo Road Corridor Revitalization Specific Plan Project and related General Plan Amendment.

**1. Background on the previously certified EIR:**

A Program EIR for the County of San Diego (County) General Plan Update (GPU EIR; Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-001; State Clearinghouse Number 2002111067) was certified by the County Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2011. The certified GPU EIR evaluated potentially significant effects for the following environmental areas of potential concern: (1) Aesthetics; (2) Agricultural Resources; (3) Air Quality; (4) Biological Resources; (5) Cultural and Paleontological Resources; (6) Geology and Soils; (7) Hazards and Hazardous Materials; (8) Hydrology and Water Quality; (9) Land Use; (10) Mineral Resources; (11) Noise; (12) Population and Housing; (13) Public Services; (14) Recreation; (15) Transportation and Traffic; (16) Utilities and Service Systems; and (17) Global Climate Change.

Of these environmental subject areas, it was determined that only Geology and Soils and Population and Housing would not involve potentially significant impacts. The certified Final Program EIR found that the project would cause significant effects which could be mitigated to a level below significance for the following areas: Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Land Use and Planning, Recreation, and Global Climate Change. Effects to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems remained significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was made in approving the General Plan Update. The previously certified GPU EIR is available at <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html>.

The Board of Supervisors approved the Housing Element Update GPA on April 24, 2013 (GPA-12-009). This GPA consisted of a minor update to the Housing Element that was previously updated by the Board with the approval of the GPU in August 2011. The revisions were largely limited to the Background Report of the Housing Element with more recent demographic data and analyses. No changes were made by this GPA to the land use map, Mobility Element map, or Central Mountain or Mountain Empire Subregional Plans. To comply with CEQA, the Housing Element Update GPA relied on an Addendum to the GPU EIR.

The Board of Supervisors approved the 2017 Housing Element Update on March 15, 2017 (GPA-16-003). This GPA consisted of minor updates to the Housing Element that were primarily limited to the Background Report, which was updated with recent demographic data and analyses and which addressed the County's ability to meet the State's new Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals through the County's Sites Inventory. To comply with CEQA, the 2017 Housing Element Update GPA relied on an Addendum to the GPU EIR.

The Board of Supervisors approved the Skyline Retirement Center (PDS2016-GPA-16-005; PDS2016-REZ-16-003; PDS2016-MUP-16-003; LOG NO. PDS2016-ER-16-19-001) on January 29, 2020. This GPA changed the Regional Category for the site from No Jurisdiction to Village; changed the site's Land Use Designation from Open Space Conservation (OS-C) to Village Residential 30 (VR-30); and changed a map in the Valle de Oro Community Plan to reflect the Land Use Designation change to VR-30. To comply with CEQA, the Skyline Retirement Center GPA relied on an Addendum to the GPU EIR.

The Board of Supervisors adopted the Housing Element and Safety Element updates (PDS2020-GPA-20-002, PDS2019-GPA-19-001) and adopted a new Environmental Justice Element (PDS2017-GPA-17-004) on July 14, 2021. This GPA assessed the unincorporated area's housing needs and developed goals, policies, and programs to address them as part of the Housing Element's sixth RHNA cycle. This GPA also reviewed and updated the Safety Element concurrently with the Housing Element update to ensure that safety hazards are considered during the development of the housing policy. As two Elements of the General Plan were updated concurrently, an Environmental Justice Element to focus on reducing pollution in overburdened and underserved communities and ensuring all people have the right to live, work, and play in a safe and healthy environment was also adopted. To comply with CEQA, these General Plan Amendments relied on two Addenda to the GPU EIR.

The Addenda listed above are on file with Planning & Development Services.

**2. Lead agency name and address:**

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310, San Diego, California 92123

- a. Contact: Mike Madrid, Project Manager
- b. Phone number: (619) 964-6918
- c. E-mail: michael.madrid@sdcounty.ca.gov

**3. Project applicant's name and address:**

County of San Diego  
Planning & Development Services  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310  
San Diego, California 92123

**4. Does the project for which a subsequent discretionary action is now proposed differ in any way from the previously approved project?**

YES

NO

The Campo Road Corridor Revitalization Specific Plan (Specific Plan) area lies within the boundaries of the Valle de Oro Community Plan. The Valle de Oro Community Plan (part of the County of San Diego General Plan) was adopted in 1977 and last updated in 2011. The Community Plan covers the Casa de Oro, Mount Helix, and Rancho San Diego communities and supplements the General Plan, establishing the framework for future development in the Valle de Oro area through the identification of specific goals, policies, and recommendations.

The Campo Road Corridor (Corridor) is the commercial and civic center of the Casa de Oro community. The County of San Diego General Plan applies the Regional Category of “Village” to the Corridor. Villages are intended to accommodate the “highest intensities and the greatest mix of uses” (General Plan Land Use Element, p. 3-6). Lands located directly on Campo Road have a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial (C-1) with a floor area ratio (FAR) designation of 0.7. However, the General Plan states that “Community Plans may specify specific areas where [this FAR] may be exceeded” (General Plan Land Use Element, p. 3-11).

Pursuant to California Government Code Sections 65450 to 65457, a local government may adopt specific plans to specify the extent, intensity, land use, and/or supporting infrastructure in a given area. The proposed Specific Plan is intended to establish the long-term vision, goals, and objectives; implementing regulations; implementation plan, including specific actions, priorities, and responsible parties; and potential funding sources to achieve the vision. Specific plans may be adopted by ordinance and amended as often as necessary. This Specific Plan is required to be consistent with the County of San Diego General Plan. Additionally, California Government Code Section 65451 requires specific plans to include text, diagrams, and a statement that detail the relationship of the specific plan to the General Plan.

The proposed Specific Plan is a community-based plan aimed at improving the urban form, quality of life, and public safety along the Corridor in the Casa de Oro community. The County of San Diego initiated the plan with a grant from the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) in order to further smart growth principles by creating an active and accessible community center in East San Diego County. The proposed Specific Plan facilitates and directly implements these recommendations. While the proposed Specific Plan may contain standards that are not anticipated in the Community Plan, the overall vision of a core commercial area and residential uses is consistent with the Community Plan. Further, the proposed Specific Plan is consistent with the County’s vision of concentrating growth in existing urbanized communities in the unincorporated County and directly implements the County’s goal of concentrating new housing and commercial growth in areas with access to public transit, services, and amenities.

As proposed, the Specific Plan would change development standards for the Corridor and allow additional future residential development to occur over time. The project will require a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan to change the existing land use designations. The adopted General Plan designates the majority of the Specific Plan area as General Commercial, with the remaining area designated as Village Residential VR-24, allowing for 24 dwelling units per acre. The General Plan and the accompanying Valle de Oro Land Use Map will be amended to reference the Specific Plan. Project implementation also requires a rezone to change the existing zoning classifications from C-36 and C-42 (General Commercial) and RU (Urban Residential) to Specific Planning Area Use Regulations (S88) within the Campo Road Corridor Revitalization Specific Plan area. All land

use regulations, development standards, and other provisions of the Specific Plan in its entirety shall apply as expressly stated in the Specific Plan. For any development criteria or regulations not amended or superseded by the Specific Plan, the provisions of the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance would prevail.

As indicated in Appendix G, Technical Information, of the GPU EIR, the GPU EIR assumed that 694.1 average daily trips (ADT) per acre would be generated for lands designated as General Commercial (C-1) (County 2011b). As almost the entirety of the approximately 41.8-acre Corridor is currently designated as C-1, using the 694.1 ADT/acre rate yields an ADT of approximately 29,000 for the Specific Plan area. These estimated trips also factor into the air quality and noise analyses in the GPU EIR for the Specific Plan area.

