



# County of San Diego

**MARK WARDLAW**  
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123  
[www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds)

**KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY**  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

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

**Date:** December 12, 2019  
**Project Title:** KA Shell Gas Station and Convenience Store  
**Record ID:** PDS2017-STP-17-028, PDS2017-BC-17-0069,  
LOG NO. PDS2017-ER-17-08-008  
**Plan Area:** North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area (Hidden Meadows Community)  
**GP Designation:** General Commercial (C-1)  
**Density:** N/A  
**Zoning:** General Commercial (C36)  
**Min. Lot Size:** N/A  
**Special Area Reg.:** B – Community Design Review  
**Lot Size:** 1.61 Acres (Site Plan Property)  
**Applicant:** KA Enterprises, Eugene Marini (858) 281-6091  
**Staff Contact:** Sean Oberbauer - (858) 495-5747  
[Sean.Oberbauer@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Sean.Oberbauer@sdcounty.ca.gov)

### **Project Description**

#### Location:

The proposed project is located at the southwest corner of Deer Springs Road and North Centre City Parkway in the Hidden Meadows Community of the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan in the unincorporated County of San Diego. The project consists of two commonly owned legal lots on the following APNs: (186-093-19-00, 186-093-23-00, 186-093-37-00, and 186-092-10-00)

#### Site Description:

The Site Plan is proposed on an approximately 1.61-acre property in order to authorize the construction and operation of a convenience store and gas station. The project site is subject to the Village Regional General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation General Commercial (C-1). Zoning for the site is General Commercial (C36). The project site is located directed adjacent to Interstate 15 (I-15), Deer Springs Road, and North Centre City Parkway. The Site Plan property contains an existing patio furniture sale use structure authorized under a Major Use Permit (Record ID: 3300-02-022).

#### Discretionary Actions:

The project consists of the following actions: Site Plan (STP) and Boundary Adjustment (BC). The Site Plan would allow for the construction of a convenience store and gas station and the Boundary

Adjustment would result in changes of the acreage of two existing legal lots to consist of 1.23 and 1.61 acres. The Site Plan is proposed on the 1.61-acre property.

**Project Description:**

The project consists of the demolition of an existing patio furniture sales structure and shed (3,430 square feet total), and the construction of a 3,500 square-foot convenience store, a 5,983 square-foot canopy with eight multi-product dispensers which would contain a total of 16 gas pumps and 19 parking spaces. Earthwork consists of 8,800 cubic yards of fill, 4,109 cubic yards of cut, and a net import of 4,691 cubic yards of fill. Of the total quantities of cut and fill, approximately 680 cubic yards of material would be hauled off site and 2,020 cubic yards of material would be removed and recompact on-site. Water service for the project would be provided by the Valley Center Municipal Water District. The project also proposes the use of an on-site wastewater treatment system. Access to the site would be provided by a driveway connecting to North Centre City Parkway.

The project site is subject to the Village Regional General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation General Commercial (C-1). Zoning for the site is General Commercial (C36). The proposed uses are consistent with the Zoning and General Plan Land Use Designation of the property.

**Overview**

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

**General Plan Update Program EIR**

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

generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the GPU.

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

### Summary of Findings

The KA Mega Mart and Gas Station (PDS2017-STP-17-028 & PDS2017-BC-17-0069) is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures (see [http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS\\_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR\\_7.00 - Mitigation Measures 2011.pdf](http://www.sdcountry.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 proposed project consists of a commercial use and does not propose additional development density or residential uses that would be in conflict with the General Commercial (C-1) General Plan Land Use Designation or Village Regional Category for which the GPU EIR was certified.

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

The subject property is no different than other properties in the surrounding area, and there are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The project site is located in an area adjacent to commercially zoned property along Mountain Meadow Road and North Centre City Parkway on a project site containing an existing patio furniture sales use. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the project would not result in any peculiar effects.

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

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

The proposed project is consistent with the use characteristics and limitations of the development considered by the GPU EIR through the application of a Site Plan and would represent a small

part of the growth that was forecasted for build-out of the General Plan. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.

