



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR

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

KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

March 5, 2020

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

Project Name: Liberty Bell Plaza
Project Record Numbers: PDS2017-STP-17-037; PDS2019-BC-19-0104
Environmental Log Number: PDS2017-ER-17-08-010

APN(s): 189-012-17-00; 189-012-20-00; 189-012-21-00; 189-012-49-00;
189-091-08-00; 189-091-22-00; 189-091-30-00

Lead Agency Name and Address:

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

County Staff Contact:

Bradley Sonnenburg, Project Manager
(858) 694-3640
bradley.sonnenburg@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Location:

The Liberty Bell Plaza project (Project) is located within the unincorporated Community Planning area of Valley Center in northern San Diego County. The approximately 8.5-acre Project site is located at 27643 Valley Center Road in Valley Center. Recreational open space borders the site to the north and east, while the south and north contain commercial and residential use types. Additionally, the Valley Center Municipal Water District facility is directly adjacent to the east of the Project site.

Project Applicant Name and Address:

Liberty Bell Plaza LLC
P.O. Box 642
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

General Plan

Community Plan: Valley Center

Regional Categories: Village

Land Use Designations: General Commercial

Density: N/A

Floor Area Ratio (FAR): .045/0.70

Zoning

Use Regulation: C36

Minimum Lot Size: 6,000sf

Special Area Regulation: Community Design Review (B); Flood Plain (F)

Description of Project: The Project is for the development of an 81,884 square foot (SF) commercial plaza, on an 8.5-acre Project site. The Project would develop 7 commercial and retail buildings, including one supermarket (50,907 SF), one mini-mart (1,215 SF) for a gas station with six fueling stations and 12 pumps, 5 other commercial/retail buildings (10,097 SF, 10,042 SF, 3,558 SF, 3,065 SF, and 3,000 SF) with a total of 378 parking spaces. The Project has been designed in accordance with the Valley Center Design Guidelines, incorporating decorative features, muted tones, brick columns, natural wood, stone and other design elements. Access to the Project site would be provided by driveways off of both Valley Center Road and Charlan Road.

Project Site Description:

The project site is relatively flat, with average slopes ranging between 5% and 15%. Historically the site has been used intermittently for agricultural purposes, with more recent use as a former commercial agricultural retail establishment for hay and grain sales. Existing buildings on site will be demolished as part of the Project.

Discretionary Actions:

Discretionary Permits for the Project include a Site Plan for Community Design Review, and a Boundary Adjustment with Certificate of Compliance.

Overview of 15183 Checklist

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

General Plan Update Program EIR

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection

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

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

Summary of Findings

The Liberty Bell Plaza Project is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the Project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce Project specific impacts, and the Project implements these mitigation measures (see http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures).

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the Project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the Project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

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

1. **The Project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.**
The Project does not propose residential units but is for the development of a commercial center. The Project site is Zoned General Commercial (C36) with a General Plan Designation of General Commercial (C-1). Commercial and retail uses, including gasoline sales, is allowed by right within the C36 zone and C-1 land use designation. The proposed Project is consistent with the land use regulations under the County Zoning Ordinance and General Plan.
2. **There are no Project specific effects which are peculiar to the Project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.**
The subject property is no different than other properties in the surrounding area, and there are no Project specific effects which are peculiar to the Project or site. The Project is located in an

area developed with residential use types, a golf course and other commercial use types. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the Project would not result in any peculiar effects.

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all Project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The Project could result in potentially significant impacts to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Transportation and Traffic, and Wildfire. However, applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.

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

The Project is consistent with the County Zoning Ordinance and General Plan land use regulations. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the Project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.

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

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

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

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

Signature

Date

Bradley Sonnenburg

**Land Use/ Environmental
Planner**

Printed Name

Title

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

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

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

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

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
1. AESTHETICS – Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

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

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

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

The Project site is located at 27642 Valley Center Road, within the Valley Center community of the unincorporated County of San Diego. The site is approximately 8.5 acres and is located just northeast of the boundary of the City of Escondido.

A number of RCAs have been identified by the County that are located within approximately 2 miles of the Project site. Three of these RCAs have been identified as visual resources: Valley Center Ridge, Burnt Mountain, and Lancaster Mountain. Valley Center Ridge is located approximately 0.5 miles southwest of the Project site, and Burnt Mountain is located approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Project site. Due to distance and intervening topography, the Project would not detract from any views of the aforementioned RCAs. The Lancaster Mountain RCA overlaps the northeast corner of the site, however, the portion of the RCA to the northeast corner of the Project site has been

identified as primarily focused on riparian and oak woodland habitats that constitute sensitive habitat. There are no identified County trails on the scenic portion of Lancaster Mountain. The Lancaster Creek trail crosses the lower elevations of the mountain, however, due to distance and intervening topography would not afford views of the Project site.

The County has identified a number of planned community trails within the Community Trails Master Plan within the vicinity of the Project site, including the Heritage trail, Joe Barry trail, and Woods Valley Ranch trail, that would afford views of the Project. The Project would be consistent with the County Zoning Ordinance, as well as with existing surrounding commercial development in the area, and would be required to conform with the design guidelines set within the Valley Center Community Plan.

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

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

No Scenic Highways designated by Caltrans are in proximity to the Project site. However, the County General Plan identifies roadways that are designated as scenic corridors within the Conservation and Open Space Element and have been included as part of the County Scenic Highway System. Designated scenic roadways located in the vicinity of the Project site include Lake Wolford Road from the Escondido city limits to Valley Center Road and Valley Center Road/Lilac Road between two terminuses along State Route 76.

No direct views to the Project site are available from either Lake Wolford Road or Valley Center Road/Lilac Road due to constraining intervening topography and distance. Lake Wolford Road is located approximately 3.54 miles to the south and east of the Project site, while Valley Center Road/ Lilac Road is located approximately .67 miles to the north.

In addition to the General Plan Scenic Highway System, Woods Valley Road from Valley Center Road to Paradise Mountain Road and Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Highway 76 are Mobility Element roads which have been noted as unique and aesthetically important within the Valley Center Community Plan. Lilac Road is located approximately 3.64 northwest of the site and would not afford any views of the Project due to distance and intervening land uses as well as topography. Woods Valley Road is located .37 miles south of the Project site. Views of the Project would be potentially available from this road segment, however the project would be consistent with surrounding existing commercial use types, and would be required to conform with the Valley Center Community Plan. Thus, the Project would not detract from the existing viewshed from a scenic roadway.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on scenic resources to be less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant

impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

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

The Project site is within the village area of the Valley Center Community Plan located off a County Maintained Road (Valley Center Road). The existing visual character and quality of the Project surroundings are characterized by commercial use types, rural residential development on large lots, planned residential development, recreational uses including a golf course, and the Valley Center Municipal Water District facilities site. Viewer groups of the Project site would include motorists, and to a lesser extent, recreationalists, such as walkers, bikers and hikers.

The project is for the development of a commercial and retail center and associated on-site improvements. The Project within the landscape would not detract from or contrast with existing visual character for the following reasons: the proposed use type is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, and would not introduce any visually dominant features which would detract from the visual quality of the site or surrounding area, and the proposed use type is consistent with the existing use types within the surrounding area.