The cumulative ADT identified for the subject area is ultimately dependent upon the mixture and size of land uses. Buildout scenarios that consider existing uses, market factors, and long-term real estate trends suggest the total floor area along the Corridor could double or triple and generate from approximately 600 to a maximum of 1,450 additional dwelling units. The difference in the number of residential uses ultimately constructed would be influenced by the amount of retail use (i.e., less retail square footage would allow for greater residential use). The maximum of 1,450 potential residential dwelling units is based upon a presumed 30 percent reduction in the amount of existing retail space as part of future redevelopment. All development scenarios considered in preparing the Specific Plan were balanced to yield the approximately the same as the 29,000 ADT estimated for the proposed Specific Plan area in the GPU EIR (i.e., the land use within the Corridor may vary, but future development would not exceed land uses that would ultimately generate greater than a cumulative total of 29,000 ADT without requiring additional analysis in conformance with CEQA). Therefore, the amount of future foreseeable growth assumed in the Specific Plan is consistent with that anticipated for the project area in the GPU EIR with respect to the generation of ADT.

Five land use scenarios were therefore developed within this limit and considered a 10- to 15-year horizon for a Specific Plan (see Table 4-1, Development Plan Scenarios, of the Specific Plan). While not anticipated to occur based on land use trends for the subject area, if future development within the Corridor is proposed beyond the 29,000 ADT limit of the GPU EIR, additional environmental analysis will be required.

Among the five scenarios evaluated, potential future residential growth within the Corridor was assumed to range from 600 to 1,450 new dwelling units. The total amount of retail/service use within the Corridor is assumed to either remain the same or to shrink over time. Retail growth assumptions were considered to fall into three categories:

- *No Growth* - Assumes that no additional retail space will be added. The existing vacant or underutilized properties will be filled or redeveloped with the same capacity as existing ones. This will account for an additional retail increase of 20%–30% due to the full utilization of properties. This is depicted in Scenario 1, as further described below.
- *15% Retail Contraction* – Assumes the current retail space (including vacant properties) will shrink by 15%. This is depicted in Scenarios 2 and 4, below.
- *23% Retail Contraction* – Assumes the current retail space (including vacant properties) will shrink by 23%. This is depicted in Scenarios 3 and 5, below.

The first three scenarios below maximize the number of dwelling units and assume all other offices/bank/civic/restaurant uses remain the same. Scenarios 4 and 5 assume a mixture of residential and modest growth of office and restaurant uses.

- Scenario 1: No retail growth; 20 to 30 percent backfill; maximum residential development
- Scenario 2: 15% retail contraction; maximum residential development
- Scenario 3: 23% retail contraction; maximum residential development
- Scenario 4: 15% retail contraction; balance residential, office, and restaurant
- Scenario 5: 23% retail contraction; balance residential, office, and restaurant

While the development scenarios identified considered a variety of outcomes, it is anticipated that actual future development within the Corridor will be a combination of these scenarios. However, the most likely significant change, compared to existing development, is the influx of approximately 600 to 1,450 new residential dwelling units. The analysis provided herein in this Addendum considers the development scenarios described above relative to General Plan buildout as previously analyzed in the certified GPU EIR.

**5. SUBJECT AREAS DETERMINED TO HAVE NEW OR SUBSTANTIALLY MORE SEVERE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS COMPARED TO THOSE IDENTIFIED IN THE PREVIOUS ND OR EIR.**

The subject areas checked below were determined to be new significant environmental effects or to be previously identified effects that have a substantial increase in severity either due to a change in project, change in circumstances or new information of substantial importance, as indicated by the checklist and discussion on the following pages.

**NONE**

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Global Climate Change) | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems          | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy   | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources          |   |



**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this analysis, Planning & Development Services has determined that:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project and there are no substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous EIR or ND due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Also, there is no "new information of substantial importance" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, the previously adopted ND or previously certified EIR is adequate.
- No substantial changes are proposed in the project and there are no substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous EIR or ND due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Also, there is no "new information of substantial importance" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, because the project is a residential project in conformance with, and pursuant to, a Specific Plan with a EIR completed after January 1, 1980, the project is exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15182.
- Substantial changes are proposed in the project or there are substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous ND due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Or, there is "new information of substantial importance," as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). However all new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in severity of previously identified significant effects are clearly avoidable through the incorporation of mitigation measures agreed to by the project applicant. Therefore, a SUBSEQUENT ND is required.
- Substantial changes are proposed in the project or there are substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous ND or EIR due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Or, there is "new information of substantial importance," as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, a SUBSEQUENT or SUPPLEMENTAL EIR is required.

---

Signature

Mike Madrid

---

Print Name

---

Date

Project Manager

---

Title

## INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164 set forth the criteria for determining the appropriate additional environmental documentation, if any, to be completed when there is a previously adopted ND or a previously certified EIR for the project.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162(a) and 15163 state that when an ND has been adopted or an EIR certified for a project, no Subsequent or Supplemental EIR or Subsequent Negative Declaration shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole public record, one or more of the following:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration; or
  - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previously adopted Negative Declaration or previously certified EIR; or
  - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Negative Declaration or EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(a) states that the lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an Addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR have occurred.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(b) states that an Addendum to a previously adopted Negative Declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary. If the factors listed in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, or 15164 have not occurred or are not met, no changes to the previously certified EIR or previously adopted ND are necessary.

**The following responses detail any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that may cause one or more effects to environmental resources. The responses support the "Determination," above, as to the type of environmental documentation required, if any.**

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UPDATE CHECKLIST

### I. AESTHETICS

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to aesthetic resources including: scenic vistas; scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway; existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or day or nighttime views in the area?

YES

NO

The General Plan Update (GPU) EIR determined that impacts to aesthetic resources would be less than significant for scenic vistas and scenic resources with the incorporation of mitigation measures. However, impacts to visual character/quality and light/glare were determined to be significant and unavoidable, even with the implementation of mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for aesthetic resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

The affected length of the Corridor is highly urbanized, is not designated as a State Scenic Highway, is not located within a scenic vista, and does not support scenic resources such as trees or rock outcroppings. Several historic resources are identified in the County GPU EIR (see Figure 2.5-2, Historic Resources and Julian Historic District) along or within proximity to the Corridor. Such resources would be subject to local and State regulations, as well as goals and policies and mitigation measures identified in the GPU and GPU EIR, respectively, to ensure their long-term protection should they be affected by any future improvements proposed within the Corridor.

The project has the potential to result in future development that would alter the visual character and quality of the project area. The Corridor is currently built out and highly urbanized in nature. Future development within the project area in conformance with the Specific Plan would change the overall visual character to a mixture of residential and commercial land uses; however, the Specific Plan is intended to provide guidance for future development and revitalization within the Corridor to enhance visual aesthetics and the overall character.

The proposed Specific Plan would allow for varying land use types and intensities that would result in a range of building heights, bulk, scale, and square footage reflective of the type of use proposed (i.e., residential versus commercial). However, the overall change in the mixture of land uses or redevelopment of existing uses within the Corridor is not anticipated to adversely alter or degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area. To ensure that future development does not adversely conflict with the existing character of the site or its surroundings, design measures are identified in the Specific Plan to achieve a cohesive visual character through transformation of the Corridor over time via specific roadway and intersection design techniques; streetscape improvements; public art; landscaping; public/community space; street lighting; mobility improvements; and other such elements. Further, Chapter 5, Development Standards and Design Guidance, of the Specific Plan provides development standards pertaining to setbacks, building height, coverage, parking, lot size, building placement, open space, and other such elements to regulate the visual character for each of the three Districts identified for the Corridor (i.e., limiting maximum building height to 55 feet (4 stories) to ensure that an appropriate scale is maintained). Future development would be required to demonstrate conformance with such measures provided in the proposed Specific Plan to ensure consistency with the overall vision identified and to avoid development that would substantially conflict with existing uses within the Corridor. With conformance with the Specific Plan, in addition to applicable goals and policies identified in the County GPU, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the existing visual character or quality

of the site and its surroundings. No new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects relative to aesthetic resources would result in this regard.