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

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

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

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

<hr/> Signature	<hr/> <b>December 12, 2019</b> Date
<hr/> <b>Sean Oberbauer</b> Printed Name	<hr/> <b>Project Manager</b> Title

## **CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist**

### **Overview**

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

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

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

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>1. Aesthetics</b> – 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) Scenic vistas are available in the project vicinity as the project is located adjacent to I-15, a Scenic Highway identified in the General Plan, and between Merriam Mountains and the Hidden Meadows Community. The project is located within the boundaries of the I-15 Design Review Corridor which requires the processing of a Site Plan permit in order to demonstrate conformance with the I-15 Corridor Design Review Guidelines. Plot plans including a site design and layout, architecture criteria, walls, fences, landscape palettes and materials have been submitted as part of the Site Plan application process. The project proposes re-development of an existing site that contains an existing commercial use. The size of the convenience store will be of comparable square footage to the existing patio furniture sales structure. Views of the rolling hills and terrain located east of the project site will not be impacted as the site is located on a property surrounding by fill slopes and roadways located at a height higher or equal to the proposed pad elevation. Drivers utilizing I-15 will have intermittent views of the project site as property located south of the project site contains mature vegetation which partially screen the site. Similar commercial uses and structures are located adjacent to I-15 and within views of the project vicinity including an ARCO and AM/PM convenience store located west of the project site on the western portion of I-15. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- 1(b) The project site is located adjacent to the Interstate 15 Scenic Highway, Scenic Highway identified in the County of San Diego General Plan. Refer to response 1(a) for a discussion regarding impacts to scenic resources.
- 1(c) The project would be consistent with existing visual character of the project site and views within the community. The proposed project consists of the redevelopment of an existing site and will not substantially alter landform steep slopes. The proposed convenience store and gas station will be located on a property with a previously permitted commercial use for outdoor sales of patio furniture. All retaining walls will be required to be landscaped as detailed on the preliminary landscape plan. The project is consistent with the applicable sign regulations as well as the "G" Height Designator in the Zoning Ordinance which requires structures to be a maximum height of 35-feet. The existing visual character of views along roadways in the project area consist of incidental commercial and residential uses located adjacent to hills and mountains along each side of I-15. Refer to response 1(a) for additional discussions regarding impacts to the existing visual character of the

project site and vicinity. The project as designed will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

- 1(d) Commercial lighting would be required to conform with the County's Light Pollution Code to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties and minimize impacts to dark skies. The project will be required to demonstrate conformance with the County's Lighting Code during the Building Permit Process. The project is also subject to the performance and lighting standards outlined Section 6300 of the Zoning Ordinance in order to prevent light pollution and spill onto adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area

### Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources – Would the Project:</b>			
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 project site contains lands identified as Soils of Statewide Significance. However, the project site contains existing structures and is previously disturbed. A Major Use Permit (3300-02-022) was approved in 2004 which authorized an outdoor sales patio furniture use on the property. The property is also surrounded by highways and roads which would make the property difficult to support agriculture. Thus, the proposed project would not convert agricultural resources to a non-agricultural use.

- 2(b) The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract or agriculturally zoned land. The nearest Williamson Act contract or Agricultural Preserve Area is located over a half of a mile northeast of the project site.
- 2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the property.
- 2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest lands.
- 2(e) As discussed in 2(a), the project site contains existing structures and is previously disturbed. A Major Use Permit (3300-02-022) was approved in 2004 which authorized an outdoor sales patio furniture use on the property. The property is also surrounded by highways and roads which would make the property difficult to support agriculture. Incidental agricultural uses are spread between residential uses at a minimum of approximately 1,000 feet east of the project site. The proposed project does not consist of a use that would prohibit expansion or conversion of agricultural uses within the project vicinity as it proposes to redevelop an existing operating commercial patio furniture use into a convenience store and gas station that is surrounded by roadways and highways. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources to a non-agricultural use.

### Conclusion

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

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



## Discussion

- 3(a) The project proposes development that was anticipated and considered by SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Based on an Air Quality Study prepared by Rincon Consultants dated August 14, 2019, the demographic and socioeconomic estimates provided by the SANDAG Data Surfer database, unincorporated San Diego County is forecast to increase the number of civilian jobs by 41 percent between 2012 (116,268 jobs) to 2050 (163,933 jobs; SANDAG 2013). The project is anticipated to provide a total of potentially nine new employment opportunities, and these positions are expected to be filled by those in the Escondido, Hidden Meadows and neighboring communities. Project employment opportunities would account for approximately 0.02% of the job growth forecast by SANDAG for the unincorporated County.