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

- 1(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project is located within Zone A of the Light Pollution Code, due to the site's location within twenty miles of the Palomar Observatory. The Project would not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations because the Project would be required to conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209). This would include the utilization of the Zone A lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights. The Code was developed by the County in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, and other experts to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. Additionally, a photometric plan was prepared for the proposed Project dated September 12th, 2018, indicating that the Project would be in compliance with the Light Pollution Code. Thus, the proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources			
– Would the Project:			
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 2(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project site contains lands designated as Farmland of Local Importance according to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). Additionally, the site contains Visalia sandy loam (VaA) and clayey alluvial sand (Co) which are County of San Diego Prime Soil candidates defined by the FMMP. However, the site has been developed with commercial structures and the majority of the site has been disturbed. As such, the soil structure and quality has likely been compromised due to soil compaction from development and operation of former commercial uses. Additionally, the Project site does not contain 10

acres or contiguous Prime Farmland or Statewide Importance Soils as defined by the FMMP. Therefore, no potentially significant impact or conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use would occur as a result of this project.

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

- 2(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project site is zone C36, a commercial zone, and is not located within a quarter mile radius to any agricultural-zoned land or active commercial agricultural operation in the County of San Diego. The nearest agricultural preserve is located approximately 2.4 mile northwest of the Project site. The nearest lands under Williamson Act Contract are located approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the Project site. Due to distance, no land-use interface conflicts would occur. Additionally, the Project is for the development of a commercial and retail center and associated site improvements, which is compatible with the surrounding commercial use types. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

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

- 2(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore Project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. The outer edge of the Cleveland National Forest is located approximately 8.5 mile to the east of the Project site. Thus, due to distance, the Project would have no impact on the Forest. In addition, the County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones.

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

- 2(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. As indicated in response 2(c), the Project site, or any off-site improvements, are not located near any forest lands. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 2(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. No agricultural operations are currently taking place on the Project site. In addition, no impacts would occur in association with interface conflicts. Please refer to response 2(a) and 2(b) for a discussion on off-site agricultural resources and interface conflicts.

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

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

Discussion

An Air Quality Assessment was prepared for the Project dated March 2, 2020 by Ldn Consulting, Inc.

The Project has incorporated design features, which have been included within the below analysis:

- All diesel construction during grading and site preparation activities would be Tier 4 Final with Diesel Particulate Filters (DPFs)

- The Project would install three electric vehicle (EV) charging stations

3(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The General Plan designates the Project site as General Commercial within the Compatible Regional Category 'Village'. The site is zoned C36, General Commercial. The Project, which is to construct a neighborhood shopping center consisting of a market, strip mall, fast food restaurant, and convenience market with six fueling stations, would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation. Because the proposed project is allowed under the General Plan land use designation, which used San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth projections, it is consistent with the regional air quality standards (RAQS) and State Implementation Plan (SIP). As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the construction and operational emissions from the project are anticipated to be below established screening-level thresholds (SLTs), as addressed under Question 3(b), and would not violate any ambient air quality standards.

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

3(b) The GPU EIR concluded impacts to be significant and unavoidable.

The air quality analysis takes into account both the construction and operation phases of the Project.

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

Construction

The project proposes construction of a 52,000 square foot (SF) market, 27,700 SF strip mall, 4,000 SF fast food restaurant, and a 1,300 SF convenience market with six fueling stations. For the purposes of the air quality analysis, project development was assumed to start in June 2020 and is projected to end October 2021. Additional construction details are provided in the Air Quality Assessment. Emissions from the construction phase would be temporary and localized. Grading operations associated with construction of the project would require a minimum watering of the project site two times per day to reduce fugitive dust under the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rule 55 and would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance. To further reduce potential impacts generated during the construction phase, the Project would require all construction equipment used during grading and site preparation activities to employ Tier 4 engines with diesel particulate filters (DPF). With the application of fugitive dust control

and equipment emission reduction measures, emissions from construction activities would be below the County SLTs as indicated in Table 4.1 of the Air Quality Assessment provided in. Therefore, the project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation during project construction

Operation

During project operations, the vehicle trips generated from the project would result in an additional 10,200 average daily trips (ADT). Daily emissions of criteria pollutants associated with these mobile sources, as well as emissions from operational area and energy sources, were estimated in the Air Quality Study. The project would generate operational daily emissions at levels below County SLTs. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation during project operations.

Projects that generate traffic may result in the formation of locally high concentrations of CO, known as CO "hot spots". A CO hot spot analysis was conducted within the Air Quality Analysis which analyzed two of the worst-case intersections as identified by the Traffic Assessment, which would be impacted by the implementation of the Project. Both intersections exceeded the 3,000 Peak Hour trips screening level. To determine if the intersections would result in a CO hotspot, the EMFAC2014 model was used. The Project was found to produce CO emission concentrations below the California Ambient Air Quality Standards.

A Health Risk Analysis was performed for the Project following the Gasoline Service Station Industrywide Risk Assessment Guidelines prepared by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) in consultation with CARB and OEHHA. The Project would be required to comply with the following conditions:

- The Project would require the installation of station source equipment, including Phase I and Phase II vapor recovery systems, to reduce potential toxic emissions to a less than significant level.

Project construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed commercial development are not anticipated to exceed the County's construction and operational SLTs, based on the analysis presented in the Air Quality Study and implementation of Project conditions.

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

3(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable.

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

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

The project would contribute PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, NO_x, and VOC emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established SLTs (see Question 3(b) above). Additionally, grading activities associated with construction of the project would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance and the SDAPCD Rule 55, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. The project would generate PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and NO_x emissions during project operations primarily from mobile sources (i.e., vehicle trips), and VOCs from area and mobile sources. Operational emissions would not be anticipated to exceed the County's SLTs.

The project is located at the intersection of Valley Center Road and Mirar De Valle Road. Two residential developments are proposed within the general vicinity of the intersection. The Park Circle development proposes 318 homes to the west and the Shady Oaks development proposes 47 homes to the southwest. Cumulative impacts could occur if the most intensive phases of construction for these projects occur simultaneous to similar phases for the Project. The most intensive construction phase for the Project and for typical developments occurs during earthwork and grading activities. To mitigate any potential cumulative impacts from construction activities, the Project would coordinate with County Staff to ensure simultaneous earthwork activities would not occur simultaneously, to the extent feasible.

The Project is proposing development that is consistent with the County's General Plan, thus operational air emissions are considered to have been accounted for in the General Plan environmental review. The General Plan was prepared consistent with the RAQS and SIP.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to non-attainment criteria pollutants. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact to non-attainment criteria pollutants with the incorporation of Project conditions listed in 3(b). Therefore, the Project would be consistent the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

3(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable.

The project would introduce commercial square footage which is not considered a new sensitive receptor. Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool – 12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, day-care centers, residences, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The proposed project would also not be considered a point-source of significant emissions.

The closest sensitive receptors to the Project site is the single family residential unit located approximately 462 feet east of the Project site. The project would generate construction emissions in the vicinity of sensitive receptors. However, abidance to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, SDAPCD Rule 55, the application of Tier 4 engines with DPF, implementation of Phase I and Phase II vapor recovery systems for the six fueling stations, and to a confined construction schedule would reduce emissions and exposure to construction emissions would be temporary and would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive concentrations of air pollutants.

The commercial development would be constructed according to SDAPCD Rules 61.3 and 61.4 which require Phase I and Phase II Enhanced Vapor Recovery (EVR) air pollution control equipment technology to allow transfer of fuel (containing VOCs) into stationary storage tanks or into vehicle fuel tanks. The Project's throughput of gasoline is estimated at 6.8 million gallons and 360,000 gallons of diesel. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) defines the proposed gas station on the project site as a large gas station (i.e. throughput of 3.6 million gallon per year or greater), for which sensitive land uses should be sited further than 300 feet of the facility. Because the nearest residential land use is approximately 462 feet east of the Project, the impact to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

The Project would generate approximately 10,200 ADT during operation, including pass by, diverted, and primary trips. According to the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared by LOS Engineering, Inc, the intersection at Valley Center Road and Mirar de Valle Road would operate at an unacceptable level of service (LOS) of E with the addition of project related trips. A CO Hotspots analysis was conducted for this intersection (see Appendix X for details); however, intersection emission levels were found to be lower than the CAAQS for CO emissions. Thus, Project implementation would not result in the formation of CO hotspots. Impacts to sensitive receptors from CO hotspots would be less than significant.