Additionally, the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element identifies State Route 94 (SR 94) as a County Scenic Highway between State Route 125 (SR 125) and Interstate 8 (I-8); SR 94 is adjacent to the Campo Road Corridor on the western end. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not adversely affect the scenic quality of SR 94; rather the Specific Plan provides design measures and implementation strategies for the redevelopment and revitalization of the Corridor that are aimed at achieving a more cohesive physical and visual environment and identity and to enhance the visual aesthetics. Conformance with GPU goals and policies would further reduce potential project effects on any such scenic resources.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to aesthetic resources. Adoption of the Campo Road Corridor Revitalization Specific Plan would not result in aesthetic impacts (direct or indirect) beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR. Additionally, as noted in the GPU EIR, individual development projects would be subject to project-specific development and planning review, including adherence to standards for community design and visual quality, such as those identified in the Valle de Oro Community Plan and the Campo Road Corridor Revitalization Specific Plan, to ensure that the project does not adversely affect any scenic resources or substantially (or adversely) alter the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. Future development would be required to conform to applicable zoning, design standards, and other regulations concerning aesthetic resources as provided in the Specific Plan and/or Zoning Ordinance, as applicable. Therefore, impacts relative to aesthetics would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

## II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to agricultural resources including: conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use, conflict with existing Williamson Act contract lands, or indirect conversion of agricultural resources?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant for land use conflicts relative to Williamson Act contract lands with incorporation of mitigation measures. However, direct and indirect impacts from the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses were determined to be significant and unavoidable, even with the implementation of mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for agricultural resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

The Corridor is highly urbanized and does not support any lands currently utilized for agricultural operations; designated Farmland by the Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, or lands zoned for agricultural use; or lands subject to a Williamson Act contract or County Agricultural Preserve. No such lands would be affected by implementation of the proposed Specific Plan.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to agricultural resources. Adoption of the Specific Plan would not result in impacts (direct

or indirect) to agricultural resources beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR. Additionally, as noted in the GPU EIR, individual development projects would be subject to project-specific development and planning review, including adherence to standards for the protection of agricultural resources as deemed applicable. Therefore, impacts relative to agricultural resources would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

### III. AIR QUALITY

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to air quality including: conflicts with or obstruction of implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violation of any air quality standard or substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation; 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; exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that air quality impacts would be less than significant relative to conflicts with air quality plans and objectionable odors. However, impacts associated with air quality violations, non-attainment criteria pollutants, and impacts to sensitive receptors were determined to be significant and unavoidable even with the incorporation of mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for air quality pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

Mobile sources would comprise the majority of emissions generated by project implementation. Mobile sources would comprise the majority of emissions generated by project implementation; however, future residential and commercial uses (i.e., multi-family residential, retail stores, restaurant, services, offices) within the Corridor would also contribute to potential emissions and effects on air quality. Cars and trucks would comprise the majority, with the remainder of emissions attributed to energy consumption and emissions from commercial establishments such as restaurant vents. It is reasonably foreseeable that the generation of any such emissions would continue to be reduced over time with the adoption of new mandates (i.e., improved technologies for exhaust filtering, etc.). As such, new or substantially increased air quality impacts above that identified in the GPU EIR are not anticipated to occur with project implementation.

As previously stated, the GPU EIR assumed 694.1 average daily trips (ADT) per acre for the uses generally located within the subject Corridor. This equates to an estimated 29,000 ADT, which represents the total number of trips generated and impacts assumed and evaluated for the area in the GPU EIR. The cumulative ADT identified for the subject area is dependent upon the ultimate mixture and size of land uses. Buildout scenarios that consider existing uses, market factors, and long-term real estate trends suggest the total floor area along the Corridor could double or triple and generate from 600 to a maximum of 1,450 additional residential dwelling units. The proposed Specific Plan evaluated potential development scenarios in the foreseeable future based on SANDAG trip generation rates. All scenarios were balanced to yield approximately the same 29,000 ADT that was estimated for the proposed Specific Plan area in the GPU EIR. The differences between scenarios reflect assumptions relative to the extent to which retail/service uses would grow or reduce in the future. Therefore, as proposed, the amount of future foreseeable growth assumed in the Specific Plan is consistent with that anticipated for the project area in the GPU EIR with respect to the generation of ADT and would not result in future development that would potentially generate short- or long-term air quality emissions not previously analyzed.

Future discretionary development within the Corridor would have the potential to result in short- and/or long-term impacts relative to air quality emissions and would be subject to additional County review and approval, as appropriate. Such future development would be evaluated for conformance with applicable local, State, and federal requirements pertaining to air quality, as appropriate at the time of consideration, to assess the potential for any new air quality-related impacts not previously considered. Additionally, as future discretionary projects would be subject to conformance with goals and policies identified in the GPU, as well as relevant plans and regulations aimed at improving air quality that are adopted over time, it is anticipated that regional and local air quality would continue to improve above that which would occur as a result of conformance with such requirements in effect at the time of GPU adoption.

As with the GPU, future development would be required to demonstrate compliance with the strategies and measures adopted as part of the Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQs) and State Implementation Plan (SIP) as part of the County's environmental review process, as well as with the requirements of the County and/or Air Pollution Control District to reduce emissions of particulate matter. Based on the requirement for consistency with emission control strategies in the RAQs and SIP, the proposed project, similar to that determined for the GPU, would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the San Diego RAQS and/or applicable portions of the SIP.

Criteria pollutant emissions associated with future development consistent with the GPU were determined to exceed adopted thresholds for PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and VOCs, and on a cumulative basis for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and O<sub>3</sub> precursors. As analyzed in the GPU EIR, future development would be required to comply with California Air Resources Board (CARB) motor vehicle standards, regulations from stationary sources and architectural coatings, Title 24 energy efficiency standards, and GPU goals and policies, in addition to specific GPU EIR measures, to ensure that the intended environmental protections are achieved and that resulting air quality effects are minimized.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to air quality. As the proposed Specific Plan is a policy document, implementation of future development projects within the Corridor would require further review and analysis by the County prior to approval in which any potential impacts outside the scope of the GPU EIR would be identified and addressed as appropriate. As such, adoption of the Specific Plan would not result in (direct or indirect) impacts to air quality beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR. Impacts relative to air quality would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

#### **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to biological resources including: adverse effects on any sensitive natural community (including riparian habitat) or species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in a local or regional plan, policy, or regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; adverse effects to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with wildlife corridors, or impeding the use of native wildlife nursery sites; and/or conflicts with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan, policies or ordinances?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts relative to conflict with applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans would be less than significant without mitigation incorporated. Impacts associated with federally protected wetlands and conflict with local biological resources related policies and ordinances would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures. However, impacts to special-status species, riparian habitats, and wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites were determined to be significant and unavoidable, even with the incorporation of mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for biological resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

The land area affected by the proposed Specific Plan is highly urbanized, and the proposed increase in the overall number of residential dwelling units or changes in the mixture of land uses as redevelopment occurs over time would not lead to any new or additional biological impacts. The project area is located within the boundaries of the South County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP); however, the site is not within an adopted or draft MSCP core or linkage area (GPU EIR, Figure 2.4-2, Adopted and Draft MSCP Core and Linkage Areas; County of San Diego 2011b). The GPU EIR identifies the project area as "Urban;" no sensitive habitat (coastal sage scrub, riparian woodland, etc.) is identified within the project area (GPU EIR, Figure 2.4-1, Aggregated Vegetation Map of San Diego County; County of San Diego 2011b). As appropriate, future projects within the boundaries of the Specific Plan would be subject to site-specific study to evaluate potential effects on biological resources; however, the Specific Plan would not directly result in physical development that could cause impacts relative to biological resources or conflict with the impact findings of the GPU EIR.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to biological resources. As the Specific Plan is a policy document, implementation of a development project would require further review and analysis by the County prior to approval in which potential impacts outside the scope of the GPU EIR would be identified and addressed as necessary. As such, adoption of the Specific Plan would not result in (direct or indirect) impacts to biological resources beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR. Impacts to biological resources would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