The proposed project is subject to the General Plan Village Regional Category and General Commercial (C-1) Land Use Designation. The project is also subject to the North County Metropolitan and Hidden Meadows Community Plan Policies as well as the I-15 Corridor Design Guidelines. The property is zoned General Commercial (C36) which permits Gas Stations and Convenience Stores in accordance with Sections 2362, 2363, and 2980 of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan Designation and the Zoning for the site and a General Plan Amendment or Zoning Reclassification is not required for the project. As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below screening levels, and will not violate any ambient air quality standards.

- 3(b) Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening level criteria established by County air quality guidelines for determining significance based on the data outlined in an Air Quality Study prepared by Rincon Consultants dated August 14, 2019. Based on a Traffic Impact Study dated October 15, 2019 prepared by Bill Darnell and Associates, the project will result in 2,560 Average Daily Trips (ADT), 179 AM peak hour trips, and 205 PM peak hour driveway trips. According to the SANDAG Not So Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, gas stations with convenience stores generate only 21% of their total ADT as primary trips with the remaining trips being related to diverted or pass-by trip. Project air emissions associated with construction and operational activities were estimated in the project's Air Quality Study. The emissions generated during construction activities and the operation of the project would not exceed San Diego County screening level thresholds for VOCs, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, SO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, or PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Therefore, the project's regional air quality impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be necessary.
- 3(c) The project would contribute PM<sub>10</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and VOCs emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening thresholds (see question 3(b) above)).
- 3(d) The project consists of the construction of a convenience store and gas station and does not propose additional residences or structures for human occupancy. The nearest residence and potential sensitive receptor to the project site is located approximately over 600 feet east of the project site. The project is located adjacent to I-15 and is surrounded by roadways adjacent to lands that are zoned for commercial uses. Potential pollutant concentrations associated with the use and construction of the project consist of

concentration of vehicle emissions due to ongoing traffic and use of the project site and potential fuels associated with the use of the gas station. The project site is located directly adjacent to I-15 and surrounding roadways which have existing operations of vehicular traffic. Fuels associated with the operation of the gas station must be permitted through the Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division through a hazardous materials business plan and permits for underground storage tanks. Underground storage tanks require maintenance and inspections in order to ensure that no leaks of fuel product will result in exposing any potential sensitive receptors to pollutants or leaking of product into the soil on the project site. Further information can be found in response 3(b).

- 3(e) According to the Air Quality Study prepared by Rincon Consultants dated August 14, 2019, The project could produce objectionable odors during construction and operation; however, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts and would not be distinguishable due to the location of the project adjacent to I-15 and the distance of sensitive receptors from the project site. Land uses and industrial operations typically associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed operations of a convenience store and gas station are not typically associated with objectionable odors, though odors from gasoline product could be noticeable in the immediate vicinity of the site. The project site vicinity is adjacent to the I-15 offramp and approximately 375 feet from I-15. The nearest potentially sensitive receptors are more than 600 feet from the site, and it is unlikely that the odors from the project would be distinguishable from existing sources given the vehicle emissions associated with adjacent roadways in the vicinity of the project site. The project is also required to comply with SDAPCD Rule 51, public nuisance, which would require the limiting of objectionable odors to be emitted from the site. Therefore, the project would not generate objectionable odors.