Furthermore, as indicated in Question 3(b), NAAQS and CAAQS would not be exceeded for both operations and construction and would not expose sensitive receptors to an incremental health risk. In addition, the implementation of Tier 4 construction equipment with DPF would reduce onsite PM₁₀ from construction exhaust emissions (i.e. diesel particulate matter), reducing inhalation cancer risk to a less than significant level. Health risks associated with the operation of the fueling station would also result in a less than significant impact to nearby sensitive receptors with the implementation of SDAPCD Rules 61.3 and 61.4.

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

3(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant.

The project could produce objectionable odors during construction from paving, painting, and equipment operation; however, these substances, if present at all, would be minimal and temporary. The operation of a fueling station would emit odors during operation in the form of exhaust from vehicles and operation of the fueling pumps. However, all fueling tanks and dispensers would be equipped with certified vapor recovery systems per SDAPCD Rules 61.3 and 61.4; requiring Phase I and II Enhanced Vapor Recovery (EVR) air pollution control equipment, capturing 98 to 95 percent of fugitive emissions from being released into the environment. Subsequently, no significant air quality odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined less than significant impacts from objectionable odors. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impacts with the incorporation of Project Conditions detailed above, the Project would be

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant by adhering to the Project conditions of approval, which are consistent with the GPU EIR.

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

Discussion

A Biological Resources Letter Report was prepared for the Project by Klutz Biological Consulting dated January 29th, 2020.

- 4(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources Report prepared by Klutz Biological Consulting, dated January 29th, 2020. The site contains 8.49 acres of developed and disturbed land. Sensitive wildlife species identified on site include turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*) and western bluebird (*Sialia mexicana*). No sensitive plant species were identified onsite. The site is located within the North County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) but is not designated as a Pre-approved Mitigation Area (PAMA).

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential project impacts to sensitive habitat and/or species would be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following standard project condition: breeding season avoidance to prevent brushing, clearing, and/or grading between January 15th and August 31st. The GPU EIR identified this mitigation measures as Bio 1.5.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to special status species as significant and unavoidable. However, the Project determined impacts to be less than significant with the incorporation of project conditioning for breeding season avoidance, consistent with GPU EIR mitigation measure Bio 1.5. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 4(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Based on the Biological Resources report prepared for the Project, no sensitive habitats or wetlands were found onsite or offsite. However, the site includes a drainage ditch that does not include any wetland or riparian vegetation along the southern portion of the site. This drainage would be regulated as “waters” of the State or U.S. Therefore, the Project would be required, as a Project Condition, to obtain permits from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), or to provide evidence from these agencies that no permits would be required. This condition is consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measure Bio 2.2. In addition, and as detailed in response 4(a) above, breeding season avoidance as a standard project condition would be required consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measure 1.5.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities as significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project's impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of Project conditions consistent with GPU EIR mitigation measures Bio 1.5 and Bio 2.2. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 4(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. However, as previous discussed in response 4(b), the site does include a non-wetland water of the State and/or U.S. The Project would be required to obtain permits from RWCQB or USACE, or provide evidence that no permits would be required, as a Project condition. This condition is consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measure Bio 2.2.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to federally protected wetlands as significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project determined impacts would be less than significant with standard project conditions consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures Bio 1.7 and Bio 2.2. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 4(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Based on a GIS analysis, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resources Letter Report, it was determined that the site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The site would not assist in local wildlife movement as it lacks connecting vegetation and visual continuity with other potential habitat areas in the general project vicinity. Additionally, the Project site is surrounded by existing commercial development.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to wildlife movement corridors as significant and unavoidable. However, the Project impacts were determined to be less than significant for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 4(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The project is consistent with the Guidelines for Determining significance for Biology, the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) because breeding season avoidance will be implemented as a mitigation measure to prevent any potential impacts to raptors or other migratory birds. The project will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on local policies and ordinances as well as habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans as less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR (Bio 1.5 and Bio 2.2) would be applied to the Project. Those mitigation measures, as detailed above, requires the Project applicant to comply with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources and to obtain permits through the RWQCB and USACE.

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

5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

☐☐☐

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

☐☐☐

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

☐☐☐

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

☐☐☐

e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

☐☐☐

Discussion

A Cultural Resources Negative Findings Report for the Project was prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. dated April 11th, 2019.

- 5(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County approved historian, Brian F. Smith, it has been determined that no historical resources occur within the Project site. The results of the survey are provided in an historical resources report titled, "Cultural Resources Negative Findings For the Liberty Bell Plaza Project", prepared by Brian F. Smith dated April 11th, 2019.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on historic resources to be less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project determined impacts on historic resources to be less than significant with no required mitigation. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 5(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County approved archaeologist, Brian F. Smith dated April 11th, 2019, it has been determined that no archaeological resources occur within the Project site. In addition, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a listing of Native American Tribes whose ancestral lands may be impacted by the Project. The NAHC response was received on September 25, 2017, indicating that no sacred sites, on record with the commission, were present on the Project site.

Although no resources were identified during the site survey, the potential exists for subsurface deposits because of dense vegetative cover on portions of the property which limited ground visibility. Additionally, several recorded archaeological sites are located within the vicinity of the Project.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: grading monitoring under the supervision of a County-approved archaeologist and a Native American monitor and conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul 2.5. The Project will be conditioned with archaeological monitoring (Cul-2.5) that includes the following requirements:

Conditions of Approval

The following includes the Project conditions of approval:

Pre-Construction

- Contract with a County approved archaeologist to perform archaeological monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all earth-disturbing activities. The Project Archaeologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, during and after construction.
- Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.

Construction

- Monitoring: Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor are to be onsite during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor will evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources
- If cultural resources are identified:
 - Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
 - The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of discovery.
 - The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
 - Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation.
 - Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Luiseno Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.
 - If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).

- Human Remains.
 - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
 - Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. If the human remains are to be taken offsite for evaluation, they shall be accompanied by the Luiseno Native American monitor.
 - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
 - The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
 - Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.

Rough Grading

- Monitoring Report: Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to the South Coastal Information Center and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.

Final Grading

- Final Report: A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center, the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
- Cultural Material Conveyance
 - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to archaeological resources as less than significant with mitigation. The Project determined impacts to archaeological resources as potentially significant. However, the Project would incorporate the GPU EIR mitigation measure Cul-2.5 (as well as Project specific mitigation measures and conditions consistent with the GPU EIR) for a less than significant impact with mitigation. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 5(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

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

- 5(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the Project is located on geological formations (Quaternary Alluvium) that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Proposed grading would include more than 2,500 cubic yards of excavation which has the potential to impact fossil deposits.

Accordingly, grading monitoring will be a condition of Project approval. As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: grading monitoring under the supervision of a County-approved paleontologist and conformance with the County's Paleontological Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul-3.1.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on paleontological resources as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project determined impacts to paleontological resources as potentially significant. However, the proposed Project would incorporate the GPU EIR mitigation measures Cul-3.1 for a less than significant impact with mitigation. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 5(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Based on an analysis of records and archaeological surveys of the property, it has been determined that the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

As previously discussed, the GU EIR determined impacts to human remains as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project determined impacts to human remains as potentially significant. However, the proposed Project would incorporate the GPU EIR mitigation measure Cul-2.5 (as well as Project specific mitigation measures consistent with the GPU EIR) for a less than significant impact with mitigation. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.