## **V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to cultural resources including: causing a change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; destroying a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; and/or disturbing any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts relative to cultural resources, including historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains, would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

Although the Corridor is highly urbanized and therefore, largely previously-disturbed, several historic resources are identified in the County GPU EIR (see Figure 2.5-2, Historic Resources and Julian Historic District) along or within proximity to the Corridor. Such resources would be subject to local and State regulations, as well as the goals and policies and mitigation measures identified in the GPU and GPU EIR, respectively, to ensure their long-term protection, should they be affected by any future improvements proposed within the Corridor. All future development projects resulting in ground

disturbance that could have potential impacts on cultural and/or historical resources would be subject to additional County discretionary CEQA review and approval, as appropriate, to ensure consistency with the GPU goals and policies aimed at the protection of such resources over the long term, and/or to identify any additional project-level mitigation measures needed to address significant impacts identified. As applicable, future development would be subject to conformance with adopted GPU EIR mitigation measures, including CUL-2.3 for easement protections; CUL-2.4 which requires coordination with potentially affected tribal governments and the Native American Heritage Commission; and CUL-2.5 which requires monitoring during grading activities for protection of unknown resources, among other measures, as appropriate, to ensure that potential effects on cultural resources are minimized or avoided to the extent feasible.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to cultural or historical resources. As the Specific Plan is a policy document, implementation of a development project would require further review and analysis by the County prior to approval in which potential impacts outside the scope of the GPU EIR would be identified and addressed as necessary. As such, adoption of the Specific Plan would not result in (direct or indirect) impacts to cultural or historical resources beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR. Impacts to cultural or historical resources would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

## **VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from geology and soils including: exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, strong seismic ground shaking, or landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; produce unstable geological conditions that would result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse; being located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property; having 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; and/or result in impairment of a unique geologic feature?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts to geology and soils would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were required.

The proposed Specific Plan area lies within the boundaries of the Spring Valley Sanitation District. Future residential and commercial development anticipated within the Specific Plan area would be served by the existing public sewer system; the use of septic systems would not be required. All future development occurring within the Specific Plan area would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local building standards and regulations (i.e., California Building Code) to address inherent geological and soils issues. Additionally, per Section 87.101 of the County Zoning Ordinance, preparation of a Soils Engineering Report would be required prior to building permit issuance to demonstrate that any proposed structures meet structural stability standards required by the California Building Code, including to address the potential for adverse effects of seismic-related events, landslides, lateral spreading, liquefaction, and/or expansive soils. Future development would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Program and Storm Water Quality Management Plan to identify potential impacts and best management practices (BMPs) in conformance with the County's BMP Design Manual



in order to minimize the potential for erosion to occur; refer also to Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, below.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to geology and soils. Impacts to geology and soils would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

## **VII. GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects related to environmental effects associated with greenhouse gas emissions or compliance with applicable plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts associated with greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be less than significant with incorporation of the mitigation measures identified. The GPU EIR was determined to be in compliance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and to result in less than significant impacts relative to potential effects of global climate change, in particular with regard to effects on water supply, wildfires, energy needs, and public health.

As previously indicated, the GPU EIR assumed 694.1 ADT per acre for the uses generally located within the Corridor. This equates to an estimated 29,000 ADT, which represents the total number of trips generated and impacts assumed and evaluated for this area in the GPU EIR; refer to previous discussion regarding Specific Plan land use development scenarios considered. Buildout scenarios that consider existing land uses, market factors, and long-term real estate trends suggest the total floor area along the Corridor could double or triple and generate from 600 to a maximum of 1,450 additional dwelling units. All future land use scenarios considered for ultimate buildout of the Corridor were balanced to yield approximately the same 29,000 ADT that were estimated for the proposed Specific Plan area in the GPU EIR. Therefore, the amount of future foreseeable growth assumed in the Specific Plan is consistent with that anticipated for the project area in the GPU EIR.

Since certification of the GPU EIR, various new state and local energy-efficient regulations have been adopted [i.e., CalGreen (Part 11 of the California Green Buildings Standards Code) which is aimed at increasing energy and water conservation and efficiency; reducing GHG emissions from buildings; promoting healthier environments to live in; and preventing waste of energy and water resources. Emissions from building energy use are a limited component of GHG emissions, as compared to other emission sources (i.e., vehicle emissions).] With consideration of such factors, a substantial future increase in GHG emissions from implementation of the Specific Plan, as compared to conditions evaluated in the GPU EIR, is not anticipated. Rather, such impacts are expected to be similar (or reduced) in severity as compared to the significance findings identified in the GPU EIR.

Further, future development occurring within the Corridor would be subject to local, State, and/or federal measures aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It is reasonably anticipated that new GHG reduction goals, policies, and regulations adopted since the time of certification of the GPU EIR (or in place subsequent to adoption of the Specific Plan) would contribute to further GHG reductions for current and future development within the County, including within the Specific Plan area, as compared to conditions as originally evaluated in the GPU EIR. Thus, potential impacts of the proposed project relative

to global climate change are not anticipated to increase in severity as compared to the GPU EIR significance findings.

The proposed Specific Plan is intended for planning purposes; no permitting or improvement plans are required for implementation. Future discretionary development within the Corridor would have the potential to result in short- and/or long-term impacts relative to GHG emissions and would be subject to additional County review and approval, as appropriate. Such future development would be subject to additional County discretionary review and would be evaluated for conformance with applicable local, State, and federal requirements pertaining to GHG and energy reduction (i.e., Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, County Climate Action Plan), as appropriate at the time of consideration, to assess the potential for any new GHG-related impacts not previously considered. It is anticipated that GHG significance criteria would require consideration for whether a project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, and/or whether a project would have the potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Possible reduction measures to reduce and/or avoid such effects may include, but may not be limited to, reducing vehicle miles traveled; off-setting carbon emissions; enhancing alternative modes of transportation (multi-modal roadway segments, shared and reduced parking); increasing building efficiency; increasing renewable electricity use (i.e., increase use of renewable energy, solar on existing homes, on-site energy generation); increasing solid waste diversion; and, reducing potable water consumption (i.e., reducing outdoor water use, increasing water efficiency in residential development).

Although new regulations relative to GHG emissions have been adopted since the time of certification of the GPU EIR, such information is not considered to be of "substantial importance" that would result in one or more effects related to environmental effects associated with GHG emissions or compliance with applicable plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Impacts would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

**VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from hazards and hazardous materials including: creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes; creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; production of hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; location on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 creating a hazard to the public or the environment; location 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; within the vicinity of a private airstrip resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; exposure of 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; and/or increase human exposure to vectors?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, accidental release of hazardous materials, use of hazardous materials within proximity to schools,

location on a site that may create hazard to the public or the environment, or the potential for increased human exposure to vectors would be less than significant without the requirement for mitigation measures. Impacts associated with public and private airport operations and interference with emergency evacuation and response plans were determined to be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Impacts relative to wildland fires were determined to be significant and unavoidable, even with the implementation of mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted relative to wildland fires pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

No portion of the project site is located within the boundaries of an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, nor within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CalFire 2020), and safety hazards relative to airport operations or wildfire are not anticipated to result with project implementation. Any storage, handling, transport, emission, or disposal of hazardous substances associated with future land uses within the Corridor would occur in conformance with applicable local, State, and federal regulations. Further, California Government Code Section 65850.2 requires verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or will meet, applicable requirements provided in the California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory. Additionally, a number of improvements are identified in the Specific Plan to enhance vehicular circulation and mobility of pedestrians, bicycles, and other means of transit. Such improvements (i.e., installation of roundabouts, signalization of several intersections, consolidated driveways, traffic calming measures, etc.) would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; emergency access to the Corridor would remain adequate with project buildout.