### Conclusion

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

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

#### 4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐
☐
☐

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐
☐
☐

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☐ ☐ ☐

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

☐ ☐ ☐

e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

☐ ☐ ☐

### Discussion

- 4(a) Based on a GIS analysis, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, aerial imagery, and review of previous permits, it was determined that the project site is disturbed and does not support habitat that requires on-site or off-site mitigation. The project site is directly adjacent to the I-15 highway and the site is completely surrounded by roads. The project site is also not located within a pre-approved mitigation area within an adopted MSCP or the draft North County MSCP. The subject property has been disturbed since the 1960s upon the initial construction of the existing on-site structure. Surrounding roadways and highways have been widened over time since the late 1960s. All mature trees and vegetation on-site consist of ornamental trees that have been planted to support the existing patio furniture use. The Site Plan property is currently covered by a Major Use Permit (Record ID: 3300-02-022) which authorized an outdoor sales patio furniture store. The Major Use Permit was found to be exempt from CEQA in accordance with Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines as the project site has been historically disturbed. A breeding season avoidance notice will be placed on any future decision for the project which will notify the applicant that they can submit evidence and documentation to Fish and Wildlife and applicable agencies that demonstrates compliance with breeding seasons (February 1 – August 31) of potential nesting birds within existing ornamental mature trees surrounding the patio furniture site in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Therefore, the project will not 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.
- 4(b) Based on aerial imagery, GIS data, and previous permits associated with the property, no wetlands or jurisdictional waters were found onsite or offsite. As detailed in response a) above, potential direct and indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in the RPO, NCCP, Fish and Wildlife Code, and Endangered Species Act have been evaluated and project will not require the purchase of off-site mitigation or dedication of habitat on-site as it is a previously disturbed property.
- 4(c) The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, therefore, no impacts will occur.

- 4(d) Based on a GIS analysis, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, aerial imagery, and review of previous permits, it was determined that the site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor as identified on MSCP maps nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The site would not assist in local wildlife movement as it lacks connecting vegetation and visual continuity with other potential habitat areas in the general project vicinity. The project site is directly adjacent to the I-15 highway and the site is completely surrounded by roads. The project site is also not located within a pre-approved mitigation area within an adopted MSCP or the Draft North County MSCP. The subject property has been disturbed since the 1960s upon the initial construction of the existing on-site structure. Surrounding roadways and highways have been widened over time since the late 1960s. All mature trees and vegetation on-site consist of ornamental trees that have been planted to support the existing patio furniture use. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any established wildlife corridor or movement of wildlife species.
- 4(e) The project is located within a draft portion of the North County MSCP and outside of the adopted South County MSCP. Because the project is located outside of the adopted South County MSCP, conformance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance is not applicable. The property is located outside of pre-approved mitigation area as identified by the North County MSCP and does not support Coastal Sage Scrub. The project is in conformance with the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) because it does not propose development of steep slopes and the project site does not contain sensitive lands and wetlands as defined by the RPO. Further information regarding conformance with the RPO and other applicable ordinances can be found within the Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated December 12, 2019. Therefore, 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.

### Conclusion

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

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

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

### Discussion

5(a) Based on an analysis of records, databases, historic imagery, aerial imagery, and review of previous permits by a County approved archaeologist, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The project site contains an existing structure currently being used for the operation of an outdoor sale patio furniture use which was authorized under a Major Use Permit (Record ID: 3300-02-022). The structure was constructed in the 1960s and is over 50 years old. However, the exterior of the structure has been altered including changes for storage areas for the patio furniture sale use. The structure does not display a high degree of integrity and would not be considered historically significant.

5(b) Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by the County of San Diego staff archaeologist, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. The project site has been historically disturbed since the 1960s and since the approval of a previous Major Use Permit (Record ID: 3300-02-022) for the operation of an outdoor sales patio furniture sales use. The project site has also been subject to artificial fill and previous grading during the construction of the original on-site structure and adjacent roadways and highways. County staff requested a Sacred Lands Check with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC responded on July 25, 2017. The search had "negative results, however the area is sensitive for potential tribal cultural resources."

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: grading monitoring under the supervision of a County-approved archaeologist and a Native American observer 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 environmental documentation associated with the project does not consist of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report which requires AB-53 consultation. However, the project will be conditioned to include monitoring in order to mitigate for potential impacts to cultural resources in the event that they are encountered during earth disturbing activities.

5(c) 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.

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

formations that have no potential to contain unique paleontological resources. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

### Conclusion

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

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?	<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

- 6(a)(i) 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, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault.