3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR (Cul-2.5 and Cul-3.1), would be applied to the Project. Those mitigation measures, detailed above, require paleontological monitoring during grading, as well as implement the requirements of the Grading Ordinance to minimize impacts to paleontological resources.

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

6. Energy Use – Would the Project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

☐☐☐

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

☐☐☐

Discussion

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

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

Grading and Construction

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

The energy needed for the Project grading and construction would be temporary and is not anticipated to require additional capacity or increase peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. The Project would rely on petroleum consumption throughout the grading as well as the construction phases. Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resources expended over the course of grading and construction. Vehicle trips associated with the transportation of construction materials and construction workers commutes would also result in petroleum consumption, but to a lesser extent. The Project would require heavy -duty construction equipment with Tier 4 engines to be used during each phase of construction, which is anticipated to commence beginning year 2020 with full operations by 2022. Petroleum consumptions would be necessary for operation and maintenance of construction equipment and would not be beyond what is necessary for the Project. The application of Tier 4 engines for construction equipment would improve the efficiency of the equipment beyond what would be assumed for a standard fleet. Due to the aforementioned factors, the Project's energy consumption during the grading and construction phase would not be considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

Operational

Operation of the Project would be typical of commercial land uses requiring natural gas for space and water heating and landscape maintenance activities. In addition, a gas station would be installed at the project site, which is an allowed use within the C-36 zone. Indirect energy use would include wastewater treatment and solid waste removal at offsite facilities. The Project would meet the California Code of Regulations Title 24 Standards for energy efficiency that are in effect at the time of construction. For the gas station specifically, the project would be required to work with the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) for the completion of the permit. This would require appropriate station source equipment to reduce potential toxic emissions associated with fueling. Additionally, the Project would provide numerous sustainability features that would reduce transportation and building energy consumption and increase the efficient use of water. A summary of these features in the Project's Climate Action Plan Consistency Review Checklist, prepared by Ldn Consulting.

The Project would generate approximately 9,826 driveway average daily trips (ADT), as described in the Project's Transportation Impact Analysis prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers and dated July 2019. The Project would include a dedicated parking stall for vanpool, clean vehicle, and carpool only. Additionally, the Project would plumb for 12 electric vehicle (EV) stations and install 3 EV stations for employees and public use. Therefore, the Project would not be expected to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary petroleum usage throughout Project operations.

Over the lifetime of the proposed Project, fuel efficiency of vehicles is expected to increase as older vehicles are replaced with newer, more efficient models. As such, the amount of petroleum consumed as a result of vehicles trips to and from the Project site during operation would decrease over time. State and Federal regulations regarding standards for vehicles (e.g. Advanced Clean Cars Program, CAFÉ Standards) are designed to reduce wasteful, unnecessary, and inefficient use of fuel. The coupling of various State policies and regulations such as the Zero-Emission Vehicles Mandate and Senate Bill 350 would result in the deployment of electric vehicle which would be powered by an increasingly renewable electrical grid. These actions, along with the Project's designated vanpool, carpool, and EV charging stations, would reduce energy use compared to other similar Projects consistent with the General Plan.

The Project would use electricity for site and parking lot lighting and appliances and lighting within the commercial and retail spaces. The Project would be required to meet Title 24 of the California Building Code, which establishes energy efficiency standards for buildings to reduce energy demand and consumption. The Project is consistent with the General Plan and would not be expected to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary electric energy usage throughout Project operations.

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

6(b) Many of the regulations regarding energy efficiency are focused on increasing the energy efficiency of buildings and renewable energy generation, as well as reducing water consumption and reliance on fossil fuels. The Project includes the following energy conservation measures:

- Tier 4 construction equipment which would reduce fuel consumption associated with construction activities;
- Compliance with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance, demonstrating a 40% reduction in outdoor use which would reduce energy required for water conveyance;
- Plumb for 12 EV charging stations and install 3 EV charging stations for employee and public use.
- Work with the SDAPCD for appropriate station source equipment for the gas station

The County's Climate Action Plan is a long-term plan that identifies strategies and measures to meet the County's targets to reduce GHG emissions by 2020 and 2030, consistent with the State's legislative GHG reduction targets, and demonstrates progress towards the State's 2050 GHG reduction goal (County of San Diego, 2017). Implementation of the CAP requires that new development Projects incorporate more sustainable design standards and implement applicable reduction measures consistent with the CAP. To help streamline this review and determine consistency of proposed Projects with the CAP during development review, the County has prepared a CAP Consistency Review Checklist (Checklist). The Project would implement all applicable measures identified in the Checklist and would therefore be consistent with the County's Climate Action Plan. In addition, the Project would be consistent with several energy

reduction policies of the County General Plan including policies COS-14.1, COS-14.3 and COS-16.3. Additionally, the Project would be consistent with sustainable development and energy reduction policies such as policies COS-14.3 and COS-15.4, through compliance with the most recent Title 24 standards at the time of Project construction. Therefore, the proposed Project would implement energy reduction design features and comply with the most recent energy building standards consistent with applicable plans and policies. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

7. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: (i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, (ii) strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, (iii) liquefaction, and/or (iv) landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

7(a)(i) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, nor is it located within a known Active Fault Near-Source Zone. The County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards consider a project to have a potentially significant impact if the project proposes any building or structure to be used for human occupancy over or within 50 feet of the trace of an Alquist-Priolo fault or County Special Study Zone Fault. The Project site is located approximately 14.9 miles southwest from the nearest Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone and 14.4 miles southwest from the nearest County Special Study Zone. Additionally, construction in accordance with the California Building Code Seismic Requirements would be required prior to the issue of a building permit. Therefore, a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

7(a)(ii) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the Project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. In addition, a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendation would be required to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code would ensure that the Project would not result in a significant impact.

7(a)(iii) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Additionally, the site is underlain with

alluvial materials. According to review of the Project site by County Staff Hydrogeologist, in-situ soil densities are expected to be sufficiently high to preclude liquefaction. To ensure no impacts would occur, a soils compaction report would be required prior to all ground disturbance activities.

- 7(a)(iv) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards and is identified as Marginally Susceptible to potential landslides. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Based on review of the Project by County Staff Hydrogeologist, and the flat topography of the site, potential hazards associated with landslides are less than significant. In addition, a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendation would be required to be approved before the issuance of a building permit.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined less than significant impacts from exposure to seismic-related hazards and soil stability. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with the incorporation of Project conditions for a geological soils report, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 7(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as mollisols and other unidentified soils that have a soil erodibility rating of moderate and severe. However, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the Project would be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which would ensure that the Project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns, and would not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the Project would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) per the Priority Development Project Storm Water Quality Management Plan to prevent fugitive sediment. Please see Section (10) Hydrology and Water Quality for a detailed discussion.

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

- 7(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. As indicated in response (a)(iv), the site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards, however, the site has relatively flat topography and potential hazards associated with landslides have been determined to be less than significant by County Hydrogeologist. Lateral spreading is a principal effect from liquefaction. The site is located within a potential liquefaction area, however, as indicated in response 7(a)(iii), in-situ soil densities are expected to be sufficiently high to preclude liquefaction.

In order to assure that any proposed buildings are adequately supported, a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. With this standard requirement, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- 7(d) The Project site is underlain with the following soils according to the Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project by SCST, LLC dated August 21st, 2019: Holocene-to late Pleistocene-age young colluvial deposits consisting of poorly consolidated and poorly sorted slope wash and stream deposits, and sedimentary deposits underlain at depth by rocks of the Southern California Batholith. Soils in the vicinity of the Project site have been identified by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) -Soil Conservation Service as sandy loam to clay loam with expansive soil potential ranging from low to high. However, the Project would not result in a significant impact because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques would ensure structural safety.