Future discretionary permits may be required to implement individual projects within the Corridor. Such development would be evaluated on a project-specific basis to ensure that no hazardous conditions from construction or operations would result.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects from hazards and hazardous materials. The Specific Plan does not include changes to existing land uses that would result in an increased potential for exposure to hazardous materials or conditions, including the potential for wildfire occurrence, as compared to the conditions analyzed in the GPU EIR. As such, adoption of the Specific Plan would not result in impacts relative to hazards and hazardous materials beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR. Impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

## **IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to hydrology and water quality including: violation of any waste discharge requirements; an increase in any listed pollutant to an impaired water body listed under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act; cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses; 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; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation or flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems; provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; place housing or other structures which would impede or redirect flood flows 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; expose people or structures to a significant risk of

loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; and/or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts associated with hydrology and water quality would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures, with the exception of impacts relative to the degradation of water quality and conformance with water quality standards requirements, and groundwater supplies and recharge, which were determined to be significant and unavoidable, even with the incorporation of mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for hydrology and water quality pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

On February 26, 2016, subsequent to certification of the GPU EIR, the County adopted the updated Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance No. 10410 (N.S.). Additionally, a Municipal Stormwater Permit was reissued by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (Order No. R9-2013-0001). The revisions made to these planning documents do not affect or increase the severity of potential impacts as previously analyzed in the GPU EIR.

No County or Federal Emergency Management Act (FEMA) floodways or floodplains are mapped within the project boundaries; the project site is not located within a flood hazard area. Additionally, the project area is served by public utilities and no effects on groundwater supplies or recharge are anticipated with buildout over time. The project site is also not located within an area subject to inundation due to dam failure (County 2011b) or potential effects of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow hazards; impacts in this regard would not occur.

Additionally, as with the buildout of the GPU, project implementation would result in land uses and future development that would increase the amount of impermeable surfaces and potentially result in an excess of polluted runoff that could exceed the capacity of existing drainage facilities. Future development within the Specific Plan area would be subject to the San Diego municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permit requirements to reduce polluted stormwater runoff on-site through project design, management practices, control techniques, system design and engineering methods, and other measures as appropriate. Additionally, future development would be subject to conformance with applicable goals and policies identified in the General Plan Land Use Element, Conservation and Open Space Element, and Safety Element to reduce potential development impacts relative to hydrology and water quality. However, adoption of the Specific Plan would not directly result in physical development that would have the potential to adversely affect water quality, existing drainage patterns, or groundwater resources. Similar to that analyzed in the GPU EIR for buildout under the General Plan, future discretionary projects within the area affected by the Specific Plan would be subject to County review prior to approval relative to flooding and drainage patterns, stormwater quality, and groundwater protection. Future development would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Program and Storm Water Quality Management Plan to identify potential impacts and best management practices in conformance with the County's BMP Design Manual. Conformance with such measures, as well as General Plan goals and policies and other applicable regulations, would reduce potential construction and/or operational effects on downstream water quality and land uses (i.e., offsite flooding, erosion, and/or siltation,) and would ensure that future development within the Specific Plan area would meet applicable stormwater discharge requirements in conformance with the Municipal Stormwater Permit.

Future development within the Corridor is subject to incorporation of mitigation measures identified in the GPU EIR, as appropriate. Such mitigation measures may include, but would not be limited to, HYD-1.1, which requires adherence to the County's low impact development (LID) standards in order to minimize

runoff and maximize infiltration; and/or HYD-2-1, which requires that discretionary project applications include commitments from available water districts.

As the Specific Plan is a policy document, implementation of future development would require further review and analysis by the County prior to approval, as appropriate, in which potential impacts outside the scope of the GPU EIR would be identified and addressed as necessary. As such, adoption of the Specific Plan would not result in impacts to hydrology and water quality (direct or indirect) beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR. Impacts to hydrology and water quality would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

**X. LAND USE/PLANNING**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to land use and planning including: physically dividing an established community; conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts associated with the physical division of an established community would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Further, impacts resulting from conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations, or an HCP or NCCP, were determined to be less than significant with no mitigation required.

As previously described, the proposed Specific Plan has been prepared in conformance with California Government Code Sections 65450 to 65457, which allows a local government to adopt specific plans specifying the extent, intensity, land use, and supporting infrastructure in a given area. Additionally, California Government Code Section 65451 requires specific plans to include text, diagrams, and a statement that detail the relationship of the specific plan to the General Plan. The proposed Specific Plan is consistent with the County's vision of concentrating growth in existing urbanized communities in the westernmost areas of the unincorporated area. The plan does not conflict with goals, policies, or land use designations in the General Plan and directly implements the County's goal of concentrating new housing and commercial growth in areas with high access to public transit, services, and amenities. Additionally, the County General Plan recognizes the Campo Road Corridor as a Village. Villages are intended to accommodate the "highest intensities and the greatest mix of uses" (General Plan Land Use Element, p. 3-6).

The proposed Specific Plan would amend the General Plan including the land use map to reference the Campo Road Corridor Revitalization Specific Plan. In addition, the Specific Plan would require the existing C-36 General Commercial zone that currently applies to the Campo Road Corridor be rezoned within the Specific Plan area and the zoning map amended to indicate a new zoning classification of Campo Road Corridor Specific Plan area. However, such changes are not considered to conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations that currently apply to the subject area.

While the Specific Plan may contain standards that are not anticipated in the Valle de Oro Community Plan, the overall vision of a core commercial area and residential uses is consistent with the Community Plan. The Specific Plan is consistent with the County's vision of concentrating growth in existing urbanized communities in the unincorporated County and directly implements the County's goal of concentrating new housing and commercial growth in areas with access to public transit, services, and

amenities. The Specific Plan provides a vision for future development within the Corridor to unify and connect the community, encourage a mixture of uses and spaces that support social interaction, and facilitate mobility. As such, project implementation is not anticipated to conflict with an applicable land use plan or result in development that would physically divide the established Casa de Oro community.

Future development within the Corridor would be required to conform with applicable County General Plan goals and policies including Policy LU-2.3, Development Densities and Lot Sizes, aimed at the assignment of densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community; Policy LU-2.4, Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character, intended to ensure that the land uses and densities within any Regional Category or Land Use Designation depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a Community Plan area, in addition to the General Plan Guiding Principles; Goal LU-3, Diversity of Residential Neighborhoods, which allows for a land use plan that accommodates a range of building and neighborhood types suitable for a variety of lifestyles, ages, affordability levels, and design options; and Goal LU-5, Climate Change and Land Uses, which provides for a land use plan and associated development techniques and patterns that reduce emissions of local greenhouse gases in accordance with State initiatives, while promoting public health. Additionally, future development would be subject to conformance with Valle de Oro Community Plan goals and policies, including Policy 1 pertaining to community character which seeks to eliminate existing uses which are nonconforming and are detrimental to surrounding uses; the Residential Goal, aimed at providing for gradual residential growth that conforms with existing community character and encourage development only in areas where necessary public services and facilities are easily provided; Residential Policy 2, which encourages medium and high density residential development only in areas where necessary public services and facilities are easily provided and surrounding land uses are compatible; and the Commercial Goal of providing for the orderly growth of well-designed and located commercial areas which are necessary and convenient for shopping needs and compatible with the character of the community, among other relevant goals and policies.

The project area is located within the boundaries of the South County MSCP; however, the site is not within an adopted or draft MSCP core or linkage area. The GPU EIR identifies the project area as "Urban;" no sensitive habitat (coastal sage scrub, riparian woodland, etc.) is identified within the project area (County of San Diego 2011b). As appropriate, future development projects within the Specific Plan boundaries would be subject to site-specific study to evaluate potential effects on biological resources; however, implementation of the Specific Plan would not directly result in physical development that could conflict with the impact findings of the GPU EIR relative to the MSCP.