- 6(a)(ii) To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.
- 6(a)(iii) The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. The project consists of remedial grading in order to recompact soils associated with the historic use of the project site.
- 6(a)(iv) The site is not located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. The project proposes remedial grading in order to recompact soils associated with the historic use of the project site.
- 6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Placentia sandy loam, 5 to 9 slopes, eroded, Placentia sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes, and Visalia sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, and that has a soil erodibility rating of severe. However, the project site has also been subject to artificial fill and previous grading during the construction of the original on-site structure and adjacent roadways and highways. In addition, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.
- 6(c) The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. The project site has also been subject to artificial fill and previous grading during the construction of the original on-site structure and adjacent roadways and highways. Furthermore, the project will be required to comply with the WPO and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils and will not develop steep slopes that could cause landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.
- 6(d) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County the project is underlain by Placentia sandy loam, 5 to 9 slopes, eroded, Placentia sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes, and Visalia sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, which may contain expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). However, the project site has also been subject to artificial fill and previous grading during the construction of the original on-site structure and adjacent roadways and highways. The project will not result in a significant impact because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.
- 6(e) An onsite wastewater treatment design and percolation report dated June 23, 2017 has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Environmental Health. Installation of the wastewater treatment and septic systems will be overseen by the Department of Environmental Health during the construction and building permit phase of the project.

**Conclusion**

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

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

**Discussion**

- 7(a) The project would produce GHG emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion. However, the project falls below the screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that would have less than cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.

The 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 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 proposed project would implement all applicable measures identified in the Checklist and would therefore be consistent with the County's Climate Action Plan. The project will be required to submit a formal Landscape Documentation Package that is compliant with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance. The Landscape Plan will be required the project to demonstrate a 40% reduction in the Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) for outdoor use landscaping. The project would be consistent with the County's Climate Action Plan and General Plan assumptions through the implementation of measures identified in the County's CAP Checklist.

In order to supplement the CAP Checklist, the applicant prepared a memo (dated November 18, 2019) which includes a discussion related to the Traffic generated by the project as Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Climate Action Plan is aimed at reducing commute Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). According to the SANDAG Not So Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, gas stations with convenience stores generate only 21% of their total ADT as primary trips with the remaining trips being related to diverted or pass-by trip. The diverted or pass-by trips are typically generated by uses within the existing community. The nature of the use is intended to serve density in existing travel patterns associated with developed communities. The maximum amount of employees to serve and operate the site will be approximately three employees and their commutes will occur outside of typical commute hours. To the extent feasible, the project would encourage alternative transportation and



carpooling programs for employees of the proposed use. However, even a significant reduction in employee commutes would not result in a significant reduction in the project's overall VMT due to the minimal number of employees. Therefore, the project would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment.

- 7(b) The proposed project is subject to the General Plan Village Regional Category and General Commercial (C-1) Land Use Designation. The project is also subject to the North County Metropolitan and Hidden Meadows Community Plan Policies as well as the I-15 Corridor Design Guidelines. The property is zoned General Commercial (C36) which permits Gas Stations and Convenience Stores in accordance with Sections 2362, 2363, and 2980 of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan Designation and the Zoning for the site and a General Plan Amendment or Zoning Reclassification is not required for the project. Additionally, the project has demonstrated consistency with the County's Climate Action Plan (see Question 7(a) above). Therefore, the project would be consistent with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

### Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

- 8(a) The project proposes storage of potential hazardous materials consisting of fuels that will be sold in product dispensers and stored in underground storage tanks on the project site. Fuels associated with the operation of the gas station must be permitted through the Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division through a hazardous materials business plan and permits for underground storage tanks. Underground storage tanks require maintenance and inspections in order to ensure that no leaks of fuel product will result in exposing any potential sensitive receptors to pollutants or leaking of product into the soil on the project site. The project site has been previously disturbed and graded and received authorization to operate an outdoor patio furniture sales use through a Major Use Permit (Record ID: 3300-02-022) approved in 2004. Any existing onsite septic systems will be required to be pumped and removed under the permitting of the Department of Environmental Health. Additionally, prior to demolition of the existing structure, a lead and asbestos survey will be conducted and a demolition permit will be required from the Department of Environmental Health for the removal and demolition of the existing structure in order to ensure that the project site is not subject to release of hazardous substances. Therefore, the project will not 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 as the project requires additional permits for construction and operation of the site.
- 8(b) The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Further information can be found in response 8(a). Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.
- 8(c) Based on historic imagery, review of previous permits, and review of applicable databases, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense

Site. The project site has been previously disturbed and graded and received authorization to operate an outdoor patio furniture sales use through a Major Use Permit (Record ID: 3300-02-022) approved in 2004. Any existing onsite septic systems will be required to be pumped and removed under the permitting of the Department of Environmental Health. Additionally, prior to demolition of the existing structure, a lead and asbestos survey will be conducted and a demolition permit will be required from the Department of Environmental Health for the removal and demolition of the existing structure in order to ensure that the project site is not subject to release of hazardous substances. Further information regarding ongoing operations of the site and potential release of hazardous substances can be found in response 8(a). Therefore, the project will not emit or release hazardous materials due to the historic uses of the site.

8(d) The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

8(e) The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

8(f)(i) **OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:** The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

8(f)(ii) **SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN:** The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

8(f)(iii) **OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT:** The project is not located along the coastal zone.

8(f)(iv) **EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN:** The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

8(f)(v) **DAM EVACUATION PLAN:** The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

8(g) 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. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated October 2019 has been received from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be 1 to 2 minutes which is within the maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element. The project design has been reviewed and approved by the San Diego County Fire Authority. A Deer Springs Fire Protection District Station is located west of the project site directly across I-15 which is in close proximity to the project site. The project does not propose a residential use for occupancy. Therefore, the project will not 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

8(h) The project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

### Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:</b>			
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

☐ ☐ ☐

f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

☐ ☐ ☐

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

☐ ☐ ☐

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

☐ ☐ ☐

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

☐ ☐ ☐

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

☐ ☐ ☐

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

☐ ☐ ☐

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?

☐ ☐ ☐

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

☐ ☐ ☐

## Discussion

9(a) The project will require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. A Priority Development Project Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) was prepared for the project by Omega Consultants dated August 13, 2019. The SWQMP demonstrates that the project would comply with all requirements of the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO). The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or structural BMPs to reduce potential pollutants and address hydromodification impacts to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program (JRMP) and BMP Design Manual, 2019.

In addition to WPO compliance this facility is subject to compliance with the Industrial Storm Water Permit with the CA State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and is required to file a Notice of Intent (NOI) and develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in the event that the project impacts an area of 1 or more acres

- 9(b) The project lies in the Twin Oaks (904.53) hydrologic subareas within the Carlsbad hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of these watersheds are impaired. Constituents of concern in the watershed include phosphorous, nutrients, bacteria, and trace metals. The project could have the potential to contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) The project will obtain its water supply from the Valley Center Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- 9(e) As outlined in the project's SWQMP and in responses 9(a) and 9(b), the project will implement source control and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff and will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(f) A Drainage Study was prepared by Omega Consultants dated August 13, 2019 for the proposed project. It was determined that the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or area. As outlined in the project's SWQMP, the project will implement source control and/or structural BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion
- 9(g) The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The majority of the proposed improvements associated with the project will drain to a biofiltration BMP as well as runoff will be conveyed by a brow ditch that outlets to a rip-rap pad.
- 9(h) The project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.
- 9(i) No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations.
- 9(j) No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site or offsite improvement locations. Therefore, no structures would be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows.
- 9(k) The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area.

9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.

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

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

9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

### Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>10. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project:</b>			
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

10(a) The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Additionally, build-out of this site was anticipated in the GPU EIR and GPU EIR mitigation measures Lan-1.1 through Lan-1.3 requiring coordination efforts to ensure that development of the site would not divide an established community.