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

- 7(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project site would rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. As such, the Project would not place septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems on soils incapable of adequately supporting the tanks or system.

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

Conclusion

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

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

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

8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the Project:

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

Background on CAP

The County of San Diego adopted a Climate Action Plan on February 14, 2018 which outlines actions that the County will undertake to meet its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions targets. Implementation of the CAP requires, among other things, that new development Projects incorporate more sustainable design standards and implement applicable reduction measures consistent with the CAP.

Discussion

Project Design Features:

The Project has incorporated design features to reduce the impacts associated with GHG.

- Plumb for 12 EV charging stations and installation of 3 EV charging stations for employee and public use;
- Compliance with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance and demonstrate a 40% reduction in outdoor water use;
- Utilization of architectural coatings compliant with San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rule 67 (SDAPCD, 2015).

Analysis

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

The Project is for the development of a commercial and retail center with associated site improvements. The Project would produce GHG emissions through grading and construction activities, as well as during the operation of the Project through vehicle trips, use of the commercial and retail buildings, the proposed on-site fueling station, and other associated uses. Indirect GHG uses would also be produced from offsite sources such as water conveyance and utilities. The project is consistent with the County of San Diego's Climate Action Plan (CAP), thus would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact related to GHG emissions.

The County adopted a CAP to establish a streamlined review process for proposed development projects to determine consistency with the County General Plan and its growth projections. To determine consistency with the CAP and General Plan, the project was evaluated using the CAP Consistency Review Checklist (Checklist). Thus, if the project is consistent with the Checklist then it is consistent with the County's General Plan and CAP.

The Checklist contains two steps: (1) Land Use Consistency; and (2) CAP Measures Consistency. The proposed project would implement all applicable measures identified in the Checklist and would therefore be consistent with the County's CAP. The proposed measures to incorporate from the CAP Checklist include the following:

- **Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled:** Because the project would have more than 25 occupants, the project will provide one carpool/vanpool-only parking space and promote employees to participate in carpool programs to reduce commute trips. The project will also install three electric vehicle (EV) charging stations for employees and plumb for 12 EV charging stations (3 percent of total parking spaces). In addition, the project would install bicycle parking facilities on-site for alternative transportation modes. The application of these design features would reduce project trips to the extent feasible. Due to the proposed project use, some trips occurring on the site would be pass-by/diverted trips, considered to be generated by other, off-site uses. These VMT reduction measures are aimed at reducing new trips that are directly associated with the project.
- **Reduce Outdoor Water Use:** The project would comply with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance by submitting a landscape documentation package which is required to demonstrate a 40 percent reduction in outdoor water use.

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

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

The project's is consistent with the General Plan land use designation 'General Commercial' within the Compatible Regional Category 'Village' which allows for the following types of commercial uses: regional shopping centers, community shopping centers, existing strip development or commercial clusters containing small but diverse commercial uses. The project would also be consistent with the zoning designation General Commercial (C36). Consistency with the regional category, land use and zoning designations, the project would be consistent with the General Plan's projected growth and land use assumptions.

As described above in discussion item 8(a), the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change as it is consistent with the County's General Plan and CAP, which were developed to support the goals and requirements of State legislation and recommendations. Thus, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.

2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

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

9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

☐☐☐

b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

☐☐☐

c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

☐☐☐

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐☐☐

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐☐☐

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐☐☐

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

☐☐☐

h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

☐
☐
☐

Discussion

An Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the Project by SCST, LLC dated August 21st, 2019. A Limited Phase II ESA was completed in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice for Phase I and II ESA Processes and the 2004 DEH SAM Manual.

- 9(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project proposes the on-site sale of gasoline and would result in handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous substances which exceed threshold quantities. Further discussion of the proposed on-site fueling station is continued below.

In addition, pursuant to the Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project, the Project site and sites identified within one-quarter mile of the Project site, have known presence of Hazardous Substances and are discussed below.

Terry's Hay and Grain

The former site of Terry's Hay and Grain overlaps the Project site and was reported in 1992 to have petroleum hydrocarbons spilled onto the site as a result of fueling activities from an aboveground storage tank (AST). Groundwater and soil samples were collected from 3 monitoring wells on the site between 1993 and 1995, with petroleum hydrocarbon constituents reported in one of the soil samples. Petroleum hydrocarbons residues have potential to exist in the soil at the former location of the AST.

E Dean Webb, DDS, Medina Eades, DDS

The existing dental facility directly adjacent to the southwest of the Project site has multiple recorded violations for medical hazardous waste handling, however there is no documented release of hazardous materials or substances and has low potential to have a recognized environmental condition.

Butterfield Trails Ranch

The Butterfield Trails Ranch site is approximately 800 feet to the northeast of the Project site and has recordation of the installation of a 500-gallon underground storage tank (UST) in 1978. There has been no recordation of unauthorized releases of petroleum hydrocarbon products and is not likely that on-site activities have created a recognized environmental condition.

McArthur Equipment Rental

The McArthur Equipment Rental was recorded to have two 500-gallon USTs and two 1,000-gallon USTs that were removed from the site in 1991. The County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH) closed a case on the site in 2003 stating that no remedial action was required, and thus it is not likely that activities at the site have created a recognized environmental condition.

Mobil Service Station

The retail gasoline station on the site approximately 600 feet northeast of the Project site has been in operation since prior to 1974, with a recorded unauthorized release of petroleum hydrocarbons sometime prior to October 1991. Contaminated soil and groundwater were left in place after the issuance of a “No Further Action letter” by the RWQCB, and a plume of impacted groundwater remains extending away from the Project site. Thus, it is not likely that activities at this facility have created a recognized environmental condition at the subject property.

Vic’s Garage & Towing

Vic’s Garage & Towing (Valley Center Auto Body, Vic’s Garage, Vic Herrera’s Auto Repair), located approximately 550 feet southeast of the Project site, has been documented as storing or generating hazardous materials onsite, however, does not have any documented release of hazardous substances. It is not likely that activities at this facility have created a recognized environmental condition at the site.

Double T Tire Service, Inc., Terry’s Auto Repair, VC Diesel Repair, Joe’s Country Feed and Pet, Gratel Repair, Inc.-DBA Diesel Repair

This site has been documented as storing or generating hazardous materials onsite, however, does not have any documented release of hazardous substances. It is not likely that activities at this facility have created a recognized environmental condition at the site.

The project would be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) for approval from the Department of Environmental Health. The purpose of the HMBP is to prevent or minimize damage to public health, safety, and the environment from a release of a hazardous material. The HMBP contains detailed information on the storage of hazardous materials at regulated facilities.

Additionally, two buildings on the Project site would be demolished as part of the proposed Project which were built prior to the ban on the use of lead-based paint and asbestos-containing materials in construction. Prior to the demolition of these buildings, surveys would be required to determine the location, presence, and quantity of hazardous building materials. The Project would be required to comply with Project conditions and applicable regulations to ensure that impacts related to the disposal of hazardous materials from the removal of structures is less than significant.

Conditions of Approval

The following includes the Project conditions of approval:

Hazardous Materials Business Plan

- A HMBP would be prepared and submitted to the County of San Diego for review and approval prior to occupancy or use of the premises in reliance of the Site Plan.

Structure and Debris Removal

- Structures and debris identified on the approved plan set for the Project as requiring remodeling or demolition would be remodeled or demolished

Lead Survey

- A facility survey would be performed to determine the presence or absence of lead based paint (LBP) and lead containing materials (LCM) in the structures identified for demolition on the approved plan set for the Project. All LBP and LCM would be managed in accordance with applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the

hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Division 4.5), the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 California Code of Regulations Section 1532.1), and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8).