Future discretionary projects within the Specific Plan area would be subject to additional County review and approval to ensure consistency with the General Plan, Valle de Oro Community Plan, and Specific Plan, as appropriate. Development consistent with the Specific Plan would be considered to be in conformance with the General Plan and Community Plan.

Future development within the Corridor is subject to incorporation of mitigation measures identified in the GPU EIR, as appropriate. Such mitigation measures may include, but would not be limited to, LAND-1.2, which requires coordination between the County, land owners, and community groups to ensure that both public and private development projects and associated infrastructure improvements minimize impacts to established communities.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to land use and planning. As the Specific Plan is a policy document, implementation of specific future development projects would require additional review and analysis by the County prior to approval in which potential impacts outside the scope of the GPU EIR would be identified and addressed

as necessary. As such, adoption of the Specific Plan would not result in impacts relative to land use and planning (direct or indirect) beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR. Impacts to land use and planning would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

## **XI. MINERAL RESOURCES**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to mineral resources including: the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State; and/or loss of locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts to mineral resources would be significant and unavoidable, even with incorporation of mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for mineral resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

The GPU EIR identifies the community of Valle de Oro as being in Mineral Resources Zone 3 (MRZ 3), which indicates that mineral resources are potentially present (GPU EIR Figure 2.10-3, San Diego County Mineral Resource Zones; County of San Diego 2011b). The project site is also not located within proximity to any areas identified as MRZ-2 (areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood exists for their presence). No existing mineral resources or mining sites are identified within the Specific Plan boundaries (GPU EIR Figure 2.10-2, Existing Mineral Resources in San Diego County; County of San Diego 2011b). Further, any mining operations for the extraction of mineral resources would be incompatible with the existing land use types within the Corridor. Based on such conditions, combined with consideration of the Specific Plan area which is highly urbanized and generally supports existing residential and commercial uses, future development within the Corridor is not anticipated to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or locally important mineral resources recovery site as delineated in the General Plan or other land use plan.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to mineral resources. Impacts to mineral resources would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

## **XII. NOISE**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from noise including: exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; and/or, for projects 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, or for projects within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that noise impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures, with exception of impacts resulting from the permanent increase in ambient noise levels, which were determined to be significant and unavoidable, even with the incorporation of mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for noise impacts pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

Over time, future development projects proposed within the Specific Plan area would have the potential to generate construction and/or operational noise and would therefore be subject to County CEQA discretionary review and approval to ensure that noise impacts are reduced to the extent feasible. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not directly result in physical development that would have the potential to generate increased short-term or long-term noise levels inconsistent with the County's adopted noise thresholds, Any increase in overall density or land use changes resulting with project implementation would not result in a significant increase in the severity of noise impacts as compared to that previously analyzed in the GPU EIR. Potential noise impacts would be subject to the same mitigation measures as previously identified for future development occurring with General Plan buildout (i.e., including, but not limited to, NOI-1.1 - Preparation of an acoustical analysis if 60 dBA (CNEL) noise levels may be exceeded; and/or, NOI-3.2 - Determine appropriate noise reduction site design techniques (i.e., setbacks or buffers from noise sensitive land uses)). Additionally, future construction activities within Corridor would be subject to regulations identified in the County Noise Ordinance (Sections 36-404, Operational Noise; Section 36-410, Construction Noise) and Table N-1 of the County General Plan Noise Element. Per such regulations, construction would be limited to the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., thereby reducing potential noise disturbances.

The proposed Specific Plan area is not located within the boundaries of an airport land use plan. No potential noise impacts would result in this regard with future development within the Corridor.

Future development within the Corridor is subject to incorporation of mitigation measures identified in the GPU EIR, as appropriate. Such mitigation measures may include, but would not be limited to, NOI-1.1, which requires an acoustical analysis when a new development may result in existing or future noise sensitive land uses being subject to on-site noise levels that exceed 60 dBA (CNEL) or greater, or other land uses that may exceed the "acceptable" standard in the Noise Compatibility Guidelines of the Noise Element; and/or NOI-3.2, which requires coordination between the County and project applicant during review of a building permit or discretionary action to determine appropriate noise reduction site design techniques.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects from noise. As the proposed Specific Plan is a policy document, implementation of future specific development projects within the Corridor would require further review and analysis by the County prior to approval in which potential impacts outside the scope of the GPU EIR would be identified and addressed as necessary. As such, adoption of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in noise impacts (direct or indirect) beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR. Potential noise impacts would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

### **XIII. POPULATION/HOUSING**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects to population and housing including displacing substantial



numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

YES

NO

As indicated in the GPU EIR, buildout of the General Plan would not result in a substantial increase in population. The development and infrastructure proposed under the GPU would directly and indirectly induce population growth; however, such growth is considered to be consistent with forecasted growth for the unincorporated County. As stated in the GPU EIR, the GPU is a comprehensive plan to guide future growth and includes a framework for land use and development, as well as goals and policies, to prevent unanticipated or inappropriate population growth in the unincorporated County (County 2011a). Therefore, the GPU EIR concluded that buildout of the General Plan would not result in the direct or indirect inducement of unplanned population growth and a significant impact would not occur.

The County General Plan recognizes the Campo Road Corridor as a Village. Villages are intended to accommodate the "highest intensities and the greatest mix of uses" (General Plan Land Use Element, p. 3-6). As proposed, the proposed Specific Plan is anticipated to allow for the addition of approximately 600 to a maximum of 1,450 new residential dwelling units, depending on the amount of existing retail space retained with future redevelopment. As discussed previously, all buildout scenarios considered for potential future development within the Specific Plan area were balanced to yield approximately the same 29,000 ADT that were estimated for the Specific Plan area in the GPU EIR; refer to previous discussion and Table 4-1 of the Specific Plan which identifies each of the land use scenarios considered. Therefore, project implementation would not exceed anticipated future development that would be inconsistent with that originally analyzed in the GPU EIR.

Although an increase in residential housing within the Corridor may occur with project implementation, future buildout under the Specific Plan as proposed would not result in substantial unplanned population growth above that already anticipated in the GPU EIR, and such growth can be accommodated within the affected Corridor; refer also to the analysis elsewhere in this Addendum which evaluates the potential environmental effects of such future development. The extension of existing roads to serve future development in the area is not required with implementation of the Specific Plan, and the construction of new roadways is not proposed. Additionally, the area is currently served by various public agencies (water, sewer, electricity, etc.) and the extension new services or infrastructure to the area is not required; therefore, the project would not indirectly spur population growth as a result of access to such services. Further, the Specific Plan does not directly propose or require the displacement of existing housing or people within the Corridor that would necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere, but rather is intended to serve as a guide for how future development may occur within the affected area.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project or in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to population and housing. Impacts relative to population and housing would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

#### **XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts to public services (fire, police, and other public services) would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures, with the exception of impacts to school services, which were determined to be significant and unavoidable even with incorporation of mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for public services pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

The San Diego County Fire Department provides fire protection services to the project site and surrounding community. The fire station that serves the project site is the San Miguel Fire District Station 15, located at 2850 Via Orange Way, Spring Valley, approximately 1.3 miles southeast of the project site. Police services are provided by the San Diego County Sheriff's Department. The sheriff's station that serves the project site is San Diego County Sheriff's Department Lemon Grove Substation located at 3240 Main Street, Lemon Grove, approximately 2.3 miles southwest of the project site. Public parks in the area are limited and include the Estrella County Park, approximately 0.2 mile to the north of the Corridor. The Casa de Oro Public Library is currently located at 9805 Campo Road and serves the Valle de Oro population; plans are underway to construct a new public library on Campo Road between Conrad Drive and Rogers Road.

As proposed, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would allow for the addition of approximately 600 to a maximum of 1,450 new residential dwelling units, depending on the amount of existing commercial space retained with future redevelopment. Development as anticipated by the Specific Plan over time would not exceed anticipated growth projections as estimated by the General Plan and as analyzed in the GPU EIR.