10(b) The proposed project is subject to the General Plan Village Regional Category and General Commercial (C-1) Land Use Designation. The project is also subject to the North County Metropolitan and Hidden Meadows Community Plan Policies as well as the I-15 Corridor Design Guidelines. The property is zoned General Commercial (C36) which permits Gas Stations and Convenience Stores in accordance with Sections 2362, 2363, and 2980 of the Zoning Ordinance. The project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

### Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>11. Mineral Resources – Would the Project:</b>			

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? ☐ ☐ ☐

11(a) The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as areas containing mineral occurrences of undetermined resource significance or “Resources Potentially Present” (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by Highways and roads with intermittent residential 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, the project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

11(b) The project site is not located in an Extractive Use Zone (S-82), nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25). Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

### Conclusion

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

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

### 12. Noise – Would the Project:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? ☐ ☐ ☐

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☐

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☐

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles ☐ ☐ ☐



of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐
☐
☐

## Discussion

12(a) The area surrounding the project site consists of highway uses such as I-15, roadways, vacant land, and residential and agricultural 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. The project is located directly adjacent to I-15 and within a 60 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour as identified by the General Plan. However, the project does not propose residential occupancy or sensitive receptors to noise levels that are not in compliance with the Noise Element of the General Plan as the proposed project consists of a commercial use through the construction and operation of a gas station with a convenience store.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404: The project consists of a commercial development for a gas station and convenience store. Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project's property line as the primary ongoing operation noise sources consist of intermittent vehicular truck signals and heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. 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 Transportation and Utility Corridor (S94) and Neighborhood Commercial (C35) and currently do not include existing sensitive receptors or residential uses. The project is located directly adjacent to I-15 and within a 60 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour as identified by the General Plan. The nearest residence and sensitive receptor located near the project site is approximately 600 feet away from the project site. The project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

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

12(b) The proposed project does not propose residential occupancy or introduction of sensitive receptors to groundborne noise or vibration, nor does the project propose any major, new, or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways, major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

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

12(d) The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Vehicular traffic on nearby roadways and heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. The project site is located over 600 feet away from the nearest residence. 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 the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

12(e) 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.

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

### Conclusion

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

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

### Discussion

13(a) The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or

encourage population growth in an area. The project does not include an increase in population

13(b) The project will not displace existing housing as the project involves the construction of a gas station and convenience and the removal of an existing outdoor patio furniture sales building. No occupied residential structures or housing are proposed to be removed as part of the project.

13(c) The proposed project will not displace any numbers of people as the project consists of the removal of an existing authorized outdoor patio furniture sales use by Major Use Permit Record ID: PDS2002-3300-02-022.

### Conclusion

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

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

### 14. Public Services – Would the Project:

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

☐
☐
☐

### Discussion

14(a) The project does not include construction of new or altered public service facilities. The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan projections and Land Use regulations, therefore, service ratios for public services associated with the project were analyzed within the GPU EIR and the project is not anticipated to require additional services. Based on the project's service availability forms, the project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

### Conclusion

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

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

### 15. Recreation – Would the Project:

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

☐
☐
☐

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

15(a) The project does not propose any residential use and will not increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities.

15(b) The project does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

### Conclusion

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

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>16. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Discussion

- 16(a) Level of Service (LOS) is a professional industry standard by which the operating conditions of a given roadway segment or intersection is measured. 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.

Based on a Traffic Impact Study dated October 15, 2019 prepared by Bill Darnell and Associates, the project will result in 2,560 Average Daily Trips (ADT), 179 AM peak hour trips, and 205 PM peak hour driveway trips. By taking into account the existing patio furniture use, the project will generate an addition 1,735 ADT, 126 AM peak hour and 138 PM peak hour trips. The proposed project will not have any impacts that will result in adjacent roadways or segments to operate at a LOS below the acceptable LOS D. The Traffic Impact Study identifies a potential direct impact to the Mesa Rock Road and the I-15 southbound on and off ramp, however, the segment will still operate at an acceptable LOS D. The project will be subject to the payment of Traffic Impact Fees in accordance with the Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program in order to address potential cumulative impacts associated with the project and to roadways within the vicinity of the project site. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

- 16(b) As discussed in 16(a), based on a Traffic Impact Study dated October 15, 2019 prepared by Bill Darnell and Associates, the project will result in 2,560 Average Daily Trips (ADT), 179 AM peak hour trips, and 205 PM peak hour driveway trips. By taking into account the existing patio furniture use, the project will generate an additional 1,735 ADT, 126 AM peak hour and 138 PM peak hour trips. According to the SANDAG Not So Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, gas stations with convenience stores generate only 21% of their total ADT as primary trips with the remaining trips being related to diverted or pass-by trips given the nature of the use. The additional 1,735 ADTs from the project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG. The project also primarily generates 538 ADT as a result of the use. The project would be conditioned to obtain appropriate encroachments and approvals for any work within Caltrans or County of San Diego Right-of-Way as the project is located adjacent to roadways maintained by multiple jurisdictions. Therefore, the project does not 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
- 16(c) The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport. Therefore, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that could result in substantial safety risks.
- 16(d) The project will be conditioned to maintain adequate unobstructed sight distance. Therefore, the proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.

- 16(e) The Deer Springs Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access. A Deer Springs Fire Protection District fire station is located on the western side of I-15 which is less than a quarter mile from the project site.
- 16(f) Based on the Traffic Impact Study, land use, and Site Plan application, and adjacent road classifications, the project is conditioned to construct and install a six-foot decomposed granite (DG) sidewalk along the North Centre City Parkway frontage. The project will also be conditioned to execute an Irrevocable Offer of Dedication (IOD) for future right-of-way to accommodate a maximum of 49-feet from the centerline of North Centre City Parkway. The project will not impede or result in the removal of existing roadways or transit systems such as an existing park-and-ride located north of the Site Plan project site. Therefore, the project will not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to transportation/traffic; 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
<b>17. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project:</b>			
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

- 17(a) The project proposes on-site wastewater treatment or septic designs that have been reviewed and approved by the Department of Environmental Health. The project as designed does not require wastewater treatment from a sewer provider. The Department of Environmental Health would permit the installation of the on-site wastewater treatment design during the construction and building permit phase of the project. The current project as designed would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board as preliminary designs of a wastewater treatment system for the property anticipate that the project could potentially generate a maximum of 2,600 gallons per day which is below thresholds that would require direct permitting from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- 17(b) The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Based on the service availability forms received, the project will not require construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. A service availability form has been provided which indicates adequate water services are available to the project from Valley Center Municipal Water District. The project proposes on-site wastewater treatment or septic designs that have been reviewed and approved by the Department of Environmental Health. The project as designed does not require wastewater treatment from a sewer provider. The Department of Environmental Health would permit the installation of the on-site wastewater treatment design during the construction and building permit phase of the project. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.
- 17(c) The project involves new storm water drainage facilities including bioretention basins as detailed in Stormwater Quality Management Plan dated However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(d) The project requires water service from the Valley Center Municipal Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Valley Center Municipal Water District has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.
- 17(e) The project proposes the use of an on-site wastewater treatment design that has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Environmental Health. The project does not propose to connect to a sewer system for treatment of wastewater. Therefore, the proposed project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.
- 17(f) All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the project.
- 17(g) The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility during the construction and demolition phase of the project. The project does not anticipate ongoing generation of solid waste during operations of the project. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-

44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project is also required to obtain approval from the Department of Environmental Health for the installation and operation of underground storage tanks as well as a hazardous materials business plan for any storage of fuels related to the use of the gas station on-site. The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**Conclusion**

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

**Attachments:**

Appendix A – References

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



## Appendix A

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

**Air Quality:**

Air Quality Study, Rincon Consultants, Inc., August 14, 2019

**Cultural:**

Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands Check, July 25, 2017

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions:**

Climate Action Plan Checklist dated August 2019

Greenhouse Gas Memo, Rincon Consultants, Inc. and KA Enterprises, November 18, 2019

**Hydrology/Water Quality:**

Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP), Omega Consultants, August 13, 2019

Drainage Study, Omega Consultants, August 13, 2019

**Percolation Report and On-site Wastewater Treatment:**

Percolation Test Report and On-site Wastewater Treatment, Vinje and Middleton Engineering, Inc., June 2017

**Previous Major Use Permit:**

Major Use Permit (Record ID: 3300-02-022) Approved January 15, 2004, Plot Plans

Major Use Permit (Record ID: 3300-02-022) Approved January 15, 2004, Decision

**Service Availability Forms:**

Project Facility Availability - Fire, Deer Springs Fire Protection District, October 18, 2019

Project Facility Availability – Water, Valley Center Municipal Water District, June 9, 2017

**Traffic/Transportation:**

Traffic Study, Darnell and Associates, October 15, 2019

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