Asbestos Survey

- A facility survey would be performed to determine the presence or absence of Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) in the structures identified for demolition on the approved plan set for the Project by a person certified by Cal/OSHA pursuant to regulations implementing subdivision (b) of Section 9021.5 of the Labor Code and who has passed an EPA-approved Building Inspector Course.

Soil Testing and Remediation

- Remediation of excavated soil would be performed under the supervision of the DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Program. Soil would be stockpiled, tested, and characterized for disposal, and an addendum to the Phase II ESA prepared by a Registered Engineer or Professional Geologist. A Soil Management Plan would be prepared for the remediation of hazardous materials.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials and accidental release of hazardous materials to be less than significant. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with standard project conditions for a Hazardous Materials Management Plan, structure and debris removal, lead and asbestos surveys, and soil testing and remediation. The project conditions are consistent with San Diego County Board Policy I-132 and General Plan Policy S-11.4 as analyzed in the GPU EIR. Thus, for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Thus, the Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a school.

The Project is required to comply with applicable regulations pertaining to hazardous waste to ensure that impacts related to hazardous emissions and schools is less than significant.

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

- 9(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. Based on the Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project, the site has the potential to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Refer to response 9(a) above for further discussion on release of hazardous substances.

The Project does not proposed structures for human occupancy, nor does it propose significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, nor is located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing

burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials and accidental release of hazardous materials to be less than significant. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with standard project conditions as identified in response 9(a) for a Hazardous Materials Management Plan, structure and debris removal, lead and asbestos surveys, and soil testing and remediation. The project conditions are consistent with San Diego County Board Policy I-132 and General Plan Policy S-11.4 as analyzed in the GPU EIR. Thus, for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project is not located within an Airport Influence Area or an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Area. Additionally, the Project is not located within an Airport Safety Zone, within an Avigation Easement, an Overflight area or within a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface area. In addition, the Project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.

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

- 9(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

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

- 9(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN:
The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.

- 9(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT:
The Project is not located along the coastal zone.

- 9(f)(iv) EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN:

The Project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.

- 9f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN:

The Project site is not located within an identified dam inundation zone. Additionally, the development would not constitute a "Unique Institution" such as a hospital, school, or

retirement home pursuant to the Office of Emergency Services included within the County Guidelines for Determining Significance, Emergency Response Plans

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

- 9(g) The GPU EIR concluded this impact as significant and unavoidable. The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 16 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County.

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

- 9(h) The GPU EIR concluded this impact as less than significant. The project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant by adhering to the Project conditions of approval, which are consistent with the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
10. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

Technical studies were prepared for the Project related to hydrology and water quality:

(1) PDP SWQMP dated January 29, 2020 prepared by Alidade Engineering.

(2) A Preliminary Drainage Study dated October 15, 2019 prepared by Alidade Engineering.

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

During the construction phase, the Project would prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would implement typical erosion control BMPs such as hydraulic stabilization and hydroseeding on disturbed slopes, silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel and sandbags, storm drain inlet protection and engineered desilting basin for sediment control. The SWPPP would be prepared in accordance with Order No. 2009-009-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) order CAS000002 Construction General Permit (CGP) adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) on September 2, 2009.

In the post-construction phase, as outlined in the SWQMP, the Project would implement site design, source control and structural BMPs to prevent potential pollutants from entering storm water runoff. The SWQMP has been prepared in accordance with the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual and SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (2013), as adopted by the RWQCB on May 8, 2013.

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

- 10(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project lies in the Valley Center (903.14) hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of this watershed is

impaired. Constituents of concern in the San Luis Rey watershed include Chloride and total dissolved solids. The project would contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the Project would comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to water quality standards and requirements. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5) to water quality standards and requirements. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determine significant and unavoidable impacts to water quality standards and requirements and groundwater supplies and recharge. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation to water quality standards and requirements, and groundwater supplies and recharge (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5). Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project will obtain its water supply from the Valley Center Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The Project would not use any groundwater, and the existing well on the Project site would be destroyed and inspected by County Department of Environmental Health (DEH) as a standard condition of approval. The Project would not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to groundwater recharge for the reasons stated above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

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

Existing site runoff drains to the northwest to two existing culverts and through an existing graded channel crossing the Project site. To avoid concentrated discharge impacts, including substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site, on-site improvement would include the following: extension of the existing culvert to the easterly property line, construction of a new headwall or drop structure to direct water within the existing channel through the Project site, conveyance of run-on water to an on-site storm drain, installation of biofiltration basins, and installation of a swale along the southerly property line.

In addition, the Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site because as previously stated in response 10(a), storm water management plans are prepared for both the construction and post-construction phases of the development Project. The SWPPP and SWQMP specify and describe the implementation process of

all BMPs that would address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream receiving waters. The Department of Public Works would ensure that these Plans are implemented as proposed. Although on-site drainage patterns would be altered, the proposed improvements would ensure the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site.

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

- 10(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Preliminary Drainage Study prepared for the Project by Alidade Engineering determined that the proposed Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site. Redevelopment of the Project site would direct runoff northeasterly through an existing graded channel to two culverts along the easterly property line for treatment and biofiltration management. The Project's proposed drainage patterns would result in less than significant impacts to the properties downstream of the Project site. Additionally, although a portion of the project site is located within the floodplain limits for Moosa Creek, no proposed buildings would be located within these limits.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to flooding as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to flooding with the incorporation of design features and improvements. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(g) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Pursuant to the Preliminary Drainage Study prepared by Alidade Engineering, the proposed Project would redirect runoff, but not in a manner to exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

A water surface pressure gradient hydraulic analysis was performed to clearly demonstrate that the existing box culvert can safely convey peak flows, maintaining hydraulic grade line below the finished surface similar to existing conditions. The results demonstrated the existing culvert can safely convey and increase in design peak from the project site. In addition, the Preliminary Drainage Study also determined that velocity increase would be negligible to the public storm drain in Valley Center Road.

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

- 10(h) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs,

and treatment control BMPs as indicated in response 9(a) would be employed such that potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.

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

- 10(i) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Pursuant to the Preliminary Drainage Study prepared by Alidade Engineering, a portion of the Project site is located within the Moosa Creek floodplain limits. However, no structures are proposed to be located within these limits. Additionally, the Project is for a commercial and retail center and associated improvements and does not propose any residential uses. Therefore, the Project would not place housing within a County or federal floodplain or floodway.

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

- 10(j) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. As previously stated under response 10(i), no structures would be located within a County or federal floodplain or floodway. In addition, the project site is not located within a Dam Inundation Zone.

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

- 10(k) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project is for the development of a commercial and retail center. No residential housing is proposed as part of the Project. In addition, as discussed in response 10(i), no structures would be located within the Moosa Creek floodplain limits and as previously stated in response 10(j), the project site is not located within a Dam Inundation Zone.

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

- 10(l) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The County Office of Emergency Services maintains Dam Evacuation Plans for each dam operational area. These plans contain information concerning the physical situation, affected

jurisdictions, evacuation routes, unique institutions, and event responses. If a “unique institution” is proposed, such as a hospital, school, or retirement home, within dam inundation area, an amendment to the Dam Evacuation Plan would be required. As previously discussed in response 10(j), the project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County.

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

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

10(m)(i) SEICHE: The Project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5) would be applied to the Project. The mitigation measures, as detailed above, requires the Project applicant to comply with Watershed Protection Ordinance, Stormwater Standards Manual, Guidelines for Determining Significance for Hydrology and Water Quality.