The population and housing increase projected with buildout of the GPU would increase the demand for fire and police protection, as well as for parks, schools, and other public services. To maintain or achieve acceptable service standards for fire and police services, as well as for other public services such as libraries, the provision of new or physically altered facilities may be required which would have the potential to result in adverse environmental impacts. Conformance with County policies and regulations, as well as GPU goals and policies, and implementation of mitigation measures identified in the GPU EIR, in combination with payment of appropriate development impact fees, would be required to reduce potential impacts resulting with future development to less than significant and to ensure that fire, police, and other public services remain adequate for the resulting population.

Project implementation would include residential growth that may result in the need to construct or expand school facilities that could cause a significant environmental impact. Conformance with the adopted GPU policies and GPU EIR mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts related to school facilities; however, as indicated in the GPU EIR, due to the County's limited authority over the construction and expansion of school facilities, impacts are considered potentially significant and unavoidable. Future development within the Corridor would be subject to the payment of appropriate school impact fees to ensure that potential effects on school resources are minimized to the extent feasible and that the adequate provision of services can continued to be maintained.

Additionally, project implementation may increase future demands on County park services. The Specific Plan identifies the potential for future development of public parks or other community resources (public plaza, community space, etc.). Alternatively, payment of in-lieu-of fees for common open space may also be made with future development project pursuant to the County's Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) (County Code Sections 810.101 through 810.129) which allows for the collection of fees for park land and park improvements pursuant to the Quimby Act and the Mitigation Fee Act. Refer to discussion under XV, Recreation, below, for additional discussion.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to public services. Although the Specific Plan would encourage new residential housing and commercial development in the Corridor, adoption of the Specific Plan would not directly result in the development of unplanned housing or induced population growth that would increase demand for new public services or facilities, as the Specific Plan serves as a policy document.

Future development within the Corridor is subject to incorporation of mitigation measures identified in the GPU EIR, as appropriate. Such mitigation measures may include, but would not be limited to, PUB-1.9, which ensures that new development fund a fair share toward fire service facilities through additional funds and/or development of infrastructure; and PUB-3.2, which requires that discretionary project applications include commitments from available school districts.

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in impacts (direct or indirect) to public services beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR. Impacts to public services would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

**XV. RECREATION**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in an increase in 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; or that include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts relative to recreation would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

The proposed Specific Plan area has a regional category designation of Village. As anticipated with future buildout of the area, additional population would be generated over time that may use recreational facilities within the unincorporated County. However, the additional residential dwelling units generated with implementation of the Specific Plan would not significantly increase the population within Casa de Oro and would be within the population growth projections previously identified for the region. As such, the proposed Specific Plan would not directly generate or encourage unplanned growth that would substantially increase demands on the County's recreational resources or public parks, or cause the accelerated deterioration of such resources. Additionally, the Specific Plan identifies opportunities for development of a variety of public spaces for gathering and/or passive recreation. Opportunities for a central community gathering space, such as a park or plaza, are also encouraged, as shown in Figure 4-14, Community Space Incentive, and further described in Section 4.5.7, Community Facilities, of the Specific Plan. Alternatively, payment of in-lieu-of fees for common open space may also be made with future development projects as proposed within the Corridor, pursuant to the County's PLDO (County Code Sections 810.101 through 810.129) which allows for the collection of fees for park land and park improvements pursuant to the Quimby Act and the Mitigation Fee Act. As authorized by the Quimby Act (Government Code Section 66477 et. seq.), the PLDO requires subdivisions to dedicate land, pay a Park In-Lieu Fee, or a combination of both, for local park or recreational purposes. As authorized by the Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code Section 66000 et seq.), the PLDO requires non-subdivision residential development to pay the Park Land Acquisition Impact Fee for acquisition of park land, and requires both subdivision and non-subdivision residential development to pay the Park Improvement Impact Fee for the provision of park improvements. The provision of such community recreational

amenities would be consistent with the Valle de Oro Community Plan which identifies the goal of establishing “a well-balanced system of parks and recreational facilities which...will enrich the lives of all residents within the community” (County of San Diego 2011c).

As a policy document, the Specific Plan would not directly result in unplanned physical development that would substantially increase area population or demands on the County’s recreational resources. Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project or changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to recreation. Impacts to recreation would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause effects to transportation/traffic including: an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system; exceedance, either individually or cumulatively, of a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); inadequate emergency access; inadequate parking capacity; and/or a conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts to transportation and traffic would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures, with the exception of impacts relative to the degradation in level of service (LOS) for roadways in unincorporated San Diego County and adjacent cities, and to rural road safety, which were determined to be significant and unavoidable even with mitigation measures incorporated. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for transportation and traffic pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

The project includes a proposed Specific Plan with new policies and development regulations designed to allow and promote new mixed-use (residential) development in the corridor. The Specific Plan would allow for future transformation and reorientation of Campo Road to a “Main Street” with reduced lanes, lower traffic speeds, on-street parking, wider sidewalks, and street trees. The Specific Plan provides guidance to encourage alternative means of transportation within the Corridor, including enhanced pedestrian and bicycle amenities, improved access to transit, and incorporation of traffic calming measures, and would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs supporting alternative transportation, consistent with findings of the GPU EIR for buildout of the General Plan.

The ADT identified for development of the Corridor is dependent upon the ultimate mixture and size of future land uses. As stated previously, five buildout scenarios that consider existing uses, market factors, and long-term real estate trends were evaluated as part of the Campo Road Revitalization Plan. Under such scenarios, the total floor area along the Corridor could double or triple depending on the ultimate mixture of land uses that are developed (i.e., residential dwelling units versus commercial square footage) and could potentially generate between 600 to a maximum of 1,450 additional dwelling units at buildout. The development scenarios considered in the Specific Plan were based upon SANDAG Series 13 trip generation rates. All scenarios were balanced to yield approximately the same 29,000 ADT that were approved for buildout of the Specific Plan area as part of the GPU EIR; refer to previous discussion regarding the land use development scenarios considered in preparing the Specific Plan. The differences

between the scenarios reflect assumptions relative to the extent to which retail/service uses would grow or reduce in the future. Therefore, as proposed, the amount of future foreseeable growth that could result from the proposed Specific Plan is consistent with that anticipated for the project area in the GPU EIR, and buildout of the Specific Plan would not generate new traffic-related impacts not already analyzed and identified in the GPU EIR.

The GPU EIR identifies Campo Road between Kenwood Drive and Conrad Drive as LOS F in Table 2.15-21, Proposed Project Deficient Facilities (LOS E/F) by Community, with buildout of the GPU. A Traffic Analysis and Parking Assessment (Michael Baker International 2021) was prepared to evaluate ultimate buildout of the Corridor as proposed under the Specific Plan, including the various transportation improvements identified for the area (i.e., lane reductions, construction of raised medians, buffered bike lanes, on-street angled parking, and intersection modifications). The analysis determined that under a Horizon Year 2035 with Project scenario, all affected intersections would operate at acceptable LOS with exception of 3 intersections; however, it was determined that the LOS at these 3 intersections could be improved to LOSD or better with implementation of alternative traffic controls (i.e., restriction of left turns, two-way stop, or signal controls, and/or dedicated/shared turn lanes at specific locations). It should be noted that such design treatments have been incorporated into the Specific Plan, and therefore, existing traffic controls would change at many of the intersections along the Corridor, along with the addition of intersections. Such treatments would be incorporated as part of the Specific Plan and would not be considered mitigation measures. Refer to the Traffic Analysis and Parking Assessment (Michael Baker International 2021) for additional discussion.

Additionally, existing and projected daily traffic volumes do not have a close correlation to the LOS offered by Campo Road since the peak-hour intersection conditions dictate the worst LOS that would be experienced along the roadway. Therefore, the Traffic Analysis evaluated intersections (versus roadway segments) along the Corridor to more accurately determine if the segments need to incorporate left turn lanes, right turn lanes, and/or other methods of traffic control that would adequately function at the intersections.

Future development within the Corridor would be subject to conformance with relevant General Plan policies to reduce potential transportation impacts. Evaluation on a project-specific basis would also be undertaken, as appropriate, to identify any additional design or mitigation measures required to reduce potential impacts to the extent feasible.

The Traffic Analysis and Parking Assessment also determined that under current conditions, the Corridor experiences a parking utilization rate of approximately 45.7%, and thus, an excess in parking is provided (Michael Baker International 2021). All future development within the Corridor would be required to comply with existing County parking regulations applicable at the time, including conformance with County General Plan policies, to ensure that adequate parking facilities are provided. Impacts would remain less than significant, as was determined in the GPU EIR, in this regard.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project or changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to traffic and transportation. New legislation (Senate Bill 743) pertaining to the manner in which transportation-related effects are analyzed (i.e., vehicle miles traveled versus LOS and automobile delay) was adopted in September 2013 subsequent to certification of the GPU EIR. However, because the proposed project would not cause a new significant impact or a substantial increase in daily trips, an EIR addendum is appropriate and the new VMT threshold does not apply to any project changes. Accordingly, in evaluating potential environmental effects of the Specific Plan against analysis presented in the GPU EIR (which was certified in 2011, prior to adoption of SB 743), the thresholds used and methodology provided in the GPU EIR remain relevant, and consideration of potential impacts relative to vehicle miles traveled is therefore not appropriate.

As the proposed Specific Plan is a policy document, implementation of specific future development projects within the plan area would require further review and analysis by the County prior to approval to address potential impacts outside of the scope of the GPU EIR, as appropriate. As such, adoption of the Specific Plan would not result in impacts to transportation and traffic (direct or indirect) beyond those analyzed in the GPU EIR.

Impacts relative to traffic and transportation would therefore be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

**XVII. UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause effects to utilities and service systems including: exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; require new or expanded entitlements to water supplies or new water resources to serve the project; 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; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; result in noncompliance with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste; and/or require energy facilities which would have the potential to result in significant environmental effects?

YES

NO

The GPU EIR determined that impacts to utilities and service systems would be less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated with exception of impacts relative to the provision of adequate water supplies and sufficient landfill capacity, which were determined to be significant and unavoidable, even with the incorporation of mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for utilities and service systems pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

The proposed Specific Plan is anticipated to allow for the addition of approximately 600 to a maximum of 1,450 new residential dwelling units. The Specific Plan would provide for zoning that would increase the allowed density of residential development within the Corridor, and therefore, the number of residential dwelling units that could potentially be constructed, depending on the ultimate balance in the mixture of residential and commercial uses. As residential development generates a higher demand for water and sewer services as compared to commercial uses, buildout of the Specific Plan would therefore have the potential to increase overall demand for water and/or sewer services over that assumed under buildout of the General Plan.

The General Plan EIR identifies the existing conditions (year 2004) for the number of housing units and population within each San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) member district's service area, in addition to the projected increase in housing units and population within these service areas under implementation of the 2011 General Plan Update. The General Plan EIR indicates that all 15 SDCWA member districts that serve the unincorporated County would experience growth in both population and number of housing units with buildout of the General Plan. As noted above, the General Plan EIR identified a significant and unavoidable impact due to increased population and housing growth which would increase water demand and potentially result in an inadequate water supply (San Diego County 2011a). In addition to the General Plan policies to which future development would be required to conform, mitigation measures were identified to reduce potential impacts relative to water supply

(including, but not limited to, USS-4.1 – Review General Plan Amendments for consistency with goals and policies of the General Plan; USS-4.2 – Implement the County Green Building Program with incentives for development that is energy efficient and conserves resources; and/or, USS-4.3 - Implement Policy I-84 requiring discretionary projects to obtain water district commitment that water services are available); however, such measures would not reduce potential impacts from buildout of the General Plan to a less than significant level.

Growth forecasts for the region are updated by SANDAG approximately every five years; water districts update their demand forecasts and supply needs based on the most recent SANDAG forecast approximately every five years, per California Water Code Section 10617, to coincide with preparation of their Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs). The 2020 UWMP prepared by the Helix Water District, which provides water service to the Specific Plan area, provides an evaluation of whether adequate water supplies would be available to serve affected service areas under normal water year, single dry water year, and multiple dry water year conditions over the next 25 years (in 5-year increments). Such projections are intended to describe the reliability of the water supply and vulnerability of the water supply to seasonal or climatic shortages, to the extent feasible.

The 2020 UWMP for the Helix Water District provides projected water demand based on SANDAG's Series 14 Regional Growth Forecast, which considers projected buildout population of the unincorporated County as identified in the General Plan. The 2020 UWMP identifies an increase in water demand by the year 2050 largely due to growth in the residential sectors of both single- and multi-family development on both vacant lands and as redevelopment and infill development. The 2020 UWMP determined that for the normal, single dry, and multiple dry year scenarios, future supplies will meet anticipated demands and that no shortages are anticipated within the District's service area through the year 2045 (HWD 2020). As any increase in the number of residential dwelling units that may result within the Corridor as a result of implementation of the Specific Plan would be consistent with growth projections considered in the General Plan, future water supplies would be adequate to support project buildout.

Additionally, as part of the discretionary process, future development within the proposed Specific Plan area would be required to demonstrate that adequate water service can be provided to the project as proposed. Such future development would be subject to review by the HWD to confirm that the District can serve a particular use.

Therefore, although implementation of the Specific Plan would have the potential to increase the number of future residential dwelling units constructed within the Corridor, thereby increasing demand on utility and service systems, buildout would occur incrementally over time and in combination with new commercial uses. Additionally, conditions may change over time, influencing the ability of a public utility to provide services (i.e., changes in development patterns or intensities, landfill expansion, surplus water supplies, etc.). Although demands on public utilities and service systems may therefore increase as a result of project implementation, it is not anticipated to result in a new significant impact or increased severity of an impact as previously identified in the General Plan EIR.

Future development within the Corridor is subject to incorporation of mitigation measures identified in the GPU EIR, as appropriate. Such mitigation measures may include, but would not be limited to, USS-1.1, which ensures adequate availability of sewer/sanitation service for development projects; and/or USS-3.5, which requires evaluation of environmental effects of all proposed stormwater drainage facilities and ensure that significant adverse effects are minimized or mitigated.

Since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project or in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause one or more effects to utilities and service systems. Impacts relative to utilities and service systems would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

**XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in any mandatory finding of significance listed below?

*Does the project degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a 'fish or wildlife species, cause a 'fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

*Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?*

*Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

YES

NO

As proposed, buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would not exceed development as originally anticipated in the General Plan for the project area. Additionally, as a policy document, the proposed Specific Plan would not result in the physical disturbance or development of property within the Specific Plan area that would have the potential to cause direct or indirect environmental impacts to County resources.

As described in this Checklist, since the GPU EIR was certified, there are no changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would result in any mandatory finding of significance. As a policy document, the project would not result in additional impacts to biological resources or cultural/tribal cultural or historical resources, cumulatively considerable impacts, or direct or indirect environmental impacts to human beings. All impacts associated with the Specific Plan would be consistent with those previously identified in the GPU EIR.

**XIX. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UPDATE CHECKLIST FORM**

CalFire (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2020. *California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer*. <https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414>.

County of San Diego. 2011a. *General Plan*. <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/generalplan.html>.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2011b. *General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html>.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2011c. *Valle de Oro Community Plan*. [https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/docs/CP/Valle\\_de\\_Oro\\_CP2.pdf](https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/docs/CP/Valle_de_Oro_CP2.pdf).

Helix Water District. 2020. *Urban Water Management Plan*. <https://hwd.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Draft-2020-UWMP-main-body-website.pdf>.

Michael Baker International. 2021. *Traffic Analysis and Parking Assessment – Casa de Oro Specific Plan*.