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

11. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project:

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 11(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project does not propose any major introduction or expansion of infrastructure. Water and wastewater pipeline extensions would occur only within the project site. Additionally, the Project would include new private access and service road, however these will be on the Project site and would not result in division of any existing surrounding land uses. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from physically dividing an established community as less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 11(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project would permit commercial development of six total retail spaces, including one large market as well as a mini mart for a proposed gas station, which is consistent with the General Commercial use type established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR. The discretionary actions for the Project include a Site Plan to ensure conformance with Community Design Review Area requirements and a Boundary Adjustment with Certificate of Compliance.

The Project site is Zoned General Commercial (C36) and has a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial. The site falls within the Valley Center Community Plan Area. The Project would be consistent with the Valley Center Community Plan. In addition, the project was conditionally approved by the Valley Center Community Planning Group (VCCPG) South Village Subcommittee pursuant to VCCPG meeting minutes dated April 3rd, 2019. Additionally, the VCCPG approved the project June 10th, 2019.

Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to conflicts with land use plans, policies, regulations as less than significant. As the Project would have a less-than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.

2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

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

12. Mineral Resources – Would the Project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

☐☐☐

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

☐☐☐

- 12(a) The GPU EIR determined that impacts to mineral resources would be significant and unavoidable. The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) required classification of land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs). The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Inconclusive” (MRZ-4). However, the Project site is surrounded by dense residential and commercial land uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the Project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the Project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

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

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. The GPU EIR concluded significant and unavoidable impacts to mineral resources, however, the Project would have less than significant impacts for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

13. Noise – Would the Project:

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

Discussion

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

The area surrounding the project site consists of residences, vacant lots, commercial, and industrial uses. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the General Plan, Noise Ordinance, or other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element: Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires projects to comply with a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Projects which could produce noise in excess of 60 dB(A) are required to incorporate design measures or mitigation as necessary to comply with the Noise Element. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc. and dated December 10, 2018, the project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL. The report evaluated the traffic generation from this project and found that it does not create a noise level increase of more than 3 dBA CNEL on any roadways. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404: Based on the Noise Report prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc. and dated December 10, 2018, the non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned General Commercial (C36) that has a one-hour average sound limit of 60 dBA daytime and 55 dBA nighttime. The adjacent properties are zoned Variable Family Residential, General Commercial, and Specific Plan. The primary noise sources from this project would be from the roof-top mechanical ventilation system and on-site truck deliveries. The Noise Report evaluated noise levels from these sources and demonstrated that they comply with the County's Noise Ordinance, Section 36.404. Based on the report, the noise levels from the Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditionings (HVAC) is not expected to exceed the noise standards at the nearest property lines, with the incorporation of the parapet wall as a Project Design Feature. The parapet wall is required to be roughly one-foot taller than the HVAC units and block the line-of-sight from the adjacent property lines. This would result in a cumulative noise level of 43.5 dBA, therefore, complying with the County's standards. The Noise Analysis also states that the project's noise levels from the truck deliveries (which will only occur during the daytime hours of operation) at the nearest adjoining NSLU properties would be 54.5 dBA, which and will not exceed County's daytime noise level limits of 55 dBA.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410: The project will not generate construction noise in excess of Noise Ordinance standards. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

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

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

The project does not propose any residential uses which are sensitive to low ambient vibration. The proposed project consists of an 82,3000 square feet commercial plaza building with 373 parking stalls on an 8.5 gross acre lot.

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

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

As indicated in the response listed under Section 12(a), the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of any applicable noise standards. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. The Noise Report prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc. and dated December 10, 2018, evaluated potential noise impacts that may result from this project and demonstrated that the noise levels comply with the County's Noise standards.

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

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

The project does not involve any operational uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The Noise Report prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc. and dated December 10, 2018, evaluated potential noise impacts that may result from this project and demonstrated that the noise levels comply with the County's Noise standards. In addition, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, the project will not operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24 hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels as less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

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

The project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airport is the Ramona Airport, which is located approximately 12 miles to the east of the project site.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from excessive noise exposure from a public or private airport as less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

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

The project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airport is the Ramona Airport, which is located approximately 12 miles to the east of the project site.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from excessive noise exposure from a public or private airport as less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant by adhering to the project conditions of approval, which are consistent with the GPU EIR.

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

14. Population and Housing – Would the Project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☐☐☐

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐☐☐

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐☐☐

Discussion

14(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project site is designated in the General Plan as General Commercial and is zoned General Commercial (C36). The Project does not propose any new residential use types, nor does it propose extension of roads or substantial extension of infrastructure. In addition, the Project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in the area. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from population growth to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

14(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project does not propose the demolition of any residential structures and thus would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing. As such, replacement housing would not be required elsewhere.

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

14(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project does not propose the demolition of any residential structures and thus would not displace a substantial number of people. As such, replacement housing would not be required elsewhere.

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

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

15. Public Services – Would the Project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

☐☐☐**Discussion**

15(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation for the exception of school services, which remained significant and unavoidable. The proposed Project is for the development of a commercial and retail center with associated improvements. The Project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the Project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.

2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

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

16. Recreation – Would the Project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

☐☐☐

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

☐☐☐

Discussion

16(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project consists of commercial development and does not propose any residential uses which would increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts related to deterioration of parks and recreational facilities to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

16(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project does not propose any new recreational facilities on- or off-site, nor does it propose the expansion of existing recreational facilities. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts related to construction of new recreational facilities to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.

3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

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

17. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?

☐☐☐

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

☐☐☐

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐☐☐

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

☐☐☐

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐☐☐

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

☐☐☐

Discussion

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers and dated July 15th, 2019 was prepared for the proposed Project.

- 17(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines) establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. These

Guidelines incorporate standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards, Mobility Element, and the Transportation Impact Fee Program.

As discussed in the traffic study, new Project trips would be distributed onto County roads. The Project would result in 9,826 driveway average daily trips (ADT), with the Project generating 7,956 primary trips to roadways in the Project area.

Level of Service (LOS) is a professional industry standard by which the operating conditions of a given roadway segment or intersection is measures. Level of Service is defined on a scale of A to F; where LOS A represents the best operating conditions and LOS F represents the worst operating conditions. LOS A facilities are characterized as having free flowing traffic conditions with no restrictions on maneuvering or operating speeds; traffic volumes are low and travel speeds are high. LOS F facilities are characterized as having forced flow with many stoppages and low operating speeds. The LOS ranges are defined below:

Level of Service Ranges			
Level of Service	Roadway Segments – Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volume¹	Signalized Intersections – Delay (Seconds/Vehicle)²	Unsignalized Intersections – Delay (Seconds/Vehicle)²
A	Less Than 1,900	Less Than or Equal to 10.0	Less Than or Equal to
B	1,901 to 4,100	10.1 to 20.0	10.1 to 15.0
C	4,101 to 7,100	20.1 to 35.0	15.1 to 25.0
D	7,101 to 10,900	35.1 to 55.0	25.1 to 35.0
E	10,901 to 16,200	55.1 to 80.0	35.1 to 50.0
F	Greater Than 16,200	Greater than 80.0	Greater than 50.0
¹ The volume ranges are based on the County of San Diego Circulation Element of a Light Collector, the average d vided in Appendix A.			
² Highway Capacity Manual (HCM).			

The Project is anticipated to generate 9,826 driveway average daily trips (ADT), 408 a.m. peak-hour trips (245 inbound and 163 outbound), and 1,020 p.m. peak-hour trips (510 inbound and 510 outbound). Primary trips for the Project are expected to be 7,956 ADT, with 318 a.m. peak hour trips (191 inbound and 127 outbound), and 612 p.m. peak hour trips (306 inbound and 306 outbound).

All study area intersections are anticipated to continue to operate at LOS D or better with the exception of the following: Valley Center Road/ Project Driveway #3/ Mirar de Valle Road; which will continue to operate at LOS F.

Additionally, all study area roadway segments are anticipated to continue to operate at LOS D or better with the exception of the following: Valley Center Road between Thudernut Lane/N. Lake Wohlford Road and Cole Grade Road, and Cole Grade Road between Fruitvale Road and Valley Center Road; both of which will continue to operate at LOS E.

Based on the results of the TIA, the Project would cause direct and cumulative Project impacts to the following intersections and road segments:

Direct

Intersections

- Valley Center Road/ Project Driveway #3/ Mirar De Valle Road

Road Segments

- Valley Center Road (Thundernut Lane/ N. Lake Wolford Road to Cole Grade Road)
- Cole Grade Road (Fruitvale Road to Valley Center Road)

Cumulative

Intersections

- Valley Center Road/ Cole Grade Road
- Valley Center Road/ Project Driveway #3/ Mirar De Valle Road

Road Segments

- Valley Center Road (Thundernut Lane/ N. Lake Wolford Road to Cole Grade Road)
- Cole Grade Road (Fruitvale Road to Valley Center Road)

All County intersections and road segments would not result in significant impacts with the implementation of improvements and/or mitigation measures. Please see below for a list of Project improvements and mitigation measures.

Project Mitigation

The following are the proposed mitigation measures for the Project:

Direct

Valley Center Road/Project Driveway #3/ Mirar de Valle Road

- The Project applicant would be required to implement a signalized intersection

Valley Center Road (Thundernut Lane/ N. Lake Wolford Road to Cole Grade Road)

- A westbound right turn lane would be required to be provided

Cole Grade Road (Fruitvale Road to Valley Center Road)

- A westbound right turn lane would be required to be provided

Cumulative

Valley Center Road/ Cole Grade Road

- The Project applicant would be required to pay a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF)

Valley Center Road/ Project Driveway #3/ Mirar De Valle Road

- The Project applicant would be required to implement as signalized intersection and restriping of lane configurations

Valley Center Road (Thundernut Lane/ N. Lake Wolford Road to Cole Grade Road)

- The Project applicant would be required to pay a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF)

Cole Grade Road (Fruitvale Road to Valley Center Road)

- The Project applicant would be required to pay a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF)

Therefore, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact to County roadway and road segments with the incorporation of GPU EIR mitigation measures Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.7 and Tra-2.1 (as well as Project specific mitigation measures consistent with the GPU EIR) for a less than significant impact with mitigation.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to unincorporated County traffic and LOS standards. The Project would have a less than significant impact with the incorporation of GPU EIR mitigation measures and project specific mitigation measures consistent with the GPU EIR. Therefore, the project would

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

- 17(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The designated congestion management agency for the County is the San Diego Association of governments (SANDAG). In October 2009, the San Diego region elected to be exempt from the State CMP and, since this decision, SANDAG has been abiding by 23 CFR 450.320 to ensure the region's continued compliance with the federal congestion management process. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program and would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR..

- 17(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project site is not located within an Airport Influence Area, Airport Safety Zone, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Area, Avigation Easement, or Overflight Area. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact to air traffic patterns. The Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 17(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The proposed Project would not substantially alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.

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

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

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on emergency access as less than significant with mitigation. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above and is consistent with GPU EIR Mitigation Measure Tra-4.2, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR..

- 17(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the Project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on alternative transportation and rural safety as less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR (Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, Tra-1.7, Tra-2.1 and 4.2) would be applied to the Project. The mitigation measures, as detailed above, would require the Project applicant to comply with the County Public Road Standards, Guidelines for Determining Significance, County TIF Ordinance, coordinate with other jurisdictions to identify appropriate mitigation and implement the Building and Fire Codes to ensure adequate services are in place.

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

18. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project:

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐
☐
☐

Discussion

- 18(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project would discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A Project facility availability form has been received from the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) that indicates that there is adequate capacity to serve the Project.

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

- 18(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project involves new water and wastewater pipeline extensions. However, these extensions would be on-site, and would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis. Water and sewer service would be provided by the VCMWD.

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

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

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

- 18(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. A Service Availability Letter from the VCMWD has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the Project.

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

- 18(e) A Service Availability Letter from the VCMWD District has been provided, which indicates that there is adequate wastewater capacity to serve the Project.

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

18(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the Project. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

19. Wildfire – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐
☐
☐

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

☐
☐
☐

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts in the environment?

☐
☐
☐

Significant
Project
Impact

Impact not
identified by
GPU EIR

Substantial
New
Information

d) Expose people or structures to significant risk, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes?

☐☐☐

Discussion

Wildfire was analyzed within the GPU EIR within Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The guidelines for determining significance stated: the proposed General Plan Update would have a significant impact if it would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. In 2019, the issue of Wildfire was separated into its own section within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines to incorporate the four issue questions above. The GPU EIR did address these issues within the analysis; however they were not called out as separate issue areas. Within the GPU EIR, the issue of Wildland Fires was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

19(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The site is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone (FHSZ). The Project site is within the Valley Center Fire Protection District and is located approximately 1.5 miles from the nearest fire station. Based on a review by County Staff of GIS Aerial Imagery, the site would have an Emergency Response Travel Time of 0 to 5 minutes, which meets the General Plan Safety Element standard for lands designated as Commercial within the Village Regional Category of 5 minutes.

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

19(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project is within a very high fire severity zone and within the Urban-Wildlife Interface Zone. The Project would comply with regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code. Implementation of these fire safety standards would occur during the building permit process and is consistent with GPU mitigation measures Haz-4.2 and Haz-4.3. In addition, the Project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and the County of San Diego General Plan. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the Project would not be expected to experience exacerbated wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing, winds or other factors.

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

19(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would require the installation and maintenance of new private driveways, as well as on and off-site improvements. All infrastructure associated with the Project has been incorporated within this analysis. Therefore, no additional temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment related to associated infrastructure would occur that have not been analyzed in other sections of this environmental document.

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

- 19(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. As previously stated in 19(b), the Project would comply with regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code. The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards and is identified as Marginally Susceptible to potential landslides. Based on review of the Project by County Staff Hydrogeologist, and the flat topography of the site, potential hazards associated with landslides are less than significant. In addition, a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendation would be required to be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the project site would not expose people or structures to significant risk, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes.

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

Conclusion

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

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR (Haz-4.2 and Haz-4.3) would be applied to the Project. These mitigation measures, as detailed above, requires the Project applicant to implement brush management and comply with the building and fire codes.

Appendices

Appendix A – References

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

Appendix A

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

Klutz, Korey; Klutz Biological Consulting, (January 29, 2020), Biological Resource Letter Report

Lindscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, (July 15, 2019), Transportation Impact Analysis

Louden, Jeremy; Ldn Consulting, Inc., (February 10, 2020), Final Climate Action Plan Consistency Review Checklist

Louden, Jeremy; Ldn consulting, Inc., (March 2, 2020), Air Quality Assessment

Moore, Brent C.; Alidade Engineering, (January 29, 2020), Stormwater Quality Management Plan for Priority Development Projects

Moore, Brent C.; Alidade Engineering, (October 15, 2019), CEQA-Level Preliminary Drainage Study

Skinner, Douglas A.; Bell Holdings, LLC, (August 21, 2019), Update Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Phase II Environmental Site Assessment

Smith, Brian F.; Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. (April 11, 2019), Cultural Resources Negative Findings for The Liberty Bell Plaza Project

References

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

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

Appendix B

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

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf