



# County of San Diego

**DAHVIA LYNCH**  
DIRECTOR

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

**VINCE NICOLETTI**  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

August 24, 2023

## **CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G)**

1. Title: Paradise Valley Gas Station  
Project Number(s): PDS2019-ZAP-19-003, PDS2020-ER-20-18-001
2. Lead agency name and address:  
County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services (PDS)  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310  
San Diego, CA 92123-1239
3. a. Contact: Jae Roland-Chase, Land Use Environmental Planner  
b. Phone number: (619) 380-3130  
c. E-mail: Jae.Rolandchase@sdcounty.ca.gov
4. Project location:  
0 Paradise Valley Road, Spring Valley, Spring Valley Community Planning Area, County of San Diego, CA 91977  
Thomas Guide Coordinates: N/A  
APN 584-160-52
5. Project Applicant name and address:  
Joseph Brikho  
BPI1E&P, LLC.  
5494 Mission Center Road, San Diego, CA 92108
6. General Plan  
Community Plan: Spring Valley  
Land Use Designation: Limited Impact Industrial (I-1)  
Density: N/A  
Floor Area Ratio (FAR): N/A

7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: Industrial  
Minimum Lot Size: N/A  
Special Area Regulation: N/A

8. Description of project:

The proposed project consists of development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash on an approximately 0.5-acre (21,548-square-foot [-sf]) parcel in the community of Spring Valley in San Diego County.

#### Project Location and Setting

The project site is located in an urbanized area of the Spring Valley community and is bordered by Paradise Valley Road to the west, Elkelton Place to the south, and State Route (SR-) 125 to the east (Figure 1). The site is a tapered quadrangle that is approximately 220 feet wide fronting Paradise Valley Road, 130 feet wide fronting Elkelton Place, 285 feet wide along the eastern site boundary, and 18 feet wide along the northern site boundary. The southbound SR-125 on-ramp is located to the north of the project site and continues as an elevated ramp close to the eastern boundary of the project site (approximately 60 feet from the northeast corner of the site to 210 feet from the southeast corner of the site). The southbound SR-125 off-ramp is located approximately 90 feet to the east of the project site (from eastern site boundary to centerline) at ground level. The project site is currently vacant, undeveloped, and relatively flat, with lightly varied topography between 284 to 286 feet above sea level (Figure 2).

#### Project Components

The project would include a gas station with four multi-product dispensers to serve up to eight vehicles simultaneously and a 2,318-sf canopy. The project would also include a 3,555-sf convenience store building, an 855-sf carwash tunnel, and 8 on-site vehicle parking spaces adjacent to the gas station.

The proposed gas station would include four underground storage tanks (USTs), one for each of the three grades of gasoline (regular, mid-range, and premium) and diesel fuel to be dispensed during project operation. The four USTs would contain the following capacities:

- 6,000 gallons for diesel;
- 8,000 gallons for premium grade gasoline;
- 12,000 gallons for E85 flex fuel; and
- 16,000 gallons for regular grade gasoline.

The USTs would be located underground between the four multi-product dispensers and the proposed trash enclosure (located along the east project site boundary) (Figure 3). The project would include a Veeder-Root Carbon Canister Vapor Polisher (CCVP) system, which is an advanced system for managing vapor containment of USTs at gas

stations to emissions below California Air Resources Board (CARB) standards (Veeder-Root 2019). The CCVP would be mounted to the vent risers to be located next to the proposed trash enclosure. A Stage II vapor recovery system (balance system) would be used with the CCVP to ensure efficient capture of vehicle tank vapors during actual vehicle fueling activities.

#### Access and Circulation

Access to the project site is from a driveway located on Paradise Valley Road. The project would provide eight off-street parking spaces: six spaces would be standard parking spaces, one space would be designated as handicap parking, and one space would be designated van pool with the option of being converted to an electric vehicle (EV) charging space based on future needs. The gas station would also provide eight parking spaces by the eight pump stations under the canopy.

#### Off-Site Improvements

The project also includes an off-site improvement to install a concrete-filled traffic median with a 6-inch-high curb located on Paradise Valley Road on the portion of Paradise Valley Road north of Elkerton Boulevard to the intersection of Paradise Valley Road and the SR-125 on-ramp. The conceptual design estimates the median would require approximately 1,500 sf of stamped concrete fill and 700 sf of 6-inch-high curb bordering; the area of the conceptual median would be approximately 0.05 acres (2,200 sf). Installation of the median would not require soil excavation work; it is anticipated that the proposed median would be installed by scouring the pavement along Paradise Valley Boulevard and placing the concrete in place ("grind and overlay").

The project would also include raising the existing guy wire supporting the existing power pole to 30 feet above the ground, running the existing guy wire above the project site (up to 30 feet, aerial) to maintain wire tension, and connecting it to a new post located directly off-site in the undeveloped portion of the right-of-way that runs between the project site and existing sidewalk along Paradise Valley Road. The new post, proposed by San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), would be located approximately 65 to 70 feet north from the center of the existing project site driveway. This improvement would ensure safe operations of proposed uses and vehicular circulation on the project site.

#### Construction

The proposed development would require site preparation and grading. An estimated 100 cubic yards (CY) of soil would be cut and recompacted on site. An additional estimated 550 CY of fill would be imported to the Project site. Project construction is estimated to take between six to seven months, starting in June 2024. Project opening is anticipated for early 2025.

#### Operation

The proposed gas station and convenience store would operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, with a total of 10 employees (three working at any given time). The car wash

will operate between 6 a.m. and 10 p.m., seven days a week. The eight pump stations would provide three grades of gasoline (regular, mid-range, and premium) and diesel. Annual estimated gasoline throughput for the proposed gas station is 1 to 1.2 million gallons (850,000 to 1,050,000 gallons of gasoline and 100,000 to 150,000 gallons of diesel).

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is located in the Spring Valley Community Plan area, with residential development approximately 150 feet west of the project site and an outdoor sand and soil lot located to the south. The community of Spring Valley is characterized as a heavily populated suburban environment primarily consisting of single-family residential homes with newer multi-family complexes increasing in the last 30 years. The project site is designated Industrial by the County’s Zoning Ordinance and General Plan, which allow for industrial plants primarily engaged in manufacturing, compounding, processing, assembling, packaging, treatment or fabrication of materials and products. More specifically, the project site has a General Plan land use designation of Limited Industrial. The southern portion of the project site (fronting Elkelton Place, approximately 5,900 sf) has a zoning designation of M52 (Limited Impact Industrial Use), which permits commercial gasoline sales and automotive and equipment cleaning uses pursuant to limitations “12” and “8,” respectively as noted in Section 2980 of the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance. The northern portion of the project site (fronting Paradise Valley Road, approximately 15,600 sf) has a zoning designation of M54 (General Impact Industrial Use), which also permits commercial gasoline sales and automotive and equipment cleaning uses with no limitations. Both the M52 and M54 use regulations allow convenience retail operations under a minor use permit, which the project would require for the proposed convenience store. Surrounding properties to the north, west, and south are zoned Residential – Single and Residential – Variable. The properties to the east (across SR-126) are also zoned Industrial. Development surrounding the project site consists of primarily residential uses and freeway.

The proposed project site is within the South County Plan area of the County’s Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). Projects that occur within this planning area must comply with the County’s Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO) and be consistent with the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources (County of San Diego 2010).

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

| <b>Permit Type/Action</b>               | <b>Agency</b>                          |
|---|--|
| General Construction Storm Water Permit | RWQCB                                  |
| Waste Discharge Requirements Permit     | RWQCB                                  |
| Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan    | RWQCB                                  |
| Fire District Approval                  | Spring Valley Fire Protection District |

Note: RWQCB = Regional Water Quality Control Board

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan that includes consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

YES

NO

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, public lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and to reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code §21080.3.2). Information is also available from the Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code §5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code §21082.3(e) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or a “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Aesthetics</u>                      | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Air Quality</u>                                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Biological Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Cultural Resources</u>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Energy</u>  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Geology &amp; Soils</u>  | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u>           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Hazards &amp; Haz. Materials</u>       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</u>   | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Land Use &amp; Planning</u>            | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mineral Resources</u>                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Noise</u>                | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Population &amp; Housing</u>           | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Public Services</u>                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Recreation</u>                      | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Transportation</u>                     | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Tribal Cultural Resources</u>                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Wildfire</u>                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Mandatory Findings of Significance</u> |

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, PDS finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, PDS finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, PDS finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

|                  |                                |
|------------------|--------------------------------|
|                  | August 24, 2023                |
| Signature        | Date                           |
| Jae Roland Chase | Land Use Environmental Planner |
| Printed Name     | Title                          |

## INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**I. AESTHETICS** -- Except as provided in Public Resources Code §21099 -- Would the project:

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

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

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

The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash in the unincorporated community of Spring Valley. Surrounding land uses consist of primarily residential land use, with some industrial land use across SR-125 to the east. Several RCAs are located within one mile of the project site, including the Sweetwater River Floodplain (#77 of the Spring Valley Community Plan) approximately 0.7 mile to the southeast, Habitat for San Diego Variegated Dudleya (#99 of the Spring Valley Community Plan) less than 500 feet north of the project site, Habitat for San Diego Ambrosia (#100 of the Spring Valley Community Plan) located approximately 0.5 mile to the southwest, and Upper Sweetwater River (#109 of the Sweetwater Community Plan) located approximately 0.65 mile to the south. Due to the intervening SR-125 highway, structures, and topography, no impacts would occur to the Sweetwater River Floodplain or Upper Sweetwater River RCAs. Additionally, intervening topography, residences, and roadways preclude views of the project site from the Habitat for San Diego Variegated Dudleya and Habitat for San Diego Ambrosia RCAs. Given the urban environment surrounding the project site, the proposed project would not substantially degrade a scenic vista. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant effect on a scenic vista.



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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a state scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The project would be adjacent to SR-125, which is designated as a State scenic highway between its junctions with Interstate 8 and SR-94. However, the portion of the freeway adjacent to the project site is not designated as a State scenic highway and the portion that is State-designated is approximately 3.6 miles north of the project site. Additionally, SR-94, approximately 3.6 miles north, is listed as eligible for designation as a State Scenic Highway. These highways are also identified by the County in the Conservation Element of the General Plan as County Scenic Corridors. Due to distance, topography, and intervening structures, the project site is not visible from these highways. As such, the project site is not visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway or County Scenic Corridor and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway or County Scenic Corridor. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity, and expectation of the viewers.

A Conceptual Landscape Approval and Conditions Memorandum was prepared by David Kahler, County Landscape Architect, dated December 24, 2020 (Appendix A). The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Spring Valley Community Plan describes Spring Valley’s community character as a heavily populated suburban environment primarily consisting of single-family residential homes with newer multi-family complexes increasing in the last 30 years.

The project site is located in an urbanized area and is surrounded by single-family residences and SR-125. The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash, which is consistent with the Industrial land use and zoning designations for the project site. The project would be required to include preparation of Landscape Plans pursuant to the County’s Water Efficient Landscape Design Manual and Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance. The project would also be in conformance with the County’s Parking Design Manual, Grading Ordinance, the Spring Valley Design Guidelines, and the requirements of the B Designator, as described in the Conceptual Landscape Approval and Conditions Memorandum (Appendix A). Therefore, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. Zone B is any area of the unincorporated County that is not within 15 miles from the Mount Palomar or Mount Laguna observatory. The project would not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations because the project would conform to the County’s Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209). Therefore, the project would not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is not designated by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide

or local Importance. Therefore, the project would not convert an important farmland category designated by the FMMP to a non-agricultural use. Pursuant to the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources (Agricultural Guidelines), if a site is not an active agricultural operation, has not historically been used for agriculture, and is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or local Importance, these lands should not be considered agricultural resources. Therefore, according to the Agricultural Guidelines, the project site is not considered an agricultural resource and there would be no impact.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is zoned Industrial. The Industrial land use allows for industrial plants primarily engaged in manufacturing, compounding, processing, assembling, packaging, treatment or fabrication of materials and products. As described above in Section II(a), the project site is not considered an agricultural resource. In addition, the project site is not located within or within the vicinity of a Williamson Act Contract or agricultural preserve. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code §12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code §4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site does not contain forest land or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project would be consistent with existing zoning, and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland production zones.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site does not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code §12220(g); therefore, project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** As described above in Section II(a), the project has been determined to not meet the definition of an agricultural resource pursuant to the Agricultural Guidelines. In addition, the project is not under a Williamson Act Contract or agricultural preserve, nor is the project site located within the vicinity of a Williamson Act Contract or an Agricultural Preserve. Therefore, the project would not have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resource to a non-agricultural use. In addition, as described above in Section II(c) and (d), the project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: An Air Quality Report was prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon Consultants) dated March 2022 (see Appendix B). The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** There are currently no structures requiring demolition prior to construction of the project. Therefore, no demolition would occur as part of the project. The project would produce emissions during construction and operation of the proposed project, as described further in Section III(b).

The RAQS relies on information from CARB and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), including population and projected growth in the County, and other source emissions from mobile and area to forecast future emissions. Based on these emissions, the

RAQS determines from strategies necessary for the reduction of stationary source emissions through regulatory controls. Mobile source emission projections and growth projections are based on population and vehicle trends and land use plans developed by the cities and the County. As such, projects that propose development consistent with the growth anticipated by the General Plan would be considered consistent with the RAQS. The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Limited Industrial. The southern portion of the project site (fronting Elkton Place, approximately 5,900 sf) has a zoning designation of M52 (Limited Impact Industrial Use), which permits commercial gasoline sales and automotive and equipment cleaning uses pursuant to limitations “12” and “8,” respectively as noted in Section 2980 of the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance. The northern portion of the project site (fronting Paradise Valley Road, approximately 15,600 sf) has a zoning designation of M54 (General Impact Industrial Use), which also permits commercial gasoline sales and automotive and equipment cleaning uses with no limitations. Both the M52 and M54 use regulations allow convenience retail operations under a minor use permit, which the project would require for the proposed convenience store. Therefore, no amendments to the County’s General Plan, the Spring Valley Community Plan, or County zoning would be required to accommodate the project. The project would conform to the applicable plans and therefore, the project’s impact on the RAQS and SIP would be less than significant.

Furthermore, as part of its attainment planning process, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) proposes and adopts Rules and Regulations to control air pollutants to demonstrate further progress toward attainment as part of the RAQS and SIP. The project will also comply with any applicable rules and regulations that have been adopted as part of the RAQS and SIP by the San Diego APCD. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the RAQS or the SIP, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) 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?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: The San Diego APCD does not provide quantitative thresholds for determining the significance of construction or mobile source-related impacts. However, the San Diego APCD does specify Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA) trigger levels for new or modified stationary sources (APCD Rules 20.2 and 20.3). If these incremental levels for stationary sources are exceeded, an AQIA must be performed for the proposed new or modified source. Although these trigger levels do not generally apply to mobile sources or general land development projects, for comparative purposes these levels may be used to evaluate the increased emissions which would be discharged to the San Diego Air Basin from proposed land development projects. For projects whose stationary-source emissions are below these criteria, no AQIA is typically required, and project level emissions are presumed to be less than significant.

For CEQA purposes, these SLTs can be used to demonstrate that a project’s total emissions would not result in a significant impact to air quality. The daily SLTs are most appropriately used

for the standard construction and operational emissions. When project emissions have the potential to approach or exceed the SLTs listed below in Table 1, additional air quality modeling may need to be prepared to demonstrate that ground level concentrations resulting from project emissions (with background levels) will be below National and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively).

APCD Rules 20.2 and 20.3 do not have AQIA thresholds for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The use of the screening level for VOCs specified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which generally has stricter emissions thresholds than San Diego’s APCD, is recommended for evaluating projects in San Diego County. For PM<sub>2.5</sub>, the EPA “Proposed Rule to Implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards” published September 8, 2005, which quantifies significant emissions as 10 tons per year, will be used as the screening-level criteria as shown in Table 1 below:

**Table 1. San Diego County Screening-Level Thresholds for Air Quality Impact Analysis**

| Pollutant   | Total Emissions |              |               |
|---|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
|   | Lbs. per Hour   | Lbs. per Day | Tons per Year |
| Respirable Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> ) | ---             | 100          | 15            |
| Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )      | --- *           | 55           | 10*           |
| Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )                | 25              | 250          | 40            |
| Sulfur Oxides (SO <sub>x</sub> )                  | 25              | 250          | 40            |
| Carbon Monoxide (CO)                              | 100             | 550          | 100           |
| Lead  | ---             | 3.2          | 0.6           |
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)                 | ---             | 75**         | 13.7***       |

Notes: \* EPA “Proposed Rule to Implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards” published September 8, 2005. Also used by the SCAQMD.

\*\* Threshold for VOCs based on the threshold of significance for VOCs from the SCAQMD for the Coachella Valley.

\*\*\* 13.7 Tons Per Year threshold based on 75 lbs/day multiplied by 365 days/year and divided by 2,000 lbs/ton.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Currently, San Diego County is in “non-attainment” status for the NAAQS and CAAQS federal and state Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and state Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns and less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). O<sub>3</sub> is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM<sub>10</sub> in both urban and rural areas include the following: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

The project would contribute to construction and operational sources of criteria pollutant air emissions. An analysis of estimated construction and operational emissions was completed using SCAQMD’s California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The construction schedule is based on default construction schedules included in CalEEMod. CalEEMod grading operations associated with the project would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance and the San Diego APCD Rule 55, which requires the implementation of dust control measures (e.g., watering, application of surfactants, control of vehicle speeds, etc.) during grading activities. In addition, the Project would utilize low-VOC coatings in accordance with San

Diego APCD Rule 67.0.1 requirements. As shown in Table 2 below, construction-related air emissions associated with the project are estimated to be well below screening-level thresholds identified in Table 1 as established by the San Diego APCD. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial construction emissions such that any criteria pollutant air quality standard would be violated. Therefore, construction of the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant; impacts would be less than significant.

**Table 2. Estimated Construction-Related Air Emissions**

| Pollutant   | Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day) | Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day) | Above Threshold? |
|---|----------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Respirable Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> ) | 1.4                              | 100                                       | No               |
| Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )      | 0.8                              | 55  | No               |
| Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )                | 9.1                              | 250                                       | No               |
| Sulfur Oxides (SO <sub>x</sub> )                  | 0.1                              | 250                                       | No               |
| Carbon Monoxide (CO)                              | 8.3                              | 550                                       | No               |
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)                 | 14.3                             | 75  | No               |

Note: CalEEMod does not report on lead emissions and therefore, it is not included in this analysis.

The main operational impacts associated with the Project would be due to stationary source emissions from the fuel storage and dispensing and mobile emissions from vehicle trips to and from the project site. Project-specific trip generation rates were included in the CalEEMod analysis based on the traffic study completed for the project (see Section XVII, Transportation).

The project includes the installation of a vapor capture and control system, the Veeder-Root CCVP, to capture and hold excess gasoline vapors in the underground storage tanks and vehicle tanks (when fueling), as required by San Diego APCD Rules 61.3.1, 61.4, and 61.4.1. The CCVP system is a toxics best available control technology feature that would ensure fuel vapors are efficiently captured during vehicle fueling activities. Project operational emissions were estimated using CalEEMod (Table 3).

**Table 3. Estimated Operational Air Emissions**

| Pollutant   | Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day) | Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day) | Above Threshold? |
|---|----------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Respirable Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> ) | 4.0                              | 100                                       | No               |
| Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )      | 1.1                              | 55  | No               |
| Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )                | 6.3                              | 250                                       | No               |
| Sulfur Oxides (SO <sub>x</sub> )                  | <0.1                             | 250                                       | No               |
| Carbon Monoxide (CO)                              | 15.3                             | 550                                       | No               |
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)                 | 4.9                              | 75  | No               |

Note: CalEEMod does not report on lead emissions and therefore, it is not included in this analysis.

As shown in Table 3, emissions generated during the operation of project would not exceed San Diego APCD screening level thresholds for criteria pollutants. Emissions associated with the proposed project remain below the County’s screening-level thresholds for all pollutants. Because vehicular emissions decrease over time with phase-out of older vehicles and

implementation of increasingly stringent emission controls, future emissions would decrease. Therefore, project operation would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Air quality impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly. The nearest sensitive receptors consist of existing residential development located approximately 150 feet west of the project site.

CO Hotspots

Elevated CO levels can occur at or near intersections that experience severe traffic congestion. A localized air quality impact is considered significant if the additional CO emissions resulting from the project create a "hotspot" where the California 1-hour standard of 20.0 ppm or the 8-hour standard of 9 ppm is exceeded. This can occur at severely congested intersections during cold winter temperatures. The last recorded maximum 8-hour average CO level for the San Diego Air Basin was in 2012 at 3.61 parts per million (ppm), which is well below the 9 ppm state and federal eight-hour standard (Appendix B). No monitoring stations located in the San Diego Air Basin have data for CO since 2012.

A CO hotspot analysis is required by the County if a proposed development would cause road intersections to operate at or below a LOS E with intersection peak-hour trips exceeding 3,000 trips. The traffic study prepared for the project studies six intersections in the vicinity of the project site, including the project driveway off of Paradise Valley Road (Urban Systems Associates, Inc. 2020). The project would add 893 daily trips (all project generated trips, including trucks), which include 71 AM peak hour and 80 PM peak hour trips. The additional traffic generated during project operation would not cause intersections in the vicinity of the project site to operate at or below LOS E (see Appendix B). The traffic study concluded that the proposed project would not result in any significant intersection impacts. Therefore, a CO hotspot analysis is not required for the proposed project and project-generated trips would not result in, or substantially contribute to, CO concentrations that exceed the eight-hour ambient air quality standards along area roadways and intersections.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs)

High-volume TAC generators that are listed as potential health risk sources include the operation of commercial diesel engines and truck stops, landfills and incinerators, and chemical



manufacturers (CARB 2005). The proposed project entails the construction and operation of a gas station with convenience store and carwash tunnel, which is identified in the *CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook* (2005) as a facility type that emits TACs, mainly benzene. Construction activities may also result in the generation of TACs. However, the construction period estimated for the project would be temporary and limited to approximately six to seven months.

Emissions resulting from the gasoline dispensing has the potential to result in TACs (e.g., benzene, hexane, MTBE, toluene, xylene) and have the potential to contribute to health risk in the project vicinity. It should be noted that standard regulatory controls would apply to the project in addition to any permits required that demonstrate appropriate operational controls. The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) *Gasoline Service Station Industrywide Risk Assessment Guidelines* (1997) provides a screening method to determine potential cancer risk as a function of million gallons of throughput and downwind distance from the gas station that has employed all toxics best available control technologies (i.e., the Veeder-Root CCVP system) as required by the SDAPCD (pursuant to Rules 61.3.1 and 61.4.1) and CARB. Based on these guidelines, 1.2 million gallons of throughput at a distance of 40 meters (130 feet) from the gas station would result in a cancer risk of 2.42 per million. It should be noted that subsequent to the CAPCOA guidelines being released, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) published new (2015) risk assessment guidelines to account for potential early-life exposures. The 2015 OEHHA methodology results in risk estimates approximately 1.5 to 3 times higher than what would have previously been estimated. As such, to account for the 2015 OEHHA methodology, the risk per million gallons of throughput can conservatively be multiplied by 3, resulting in an estimated 7.3 risk per million, which is less than the threshold of 10 per million (Appendix B).

Lastly, mobile emissions during project operations would primarily be composed of passenger and light-duty vehicles (59.9 percent) and light trucks (18.1 percent) accessing the gas station and convenience store. Approximately 2.4 percent of the vehicles visiting the project site would be heavy trucks according to CalEEMod, which takes fuel and consumer goods delivery trucks into account. Delivery truck trips would be made to the project site based on a schedule, and additional heavy-duty trucks driven by project customers may occur as well. However, the project is designed to primarily serve customers in light autos and trucks. The project would not attract a large number of trips from large or heavy-duty vehicles that could generate mobile diesel emissions due to the passenger vehicle-serving nature of the proposed use. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed gas station and convenience store would not generate significant amounts of TACs that would adversely impact sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site.

Furthermore, a gas station permit application with the San Diego APCD would be required for the proposed project. Such projects fall under a general health risk assessment (HRA) that is in place with the San Diego APCD and a project-specific HRA is not required since use categories such as gas stations are considered small footprint facilities with small zones of impact (OEHHA 2015). Following discretionary review, the project would be required to submit an application for permit through the San Diego APCD; neither project construction nor operation would begin until that permit has been reviewed and approved by San Diego APCD.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** SDAPCD Rule 51, commonly referred to as the public nuisance rule, prohibits emissions from any source whatsoever in such quantities of air contaminants or other material that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to the public health or damage to property. The potential for an operation to result in odor complaints from a “considerable” number of persons in the area would be considered to be a significant, adverse odor impact.

According to the San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The project would involve the temporary use of diesel-powered construction equipment, which would generate exhaust that may be noticeable for short durations at adjacent properties. Project construction could result in minor amounts of odor compounds associated with diesel heavy equipment exhaust during construction and vehicle traffic idling or emissions during operations. Because the construction equipment would be operating at various locations throughout the construction site, and because any operation that would occur in the vicinity of existing receptors would be temporary, impacts associated with odors during construction are therefore not considered significant.

The project is not considered a source of objectionable odors from operations. The proposed operations of a gas station, convenience store, and carwash tunnel 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 SR-125 on- and off-ramps (tapering 60 to 210 feet and approximately 90 feet to the east of the project site, respectively). The nearest sensitive receptors consist of existing residential development located approximately 150 feet west of the project site. It is unlikely that the odors from the proposed project would be distinguishable from existing sources, given the vehicle emissions associated with adjacent roadways and SR-125 in the vicinity of the project site. Odors generated from proposed uses would dissipate and be reduced with increasing distance from the project site. Furthermore, the project would include a Veeder-Root CCVP system with a Stage II vapor recovery system (balance system) to ensure efficient capture of UST and vehicle tank vapors during vehicle fueling activities as required by San Diego APCD Rule 61.4. Therefore, the project would not generate objectionable odors, and impacts would be less than significant.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional

plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation: A Biological Resources Letter Report was prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants, dated June 2020 (Appendix C). Due to the limited biological resources on site, extensive surrounding development, and absence of native vegetation communities, wetlands, and sensitive species, a full Biological Resources Report was not warranted. The Biological Resources Letter Report consists of a literature review and results of a field reconnaissance survey conducted on June 18, 2019. The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** The Biological Resources Letter Report prepared by Rincon Consultants, dated June 2020, determined that the project would not directly or through habitat modifications impact any federally or state endangered species, or any special-status wildlife or plant species, County list A, B, C or D plant species or County Group II wildlife species, and is not adjacent to any open space, or native vegetation communities. The project would not impact arroyo toad or golden eagle habitat.

The project site is previously disturbed and does not contain suitable habitat for special-status plant species. Therefore, potential direct impacts to special-status plant species are not expected. Additionally, the proposed project site is surrounded by disturbed and developed habitat areas similar to those found on site. Therefore, no potential indirect impacts such as run-off or introduction of invasive species to special-status plant species are expected.

Species protected under federal and state laws, including the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (CFGF) Section 3503, may nest on site. Under these laws, it is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation made pursuant thereto. Direct impacts to protected nesting birds could occur if vegetation removal happens during the bird nesting season (February 1 through August 31). If project activities are conducted during the bird nesting season, MM BIO-1 would require the project to avoid impacts to protected nesting birds. The project site is not expected to provide significant habitat for foraging raptors and does not include any trees suitable for raptor nesting, therefore, no impacts to raptors are anticipated.

No other special status wildlife species are expected to occur on site, therefore no direct or indirect impacts to biological resources are anticipated as the project site is located within a highly developed area not adjacent to any open spaces or other biological resource linkage areas. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Rincon Consultants, dated June 2020, determined that the project site is entirely disturbed and would not result in the loss of any special-status habitat, as defined by the South County MSCP. Potential indirect impacts related to dust, noise, and loss of foraging habitat are not expected since the project site does not support any federally or state endangered species, or any special-status wildlife or plant species, County list A, B, C or D plant species or County Group II wildlife species, and is not adjacent to any open space, or native vegetation communities. Therefore, no impact would occur to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community from the proposed project.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of the Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Rincon Consultants, dated June 2020, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any jurisdictional waters or wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. One depression was noted during the survey; however, it does not occur in native soils, has no hydrophytic vegetation, and likely only holds water due to changes in the grade. No riparian habitat occurs onsite or in the project vicinity. The closest jurisdictional water is at Sweetwater Regional Park approximately 0.25 mile south of the site, which is separated from the project site by the SR-125 freeway (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2019). Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Based on the Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Rincon Consultants, dated June 2020, it has been determined that the project site is adjacent to a residential community and SR-125. It is surrounded on all sides by development or disturbed areas and is not adjacent to any open space or native habitat areas. The site is not located in any known wildlife corridors, biological resource linkage areas, open area preserves, nursery sites, PAMA or other protected biological refuge. Additionally, no nursery sites were observed during the site visit and field survey. Based on the site assessment, the site does not have potential to provide connectivity to open space areas or support nursery sites. The project is not expected to impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites near the project site, or interfere substantially with the movement of a native resident, migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

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?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: The project site occurs within the boundaries of the County of San Diego (County) Final South County Plan for the South County MSCP (San Diego County 1998) within the Metro-Lakeside-Jamul segment. To demonstrate consistency with the South County MSCP, analysis of biological resources within the project site follows the County of San Diego Biological Mitigation Ordinance dated April 2, 2010 (County 2010a), County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Ordinance amended October 14, 2011 (County 2011), Report Format and Content Requirements for Biological Resources dated September 15, 2010 (County 2010b), and Guidelines for Determining Significance prepared by the Land Use and Environment Group dated 2010 (County 2010c).

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is consistent with the policies and guidelines defined in the County of San Diego Biological Mitigation Ordinance dated April 2, 2010, Report Format and Content Requirements for Biological Resources dated September 15, 2010, and Guidelines for Determining Significance prepared by the Land Use and Environment Group dated 2010. No South County MSCP designated sensitive wildlife, plants, habitats linkages, or large blocks of natural habitat occur within the project site or vicinity.

In addition, the proposed project would not preclude or prevent the preparation of the subregional Natural Communities Conservation Planning Process (NCCP), impact any amount of wetlands or sensitive habitat lands as outlined in the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), or impact coastal sage scrub habitat. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

#### **BIO-1**

**PLAN CONDITIONS NOTES:** [DPW, ESU] [PDS, BD] [DPR TC, PP] [GP, IP, MA]  
**INTENT:** In order to implement the required mitigation measures, for which was the basis for approval of this project pursuant to Section 87.207 of the County Grading Ordinance the condition notes shall be implemented on the final engineering plans and made conditions of the permit issuance. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The final engineering plans shall include the following condition notes and made conditions of the issuance of said permit:

- a. If feasible, removal of vegetation within suitable nesting bird habitats will be scheduled to occur in the fall and winter (between September 1 and January 31), after fledging and before the initiation of the nesting season. For construction activities occurring during the nesting season (generally February 1 to August 31), surveys for nesting birds covered by the California Fish and Game Code (CFG) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) should be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 14 days prior to vegetation removal for each phase of the project. The surveys should include the disturbance area plus a 100-foot buffer around the site, or to the topographic divide where substantial topography is present in the buffer. If active nests are located, all construction work should be conducted outside a buffer zone from the nest to be determined by the qualified biologist. The buffer should be a minimum of 50 feet for non-raptor bird species and 300 feet for raptor species, as practicable. Larger buffers may be required depending upon the status of the nest and the construction activities occurring near the nest. The buffer area(s) should be closed to all construction personnel and equipment until the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site. A qualified biologist should confirm that breeding/nesting is completed and young have fledged the nest prior to removal of the buffer. If buffer zones are determined to be infeasible, a full-time qualified biological monitor must be onsite to monitoring construction within the buffer zones to ensure active nests and nesting birds are not impacted.

**DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall submit the grading, improvement and building plans, which shall include the above reference condition notes. The condition notes shall be in addition to what is already approved on the Conceptual Grading and Improvement Plan, unless indicated in this condition that it is superseding. Changes to the final engineering plans that are not consistent with the conceptual plan may cause further environmental review. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of any grading and or improvement plans and issuance of any Grading or Construction Permits) for any phase, the notes and items shall be placed on the plans. **MONITORING:** The [DPW, ESU, or PDS, BD for PDS Minor Grading and DPR, TC and PP for trail and park improvements] shall verify that the grading and or improvement plan requirements have been implemented on the final

engineering plans. The environmental mitigation notes shall be made conditions of the issuance of said grading or construction permit.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation: A Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report was prepared for the project by Red Tail Environmental, dated June 2020 (Appendix D). As part of the Cultural Resources Report prepared for the project, a records search and pedestrian field survey of the property were conducted. The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

**No Impact:** The records search and field survey found no historical resources previously recorded within the 0.5-acre project site. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to historical resources.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** As part of the Cultural Resources Report prepared for the project, a records search and pedestrian field survey of the property were conducted. The field survey was conducted by an archaeological field director, environmental archaeologist, and Kumayaay Native American Monitor. No cultural resources, artifacts, or features were observed during the survey effort. No bedrock was noted across the property. The Cultural Resources Report determined that the southeastern, southern, and western slopes outside of the project site must have been created between 1996 and 2002 during the construction of SR-125 and its associated surface street connections. Aerial imagery indicates that the project site and its immediate vicinity contained a structure and parking area from approximately 1964 until 1996, at which point the structure is visibly missing within later imagery, assumedly being removed during the construction of freeway offramps within the immediate area. Due to the disturbed context of the project area, the Cultural Resources Report determined that no cultural resources are present on the property and as such, did not recommend cultural resource monitoring during ground disturbing activities associated with the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to archaeological resources.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs, it has been determined that the project site is not likely to disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. Therefore, no impact to human remains would occur.

**VI. ENERGY** -- Would the project:

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash. The project would result in the use of energy resources during the construction phase. During construction, the project would require the use of heavy construction equipment that would be fueled by gas and diesel. However, the energy use would be temporary, limited, and cease upon completion of construction activities. Construction would be conducted in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations (e.g., United States Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA] and the CARB engine emission standards, which require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption, and limitations on engine idling times). Compliance with these regulations would minimize short-term energy demand during the project's grading to the extent feasible. In addition, all new construction would be required to comply with the energy code in effect at the time of construction, which ensures efficient building construction. The project would also be required to comply with Title 24 energy standards for energy efficiency. Project design features that would result in lower energy use include low-flow plumbing fixtures, a high-reflectivity cool roof, and landscaping with climate adapted plants that require little-to-no water. As such, the construction and operation of the project is not expected to result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy, and impacts would be less than significant.



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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Relevant plans that pertain to the efficient use of energy include the 2019 California Energy Efficiency Action Plan, which focuses on energy efficiency. As noted, construction activities would comply with local, state, and federal regulations (e.g., USEPA and CARB engine emissions standards, limitations on engine idling times). Compliance with these regulations would reduce short-term energy demand during the project's grading to the extent feasible and increase the project's energy efficiency. As described further in Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the project would not conflict with plans related to renewable energy, energy efficiency, and reducing GHG emissions, including the 2022 Scoping Plan and the 2021 Regional Plan. For example, the 2022 Scoping Plan Update identifies plans and regulations and strategies that are to be implemented at the State and project level that will reduce GHG emissions consistent with State policies. The project would be consistent with the plans and regulations and strategies identified in the 2022 Scoping Plan that call for reducing GHG emissions, achieving carbon neutrality, and electrification of existing and new buildings because the project would be required to comply with Title 24 energy standards for energy efficiency. Project design features that would result in lower energy use include low-flow plumbing fixtures, a high-reflectivity cool roof, and landscaping with climate adapted plants that require little-to-no water. The project applicant would provide an irrigation plan for the project site that demonstrates a 40 percent reduction in Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) for outdoor water use in the proposed landscaped areas. Consistent with the County Landscaping Ordinance, the project would incorporate climate adapted plants that require occasional, little, or no summer water. Project operations and waste management methods would be consistent with the County's Strategic Plan to Reduce Waste (2017) through the support of commercial composting programs to reduce organic waste and comply with established waste diversion requirements. Therefore, the project is consistent with the 2022 Scoping Plan. (See Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, for further discussion and refer also to Table 1 in the Greenhouse Gas Memorandum prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants [Appendix E] for a full consistency analysis with the strategies and actions in the 2022 Scoping Plan.)

The 2021 Regional Plan is intended to reimagine the San Diego region with a transformative transportation system, a sustainable pattern of growth and development, and innovative demand and management strategies. The 2021 Regional Plan aims to reduce our reliance on the automobile as a primary mode of transportation and accessing destinations with shorter trips by providing safe, affordable, and convenient alternatives. Many of the strategies to achieve this are statewide or regional initiatives to be implemented by state or regional jurisdictions, and therefore would not apply at the project-level. In general, a gas station use is inherently not oriented for sustainable transportation uses such as transit and rail. The project does include one vanpool space that would allow a reduction in vehicle miles; in addition, the space could be converted into a future EV charging space. Additionally, the proposed gas station use is planned to satisfy existing vehicle transportation fuel demand. In the future as vehicle transportation

demands change, a use located in major transportation areas such as a gas station would be likely locations for alternative fuels such as electric charging or hydrogen fuel; in that scenario, the project site would assist the 2021 Regional Plan goal of healthy air and reduced GHG emissions. While there are plans to phase out fossil fuel vehicles, the demand for gasoline will exist for the foreseeable future; even with California’s 2035 mandate for 100 percent of vehicles sold to be electric, there would still be legacy gasoline vehicles or vehicles from out of state that would need gasoline. In addition, while the project currently would not provide EV services, the gas station and convenience store would be located in a convenient location for automobiles, and thus would be an ideal location to add EV services when the market demand and technology for such services reaches a critical mass. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2021 Regional Plan. (See Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and the Greenhouse Gas Memorandum prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants [Appendix E] for further discussion of project consistency with the strategies in the 2021 Regional Plan.)

Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Project impacts would be less than significant.

**VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

- a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: The County DPS received direction from Leanne Crow, County hydrogeologist, that a Geotechnical Evaluation is not required for the project.

According to the California Geological Survey, California Geomorphic Provinces, Note 361, the Project site is located within the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province. The Peninsular Ranges are a series of ranges separated by northwest trending valleys, subparallel to faults branching from the San Andreas Fault. The trend of topography is similar to the Coast Ranges, but the geology is more similar to the Sierra Nevada, with granitic rock intruding the older metamorphic rocks. The Peninsular Ranges extend into lower California and are bounded on the east by the Colorado Desert. According to the current USGS Geologic Map, the project site is underlain by Mission Valley Formation from the middle Eocene Epoch, which is described as sedimentary bedrock units (Appendix F).

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 2007, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. The nearest active fault to the site is the La Nacion fault

zone located approximately 2.2 miles west of the site. All earthwork for the project would be verified in the field by County Engineers and a licensed or registered civil engineer in the State of California. Additionally, contaminated soils would be removed from the project site (see Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials), and MM HAZ-2 would require these soils to be replaced by compacted fill in layers to ensure the structural integrity of the gas station, convenience store, and carwash structures. Therefore, the potential for surface fault rupture at the project site to potentially cause a substantial adverse effect is considered to be low, and impacts would be less than significant.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash. Grading associated with the project would be required to conform to the grading requirements outlined in the County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance (Grading Ordinance) and be verified in the field by a licensed or registered Civil Engineer and inspected by County Grading Inspectors. In order to assure that the proposed buildings are adequately supported, a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The Report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Additionally, contaminated soils would be removed from the project site (see Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials), and MM HAZ-2 would require these soils to be replaced by compacted fill in layers to ensure the structural integrity of the gas station, convenience store, and carwash structures. Therefore, the Grading Plan prepared by the registered Civil Engineer, compliance with the Grading Ordinance, the Soils Engineering Report, and MM HAZ-2 ensure the project would not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Liquefaction typically occurs when a site is located in a zone with seismic activity, onsite soils are cohesionless (such as sand or gravel), groundwater is encountered within 50 feet of the surface, and soil relative densities are less than about 70 percent. The project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" per the County GIS as

identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. However, contaminated soils would be removed from the project site and these soils would be replaced by compacted fill in layers in accordance with MM HAZ-2 (see Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials) to ensure the structural integrity of the gas station, convenience store, and carwash structures. In addition, a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process to assure that the proposed buildings are adequately supported. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The Report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Therefore, the potential for liquefaction and its associated adverse effects to impact the project is considered very low. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is within a low/generally susceptible category "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJHMP) (URS 2004). Landslide risk areas from the MJHMP were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25 percent); soil series data (SANDAG based on U.S. Geologic Survey [USGS] 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to the western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15 percent in grade because these soils are slide prone. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The entire project site consists of Olivenhain-Urban land complex (9 to 30 percent slopes). Construction of the project would include site grading and removal of contaminated soils, which have the potential to release sediment into downstream receiving waters. All soil remediation activities would occur in accordance with the County

Grading Ordinance and the Soil Management Plan required by MM HAZ-2. Additionally, the Standard Priority Development Plan (PDP) – Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) prepared for the project by Howes Weiler Landy, dated December 19, 2022, includes identifies site-specific best management practices (BMPs) to control erosion, sediment, and other potential construction-related pollutants. By keeping soil stabilized using BMPs and with effective site management minimizing soil erosion the SWQMP specifications and guidelines demonstrates minimal to less than significant soil erosion shall occur during project grading.

The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project would not result in unprotected erodible soils.
- The project is not located in a floodplain.
- A Standard PDP – SWQMP and Preliminary Drainage Report (December 19, 2022 and February 2023, respectively) have been prepared by Howes Weiler Landy for the project (see Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality).
- The project would be required to comply with the County’s Grading Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING)]. Compliance with these regulations would minimize the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.

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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash. Grading associated with the project would be required to conform to the grading requirements outlined in the County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance (Grading Ordinance) and be verified in the field by a licensed or registered Civil Engineer and inspected by County Grading Inspectors. Additionally, contaminated soils would be removed from the project site (see Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials), and MM HAZ-2 would require these soils to be replaced by compacted fill in layers to ensure the structural integrity of the gas station, convenience store, and carwash structures. In addition, a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process to assure that the proposed buildings are adequately supported. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building

meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The Report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Therefore, the Grading Plan prepared by the registered Civil Engineer and compliance with the Grading Ordinance and MM HAZ-2 ensure the project would not result in a potentially significant impact related to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to Section VII(a)(iii) through (iv) listed above.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Based on the Preliminary Review of Resources by PDS, the project site is not located within a High Shrink Swell Zone, which would indicate expansive soils. Therefore, the project would not create a substantial risk to life or property and impacts would be less than significant.

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems because the project would include development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation: San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** The project site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance (MM GEO-1 and 2).

The project has a low potential for containing paleontological resources and will excavate the substratum and/or bedrock below the soil horizons.

With the implementation of mitigation requirements during project grading operations, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant. Furthermore, the project will not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that require grading in sensitive paleontological resource areas will be required to have the appropriate level of paleontological monitoring and resource recovery. In addition, other projects that propose any amount of significant grading would be subject to the requirements for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

#### **GEO-1 PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING**

**INTENT:** In order to comply with the [San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources](#), a Paleontological Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** This project site has marginal levels of sensitive Paleontological resources. All grading activities are subject to the [County of San Diego Grading Ordinance Section 87.430](#), if any significant resources (Fossils) are encountered during grading activities.

- a. The grading contractor is responsible to monitor for paleontological resources during all grading activities. If any fossils are found greater than 12 inches in any dimension, stop all grading activities and contact PDS before continuing grading operations.
- b. If any paleontological resources are discovered and salvaged, the monitoring, recovery, and subsequent work determined necessary shall be completed by or under the supervision of a Qualified Paleontologist pursuant to the [San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources](#).

**TIMING:** The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the grading construction. **MONITORING:** The [DPW, PDC] shall make sure that the grading

contractor is on-site performing the Monitoring duties of this condition. The [DPW, PDC] shall contact PDS if the grading contractor or applicant fails to comply with this condition.

**GEO-2 PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING**

**INTENT:** In order to comply with the [County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Paleontological Resources](#), a Paleontological Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** One of the following letters shall be performed upon completion of the grading activities that require monitoring:

- a. If no paleontological resources were discovered, submit a “No Fossils Found” letter from the grading contractor to PDS stating that the monitoring has been completed and that no fossils were discovered, and including the names and signatures from the fossil monitors. The letter shall be in the format of Attachment E of the [County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources](#).
- b. If paleontological resources were encountered during grading, a letter shall be prepared stating that the field grading monitoring activities have been completed, and that resources have been encountered. The letter shall detail the anticipated time schedule for completion of the curation phase of the monitoring.

**DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall submit the letter report to PDS for review and approval. **TIMING:** Upon completion of all grading activities, and prior to Rough Grading Final Inspection ([Grading Ordinance SEC 87.421.a.2](#)), the letter report shall be completed. **MONITORING:** PDS shall review the final negative letter report or field monitoring memo for compliance with the project MMRP, and inform [DPW, PDC] that the requirement is completed.

**VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** -- Would the project

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
 

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |
  
- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?
 

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: A Greenhouse Gas Memorandum was prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants, dated May 10, 2023 (Appendix E). The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.



Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels. GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons, and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption and personal vehicle use, among other sources.

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

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions would generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature; however, an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 recommends that lead agencies quantify GHG emissions of projects and consider several other factors that may be used in the determination of significance of GHG emissions from a project, including the extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions; whether a project exceeds an applicable significance threshold; and the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 does not establish a threshold of significance. Lead agencies have the discretion to establish significance thresholds for their respective jurisdictions, and in establishing those thresholds, a lead agency may appropriately look to thresholds developed by other public agencies or suggested by other experts, as long as any threshold chosen is supported by substantial evidence (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7[c]). The CEQA Guidelines also clarify that the effects of GHG emissions are cumulative and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA's requirements for cumulative impact analysis (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4[b]).

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact can be found not cumulatively considerable if the project would comply with an approved plan or mitigation program that provides specific requirements that would avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem in the geographic area of the project. To qualify, such plans or programs must be specified in law or adopted by the public agency with jurisdiction over the affected resources through a public review process to implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced or administered by the public agency. Examples of such programs include a "water quality control plan, air quality attainment or maintenance plan, integrated waste management plan, habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plans [and] plans or regulations for the reduction of GHG emissions." Therefore, a lead agency can make a finding of "less than significant" for GHG emissions if a project complies with adopted programs, plans, policies, and/or other regulatory strategies to reduce GHG emissions.

San Diego County has not adopted a numerical significance threshold for assessing impacts related to GHG emissions and has not formally adopted a local plan for reducing GHG emissions. Neither the San Diego APCD, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), CARB, CAPCOA, nor any other State or applicable regional agency has adopted a numerical significance threshold for assessing GHG emissions that is applicable to the project. Therefore, for this project the County has selected to analyze the significance of the project's GHG emissions impacts based upon consistency with plans and policies adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions and mitigating the effects of climate change, including the CARB 2022 Scoping Plan and SANDAG's 2021 Regional Plan. The County has also quantified the project's GHG emissions for informational purposes.

### Estimated GHG Emissions

The project would produce GHG emissions during construction operations from heavy construction equipment, truck traffic, and worker trips. The CalEEMod air quality modeling conducted for the project determined that construction of the project is estimated to generate a total of 75 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2e</sub>). When amortized over a 30-year period<sup>1</sup>, construction of the project would generate about 2.5 MT CO<sub>2e</sub> per year.

Operation of the proposed gas station, convenience store, and carwash is estimated to generate a total of 828.5 MT CO<sub>2e</sub>. When combined with the amortized construction emissions (2.5 MT CO<sub>2e</sub> per year), the total annual emissions associated with the project would be approximately 831 MT CO<sub>2e</sub>. This is provided for informational purposes only and is not used in the environmental impact analysis.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The significance of the project's GHG emissions impacts are analyzed below based upon consistency with plans and policies adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions and mitigating the effects of climate change.

### State Plans, Policies, and Strategies

In June 2005, the Governor of California signed Executive Order (EO) S-3-05. EO S-3-05 established the following statewide goals: GHG emissions should be reduced to 2000 levels by 2010, GHG emissions should be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020, and GHG emissions should be reduced to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

In 2006, the state passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which set the GHG emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, state emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with the industry standard and per SCAQMD guidance, total construction GHG emissions resulting from a project were amortized over 30 years and added to operational GHG emissions to account for their contribution to GHG emissions over the lifetime of the project.

SB 32 (enacted in 2016) set a new statewide GHG reduction target. More specifically, SB 32 codified a 2030 emissions reduction target that requires CARB to ensure that statewide GHG emissions are reduced to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

EO B-55-18 (September 2018) establishes a new statewide goal “to achieve carbon neutrality as soon as possible, and no later than 2045, and achieve and maintain net negative emissions thereafter.” This executive order directs CARB to “work with relevant state agencies to ensure future Scoping Plans identify and recommend measures to achieve the carbon neutrality goal.”

SB 375, passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires CARB to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing, and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. SANDAG has prepared a Sustainable Communities Strategy for its Regional Transportation Plan, which are elements of the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. The strategy identifies how regional GHG reduction targets, as established by CARB, would be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

AB 1279 was passed in 2022 with a goal to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions no later than 2045, which is quantified as a reduction of anthropogenic emissions (i.e., emission from human activities) of 85 percent below 1990 levels no later than 2045. CARB adopted the 2022 Scoping Plan to achieve this state target.

The Greenhouse Gas Memorandum prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants, dated May 10, 2023 (Appendix E) presents an analysis of project consistency with applicable goals and policies established in CARB’s 2022 Scoping Plan and SANDAG’s 2021 Regional Plan. The 2022 Scoping Plan expands upon earlier plans to include the AB 1279 targets. The 2022 Scoping Plan Update identifies plans and regulations and strategies that are to be implemented at the State and project level that will reduce GHG emissions consistent with State policies. For example, many of the plans and regulations and strategies identified in the 2022 Scoping Plan call for reducing GHG emissions, achieving carbon neutrality, and electrification of existing and new buildings. The project would be consistent with these strategies because the project would be required to comply with Title 24 energy standards for energy efficiency. Project design features that would result in lower energy use include low-flow plumbing fixtures, and a high-reflectivity cool roof. While the project has a natural gas component, it would contribute its fair share to reducing GHG emissions from building decarbonization, because the project receives energy from SDG&E, which has to comply with state renewable energy portfolio targets, which includes receiving 60 percent renewable energy by 2030 and zero carbon sources by 2045. Furthermore, the three applications of natural gas in this project - providing hot water for the gas station and carwash, as well as powering appliances in the convenience store - have the potential to be easily converted to electric in the future without requiring significant construction activities. The project applicant would provide an irrigation plan for the project site that demonstrates a 40 percent reduction in Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) for outdoor water use in the proposed landscaped areas. Consistent with the County Landscaping Ordinance, the project would incorporate climate adapted plants that require occasional, little, or no summer water. Project operations and waste management methods would be consistent with the County’s Strategic Plan to Reduce Waste (2017) through the support of commercial

composting programs to reduce organic waste and comply with established waste diversion requirements. Therefore, the project is consistent with the 2022 Scoping Plan. Refer also to Table 1 in the Greenhouse Gas Memorandum prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants (Appendix E) for a full consistency analysis with the strategies and actions in the 2022 Scoping Plan.

The 2022 Scoping Plan also discusses how California encourages local jurisdictions to take ambitious, coordinated climate action at the community scale; action that is consistent with and supportive of the state's climate goals, which explores the role of local government action and CEQA in detail. These local actions are discussed in detail under Appendix D of the 2022 Scoping Plan. Appendix D identifies priority GHG reduction strategies for local governments under the following three priority areas:

- Transportation electrification
- VMT reduction
- Building decarbonization

Table 2 in the Greenhouse Gas Memorandum prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants (Appendix E) provides a full consistency analysis with the priority GHG reduction strategies for local governments in Appendix D of the 2022 Scoping Plan. As described therein, while the majority of the strategies are to be implemented by the County or local transportation agencies, the project would contribute its fair share of GHG reductions in relation to transportation electrification, VMT reduction, and building decarbonization. While the project is planned to satisfy existing vehicle transportation fuel demand, it does have VMT-reducing features to contribute its fair share, such as one vanpool space that would allow a reduction in vehicle miles, that would have the effect of reducing GHG emissions; in addition, the space could be converted into a future EV charging space. In the future as vehicle transportation demands change, a use located in major transportation areas such as a gas station would be likely locations for alternative fuels such as electric charging or hydrogen fuel; in that scenario, the project site would assist the 2021 Regional Plan goal of healthy air and reduced GHG emissions. The project would also be required to comply with Title 24 energy standards for energy efficiency. Project design features that would result in lower energy use include low-flow plumbing fixtures, and a high-reflectivity cool roof. Therefore, the project is consistent with Appendix D of the 2022 Scoping Plan.

SANDAG adopted the 2021 Regional Plan on December 10, 2021, which serves as the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for the region. The 2021 Regional Plan provides a long-term blueprint for the San Diego region that seeks to meet regulatory requirements, address traffic congestion, and create equal access to jobs, education, healthcare, and other community resources. The plan is intended to reimagine the San Diego region with a transformative transportation system, a sustainable pattern of growth and development, and innovative demand and management strategies.

One of the main goals of the 2021 Regional Plan is for healthy air and reduced GHG emissions. According to the 2021 Regional Plan, reducing our reliance on the automobile as a primary mode of transportation requires that safe, affordable, and convenient alternatives are available. It also requires that people can access their jobs and other destinations by taking shorter trips. This can be achieved by focusing growth and development in the region's urbanized areas, where there are existing and planned transportation options. The 2021 Regional Plan reduces per

capita GHG emissions from cars and light-duty trucks to 20 percent below 2005 levels by 2035, exceeding the region's state-mandated target of 19 percent.

Many of the strategies to achieve this are statewide or regional initiatives to be implemented by state or regional jurisdictions, and therefore would not apply at the project-level. As the project consists of a gas station and convenience store with a limited number of employees, opportunities to reduce mobile sources of GHG emissions are generally limited. For example, measure that promote use of mass transit would be inherently inappropriate for the project. The project does include one vanpool space that would allow a reduction in vehicle miles, that would have the effect of reducing GHG emissions and creating more healthy air; in addition, the space could be converted into a future EV charging space. In general, a gas station use is inherently not oriented for sustainable transportation uses such as transit and rail. Additionally, the proposed gas station use is planned to satisfy existing vehicle transportation fuel demand. In the future as vehicle transportation demands change, a use located in major transportation areas such as a gas station would be likely locations for alternative fuels such as electric charging or hydrogen fuel; in that scenario, the project site would assist the 2021 Regional Plan goal of healthy air and reduced GHG emissions. While there are plans to phase out fossil fuel vehicles, the demand for gasoline will exist for the foreseeable future; even with California's 2035 mandate for 100 percent of vehicles sold to be electric, there would still be legacy gasoline vehicles or vehicles from out of state that would need gasoline. In addition, while the project currently would not provide EV services, the gas station and convenience store would be located in a convenient location for automobiles, and thus would be an ideal location to add EV services when the market demand and technology for such services reaches a critical mass. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2021 Regional Plan.

#### County Plans, Policies, and Strategies

Through its goals, policies, and land use designations, the County's General Plan aims to reduce Countywide GHG emissions. The project is in accordance with relevant COS (Community Open Space)-14 Sustainable Land Development policies (COS-14.10 Use of low-emission construction vehicles for construction; COS-14.11 Native Vegetation will be replanted with similar genetic vegetative stock at a 3:1 ratio unless otherwise stated). These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets. Furthermore, the project does not fall within an area where primary opportunities to reduce air quality pollutants and GHG emissions are in effect such as urbanized areas of the County where there are land use patterns that can best support the increased use of transit and pedestrian activities since most GHGs and air pollutants result from mobile source emissions (San Diego County General Plan, Conservation and Open Space Element).

Project design features that would result in reduced GHG emissions include low-flow plumbing fixtures, and a high-reflectivity cool roof. Additional GHG reductions would result from the project's incorporation of Title 24 energy standards. The site plan indicates landscaping along the frontage of Paradise Valley Boulevard and Elkelton Place, as well as minor strips of landscaping along the eastern project site boundary. The project applicant will provide an irrigation plan for the project site that demonstrates a 40 percent reduction in MAWA for outdoor water use in the proposed landscaped areas. Consistent with the County Landscaping

Ordinance, the project would incorporate climate adapted plants that require occasional, little, or no summer water, excluding edible vegetation and areas using recycled water.

All new construction would be required to comply with the energy code in effect at the time of construction, which ensures efficient building construction. Additional measures such as efficient water usage and efficient outdoor lighting would be employed by the project. The project's consistency with the policies discussed above would assist in meeting the County's contribution to GHG emissions reduction targets in California. As such, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact.

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** -- Would the project:

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: The following technical studies have been prepared for the project:

- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared by Rincon Consultants, dated June 27, 2020 (Appendix F).
- Phase II ESA prepared by Rincon Consultants, dated June 4, 2020 (Appendix G).
- Environmental Site Assessment Report prepared by Nicolas Gustafson, County Hazards Specialist, dated January 4, 2021 (Appendix H).

The following responses have incorporated those analyses.

**Less than Significant Impact:** Project construction would involve the transport of gasoline and other petroleum-based products associated with construction equipment. These materials are considered hazardous as they could cause temporary localized soil and water contamination. Incidents of spills or other localized contamination could occur during refueling, operation of machinery, undetected fluid leaks, or mechanical failure. However, all storage, handling, and disposal of these materials are regulated by California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the USEPA, and the San Miguel Fire Protection District. All construction activities involving the transportation, usage, and disposal of hazardous materials would be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local requirements, which would reduce impacts associated with the use and handling of hazardous materials during construction to less than significant. Operationally, the project would involve the transport, use, and storage of gasoline and diesel fuel. However, the project will not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because all storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances will be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520. Therefore,

the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.

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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** There is one school within 0.25-mile of the project site, Rancho Elementary School. The project site is located approximately 750 feet from the nearest corner of the school (the grass sports field). However, the project includes the installation of a vapor capture and control system, the Veeder-Root CCVP, to capture and hold excess gasoline vapors in the underground storage tanks and vehicle tanks (when fueling), as required by San Diego APCD Rules 61.3.1, 61.4, and 61.4.1. The CCVP system is a toxics best available control technology feature that would ensure fuel vapors are efficiently captured during vehicle fueling activities. Additionally, the transport and handling of minor amounts of hazardous materials during construction and operation would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations that control hazardous material handling. Further, a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) would be required under MM HAZ-1 to protect human health and the environment by providing emergency response personnel and the public information about potential hazardous chemicals being stored at a business, while also ensuring that the business has a plan for emergencies and that their staff has proper training. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** The Phase I ESA prepared by Rincon Consultants, dated June 27, 2019, determined that the site was previously used as a storage yard and has been listed on the Historical Underground Storage Tank (HISTUST) and San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division Database (HMMDD). Three USTs are known to have been placed on the site and there is no record of their removal. Additionally, properties adjacent to the site have been associated with the release of petroleum hydrocarbons. The Phase I ESA determined that the following recognized environmental conditions apply to the property:

1. Former onsite storage yard with USTs;
2. Former adjacent gasoline service station with USTs and a known release; and
3. Former adjacent, upgradient facility with USTs and a known release.

Given the findings of potential hazardous materials beneath the project site, a Phase II ESA was prepared by Rincon Consultants, dated June 4, 2020. The Phase II ESA determined that the following:

1. Evidence of the presence of USTs was not identified; however, evidence of their removal was also not identified.
2. Soil surveys detected concentrations of total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) as diesel (TPH-d) in exceedance of established Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) and that additional hydrocarbon-impacted soils may be encountered.

In order to remediate TPH-d in the soil, as identified in Phase I and Phase II ESAs, or other contaminated soils discovered during grading or construction, remediation under the supervision of the County Department of Environmental Health (DEH), Site Assessment and Mitigation Program (SAM) would be required under MM HAZ-2. MM HAZ-2 would require that the excavated soil be stockpiled, tested, characterized for disposal, and transported off-site to an appropriate disposal facility. Additionally, MM HAZ-3 would require that the County PDS and DEH be notified if any USTs, septic tanks, wells, site debris, and/or contaminated soils are discovered on-site during grading or construction activities. With implementation of MM HAZ-2 and MM HAZ-3, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment, and no impact would occur.

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located within an Airport Influence Area, Airport Safety Zone, Avigation Easement, Overflight area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface area. In addition, the proposed convenience store and carwash buildings would be one story. Therefore, the project does not propose construction of any structure which would constitute a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. The project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, and no impact would occur.



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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. SAN DIEGO COUNTY OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MJHMP:

**Less than Significant Impact:** 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 MJHMP 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 would not interfere with either plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

ii. UNIFIED SAN DIEGO COUNTY EMERGENCY SERVICES ORGANIZATION AREA HAZARDOUS MATERIALS PLAN: OIL SPILL CONTINGENCIES ELEMENT

**No Impact:** The Oil Spill Contingency Element would not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline. Therefore, no impact would occur.

iii. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan would not be interfered with because the project does not include the alteration of a major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct. Therefore, no impact would occur.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

**No Impacts:** The Dam Evacuation Plan would not be interfered with because the project site is not located within the dam inundation zone for the Sweetwater dam (or any other dam) (California Department of Water Resources [DWR] Division of Safety of Dams 2023). In addition, no sensitive receptors, such as a hospital, day-care facility, school, etc., are proposed as part of

the project. Because the project would be located outside the Dam Inundation Zone, no impacts would occur.

f) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project is not located within the Wildland-Urban Interface Zone or a very high fire hazard severity zone (FHSZ). As such, the project is not required to prepare a Fire Protection Plan (FPP). The Building Plan for the project is required to be reviewed and approved by the County Fire Authority and as such, would comply with regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code (see Section XX, Wildfire). Based on review of the project by County staff, and through compliance with the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code, impacts would be less than significant.

g) 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash in the unincorporated community of Spring Valley. No activities or uses are proposed that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g., artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Therefore, the project would not substantially increase current or future resident’s exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats, or flies.

**Mitigation Measures**

**HAZ-1:**

**HAZARDOUS MATERIALS BUSINESS PLAN (HMBP)**

**INTENT:** To protect human health and the environment, a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) serves the purpose of providing emergency response personnel and the public information about potential hazardous chemicals being stored at a business, while also ensuring that the business has a plan for emergencies and that their staff has proper training. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** A HMBP consists of: Facility Information

(contacts), Hazardous Materials Inventory & Site Map, and Emergency Response and Training Plan. The HMBP must be submitted online in the California Environmental Reporting System, and reviewed and approved by the Hazardous Materials Division (HMD) of the Department of Environmental Health (DEH) and a Unified Program Facility Permit (UPFP) will be issued to comply with California Health & Safety Code Ch 6.95, California Code of Regulations Title 19, and the San Diego County Code. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall begin by filling out a hazardous materials questionnaire in the local online portal. Once reviewed, HMD will provide the applicant with a stamped form that will let them know if the HMBP is required, or if they're exempt from that requirement. The stamped questionnaire serves as evidence from the county of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division (DEH, HMD) to state that the appropriate DEH, State and/or Federal permits are being pursued or that a Unified Program Facility Permit is not required. **TIMING:** Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the HMBP shall be prepared, submitted in CERS, and implemented. **MONITORING:** [DEH, HMD] shall verify and approve the HMBP for compliance with this condition and the business will need to annually certify this plan as well as comply with any other requirements that are part of the Unified Program. **CONTACT:** Email [HazmatPlanCheck@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:HazmatPlanCheck@sdcounty.ca.gov) for more information or to inquire about the plan check process.

#### HAZ-2:

##### **SOIL TESTING AND REMEDIATION [PDS, FEE X 2]**

**INTENT:** In order to remediate impacts associate with petroleum hydrocarbons in the soil, as identified in Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) prepared by Rincon and Associates, dated June 27, 2019 and June 4, 2020, or other contaminated soils discovered during grading or construction, remediation under the supervision of the Department of Environmental Health (DEH), [Site Assessment and Mitigation Program \(SAM\)](#) is required. The excavated soil should be stockpiled, tested, characterized for disposal and transported off-site to an appropriate disposal facility. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** For soil testing, a signed, stamped addendum to the Phase II ESA shall be prepared by a Registered Engineer or Professional Geologist. The addendum shall include the following information or as modified by DEH:

- a. Documentation that the soil sampling occurred between six inches to 2-3 feet in depth.
- b. Findings which identify whether onsite soils in this location exceed regulatory screening levels for soil vapors, petroleum, heavy metals, or other contaminants (including PCEs and TCEs).
- c. If contaminated soils are detected, provide a copy of the contract and a signed sealed statement from the Registered Engineer or Professional Geologist, which states that they will implement the work plan approved by SAM. Grading required to implement the site remediation activities is permitted.

For remediation, a California Licensed Environmental Consultant company shall prepare a Soil Management Plan (SMP), for the remediation of hazardous materials as identified above. The plan shall be prepared and implemented pursuant to the [DEH SAM Manual](#) under direction from the DEH [SAM](#):

- d. Enrollment in the DEH, Voluntary Assistance Program (VAP) is required. If contamination is found to be from an underground storage tank (UST) then enrollment in the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Underground Storage Tank (UST) Cleanup Program is required in lieu of enrollment in the VAP. All soil remediation shall be completed under supervision of the SAM/VAP or the RWQCB as required.
- e. All required grading work shall comply with the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance 87.101 et. al. If a grading permit is required for the remediation work, it shall be issued for the remediation work only.
- f. The presence, locations and quantities of septic system(s) shall be evaluated. If present, the septic tanks shall be removed under approval from the [DEH, LWQ].
- g. Once contaminated soils are removed, these soils shall be replaced by compacted fill in layers to ensure the structural integrity of the gas station, convenience store, and carwash structures.
- h. If the Director of PDS determines the remediation work will take an enormous amount of time that would be detrimental to ultimate project implementation, approval of other engineering plans and/or issuance of other project permits may be permitted as long as there is no risk of effects to public health and safety. Concurrence from the [DEH, SAM] or RWQCB is required, and the applicant shall enter into a secured agreement for the completion of the remediation work.

**DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall contract with a California Licensed Environmental Consultant to prepare the SMP and implement any required work plan for soil remediation. The applicant shall also enroll in the VAP or UST Cleanup Program and pay all applicable fees for review and completion of this requirement. Upon completion of the VAP or UST Cleanup Program, a "Closure Letter" from [DEH, SAM or the RWQCB] shall be submitted to the [PDS, PPD] for approval. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of any grading and/or improvement plans, the applicant shall comply with this condition. **MONITORING:** The [DEH, SAM or RWQCB] shall oversee the progress of the remediation project. Upon Completion of the remediation project the [DEH, SAM or the RWQCB] shall issue a "Closure Letter" to the applicant. The [PDS, PPD] shall review the closure letter for compliance with this condition.

**HAZ-3:**

**PLAN CONDITIONS NOTES [DPW, ESU] [PDS, BD] [DPR TC, PP] [GP, IP, MA]**

**INTENT:** In order to implement the required mitigation measures, for which was the basis for approval of this project pursuant to Section 87.207 of the County Grading Ordinance the condition notes shall be implemented on the final engineering plans and made conditions of the permit issuance. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The final engineering plans shall include the following condition notes and made conditions of the issuance of said permit:

- a. Prior to the preconstruction meeting for the project, the following Grading and or Improvement Plan Notes shall be placed on the Preliminary Grading Plan and made conditions of the issuance of said permits:

In the event that any activity, including earthmoving or construction, discovers the presence of USTs, septic tanks, wells, site debris, and/or contaminated soils on-site, the contractor and/or property owner shall notify County PDS and DEHQ. The presence of contaminated soils will require soil testing and remediation in accordance with standard County procedures. This process will be determined once the County is notified of the presence of contaminated soils.

**DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall submit the grading, improvement and building plans, which shall include the above reference condition notes. The condition notes shall be in addition to what is already approved on the Conceptual Grading and Improvement Plan, unless indicated in this condition that it is superseding. Changes to the final engineering plans that are not consistent with the conceptual plan may cause further environmental review. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of any grading and or improvement plans and issuance of any Grading or Construction Permits) for any phase, the notes and items shall be placed on the plans. **MONITORING:** The [DPW, ESU, or PDS, BD for PDS Minor Grading and DPR, TC and PP for trail and park improvements] shall verify that the grading and or improvement plan requirements have been implemented on the final engineering plans. The environmental mitigation notes shall be made conditions of the issuance of said grading or construction permit.

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: The following technical studies have been prepared for the project:

- PDP – SWQMP prepared by Howes Weiler Landy, dated December 19, 2022 (Appendix I).
- Preliminary Drainage Report prepared by Howes Weiler Landy, dated February 2023 (Appendix J).

The following responses have incorporated the analyses from these studies.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is required to obtain a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. Minimum required construction BMPs would include vegetation stabilization planting, fiber rolls (straw wattles), stabilized construction entrance, materials management, and waste management. In addition, a Standard SWQMP dated December 19, 2022 has been prepared. The project proposes and would be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or permanent post-construction pollutant and hydromodification control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering stormwater runoff: vegetation stabilization planting on disturbed slopes, bonded or stabilized fiber matrix, energy dissipater outlet protection for water velocity control, silt fencing, gravel and sand bags, storm

drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance, and measures to control materials management (including spill prevention and control) and waste management.

The project would be consistent with requirements of the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual, which is a design manual for compliance with local County of San Diego Watershed Protection Ordinance (Sections 67.801 et seq.) and regional Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB], San Diego Region Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100) requirements for stormwater management.

Additionally, the PDP-SWQMP prepared for the project includes several long-term operational BMPs that would prevent degradation of surface or groundwater quality (e.g., prohibiting discharges to the storm drains, maintaining landscaping using minimal-to-no pesticides, sweeping paved areas regularly, etc.).

Given that the project would incrementally increase the area of impervious surfaces onsite, and includes long-term operational BMPs, the project would have less than significant impacts on water quality standards and discharge requirements, as well as degradation of surface and groundwater quality in general.

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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is located within the La Nacion 909.12 Hydrologic Area of the Sweetwater Hydrologic Unit in the San Diego Region. The nearest impaired waterbody as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list are the Sweetwater Reservoir and Lower Sweetwater River, approximately 0.6 mile southeast of the project site. According to the Preliminary Drainage Report prepared for the project by Howes Weiler Landy, dated February 2023 (Appendix J), drainage from the project site is tributary to the Sweetwater Reservoir and Lower Sweetwater River. Specifically, flow leaves the site as sheet flow and enter an existing concrete swale, which runs parallel to the easterly property line, once flows enter the concrete swale they are collected by an underground storm drain system which conveys flow under SR-125 ultimately discharging in a creek located on the east side of SR-125, which flows in a south westerly direction and ultimately connecting to the Sweetwater river, approximately 0.25 miles west of the Sweetwater Reservoir. An existing curb inlet is located approximately 15 feet south of the existing driveway on Paradise Valley Road, flows are capture and immediately conveyed underground and routed to the same creek located on the east side of SR-125.

The Standard SWQMP prepared for the project includes design measures and source control BMPs such that potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of pollutants in receiving waters and reduce impacts on stormwater

quality and hydromodification to less than significant levels during construction (e.g., vegetation stabilization planting, fiber rolls (straw wattles), stabilized construction entrance, materials and waste management, permeable surfaces, and biofiltration basins). The BMPs are consistent with the regional surface water and stormwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and stormwater permitting regulation for County of San Diego includes the following: RWQCB, San Diego Region Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100, San Diego Watershed Protection Ordinance (Sections 67.801 et seq.), and the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual. The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to ensure the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of stormwater as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. The Watershed Protection Ordinance has discharge prohibitions and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. The project would be subject to the Watershed Protection Ordinance, which would require the preparation of a Stormwater Management Plan that details the project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and proposes BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

Additionally, the PDP-SWQMP prepared for the project includes several long-term operational BMPs that would prevent degradation of surface or groundwater quality (e.g., prohibiting discharges to the storm drains, maintaining landscaping using minimal-to-no pesticides, dry sweeping the fueling area routinely, etc.). Therefore, construction and operational impacts to an impaired water body would be less than significant.

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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The RWQCB has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit. The project lies in the La Nacion 909.12 Hydrologic Area of the Sweetwater Hydrologic Unit that has the following existing beneficial uses for groundwater: industrial service supply, contact water recreation, non-contact water recreation, warm freshwater habitat, and wildlife habitat.

Potential sources of polluted runoff resulting from the project are discussed in the Standard SWQMP prepared for the project. The following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or permanent post construction pollutant and hydromodification control BMPs would be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the project would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or

groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: industrial service supply, contact water recreation, non-contact water recreation, warm freshwater habitat, and wildlife habitat.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, stormwater and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section X(b), for more information on regional surface water and stormwater planning and permitting process.

d) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash. Limited water will be required during the construction phase for dust control and suppression and would be obtained from the Otay Water District. No groundwater would be used for any purposes during construction or operation phases of the project. In addition, the project would result in an incremental increase in impervious surfaces, which would not interfere with regional groundwater recharge, and would include landscaping bordering the paved surfaces which would allow for infiltration. The project would not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin, or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g., 0.25-mile). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surface, in a manner which would:

(i) result in substantial erosion or siltration on- or offsite;

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to create new impervious surfaces consistent with a gas station, convenience store, and carwash, including rooftops, driveways, a gas station canopy, and parking areas. The project would include grading activities to level out



areas for new improvements, and the drainage patterns would be adjusted to allow for surface flows to be collected at the project site driveway on Paradise Valley Road via a trench drain. The project proposes installation of storm drain structures that would convey flows to the same pre-development discharge point. All runoff would sheet flow in a northerly direction and would be collected by a trench drain located along the project site driveway. Flows would then be conveyed via an 8-inch HDPE storm drain system to proposed bio-filtration facilities that would improve water quality and will help avoid flooding off-site by attenuating velocities and reducing peak flows. Treated flows would then be conveyed via a 12-inch PVC storm drain to a pump structure which would ultimately discharge flows through an onsite curb outlet located in a landscape area south of the parking stalls. Flows would eventually leave the site as surface flows before entering an existing Caltrans concrete ditch which is parallel to the southernly property line. These flows would ultimately comingle with the creek flows located on the east side of SR-125, and be directed to the Sweetwater River

The project would implement construction and operational BMPs to protect water quality as established in the PDP-SWQMP prepared for the project and described above in Section X(a). Several of these BMPs are intended to reduce erosion and siltation to the maximum extent feasible. In addition, as shown in Table 3 of the Preliminary Drainage Report prepared for the project by Howes Weiler Landy, dated February 2023 (Appendix J), the 100-year peak flow from the project site would be reduced from 0.98 cubic feet per second (cfs) to 1.03 cfs following development of the site. First flush runoff from the site would be treated in biofiltration basins. Drainage patterns and basin areas would not be substantially altered by the project as shown in Table 3 of the Preliminary Drainage Report. Therefore, the Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite and impacts would be less than significant.

(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Please refer to Section X(e)(i). The proposed Project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff. As shown in Table 3 of the Preliminary Drainage Report prepared for the project by Howes Weiler Landy, dated February 2023 (Appendix J), the 100-year peak flow from the project site would be reduced from 0.98 cfs to 1.03 cfs following development of the site, and drainage patterns and basin areas would not be substantially altered. The project would result in an incremental increase in impervious surfaces and would include landscaping bordering the paved surfaces which would allow for infiltration. Given that the project site is only 0.5 acre and a portion of the project site would consist of pervious surfaces, the project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite. Impacts would be less than significant.

(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The Project would implement construction and operational BMPs to protect water quality as established in the PDP-SWQMP prepared for the Project and described above in Section X(a) and would have a less than significant impact with regard to substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. As described in Section X(e)(i) above, the project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns and would actually reduce the amount of runoff from the project site (i.e., the 100-year peak flow from the project site would be reduced from 0.98 cfs to 1.03 cfs in the developed condition). Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to creating or contributing runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage system.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Please see Section X(e)(i) through (iii). The Preliminary Drainage Report prepared for the project by Howes Weiler Landy, dated February 2023 (Appendix J) demonstrates that the project would not impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, the project would not impede or redirect flows. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is not located within a Dam Inundation Zone. The project site is also not located within Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), County Floodplain, or County Floodway flood zones, or located within a tsunami or seiche inundation zone. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

g) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site would be in compliance with the San Diego Basin Water Quality Control Plan and is not located within a County Sustainable Groundwater Management Act or Groundwater Sustainability Plan basin area. See Section X(a) through (d). Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash in the unincorporated community of Spring Valley. The project does not propose the introduction of new major infrastructure that would physically divide an established community such as roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area. In addition, no new development is proposed that would have the potential to physically divide an established community. Therefore, the project is consistent with the use regulations in place and would not significantly disrupt or physically divide an established community. No impact would be occur.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash, which is consistent with the Industrial land use and zoning designations for the project site. The project does not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**XII. MINERAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is not classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance.” The project site is surrounded by developed residential land uses which would be incompatible with future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Additionally, the project site is less than one acre in size. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource extraction would not occur at the site due to incompatible land uses.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is not located in a Mineral Resource Zone, nor is it located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan would occur as a result of this project.

**XIII. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation: The following technical studies have been prepared for the project:

- Noise Report prepared by Rincon Consultants, dated June 2020 (Appendix K).

- Noise Conditions and Comments prepared by Souphalak Sakdarak, County Environmental Planner, dated August 8, 2023 (Appendix L). Ordinance Compliance Checklist

The following responses have incorporated those analyses.

**Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash on a 0.5-acre lot. The project also includes off-site road improvements on Paradise Valley Road.

The project would be consistent with the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Ordinance, and other applicable noise standards with implementation of MM NOI-1:

#### General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is in excess of 60 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries, or similar facilities as mentioned within Tables N-1 and N-2. Noise sensitive land uses (residences as close as approximately 110 feet to the north and west across Paradise Valley Road) exist in proximity to the project site.

The project site as well as surrounding adjacent parcels to the east, south, and southwest are zoned Limited and General Impact Industrial (M52 & M54, respectively), which are subject to the noise levels of 70 dBA anytime. The adjacent parcels to the northwest are zoned Single-Family Residential (RS), which is subject to the arithmetic mean noise level limits of 60 dBA daytime and 57.5 dBA nighttime.

In accordance with the County's commercial/retail land use category noise compatibility guidelines, a significant impact from traffic noise would occur to on-site project uses if exterior noise levels exceed 65 CNEL at an exterior use area and if interior noise levels exceed 50 CNEL. On-site noise would be primarily from traffic noise. Because the proposed project entails a gas station and carwash use, the project would not have exterior use areas provided for usable open space (e.g., park, balcony, patio, etc.), and therefore the project would not conflict with the County land use compatibility standards for exterior noise for a commercial/retail use. On-site noise levels from traffic at the project's interior areas would be 46 dBA equivalent noise level ( $L_{eq}$ ), and would be within County land use compatibility standards for a commercial/retail use of 50 dBA Leq. Impacts would be less than significant.

In accordance with the County of San Diego's single-family residential land use category noise compatibility guidelines, a significant impact to off-site single-family residences from project-generated traffic noise would occur if residences are exposed to noise levels in excess of 60 CNEL for single-family residential uses or an increase of 10 CNEL or more over existing noise levels. If existing conditions approach or exceed County of San Diego standards, a direct impact to off-site uses would occur if the project more than doubles (i.e., increases by more than 3

CNEL) the existing noise level. The project would increase traffic by 893 ADT on Paradise Valley Road, which has an existing ADT of 24,104 and borders the single-family residences closest to the project site. Based on the project's 4-percent increase in traffic on Paradise Valley Road, the project's increase in off-site traffic noise levels would be imperceptible to the human ear and would not exceed the County of San Diego standard for allowable traffic noise increases; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Combined on-site operational noises from the automated carwash and Heating Ventilating Air Conditioning (HVAC) units would generate noise levels up to 57 dBA  $L_{eq}$  at the nearest single-family residential zone. Because the project site is in an industrial zone, the applicable nighttime noise limit would be the arithmetic mean between the noise limit for a residential zone and industrial zone, which is 57.5 dBA  $L_{eq}$ ; therefore, the project would not exceed the County of San Diego's daytime and nighttime noise standards at nearby single-family residences. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### Noise Ordinance

The project is also subject to the County Noise Ordinance which regulates temporary construction noise associated with the project, Sections 36.408 and 36.409. Section 36.409 of the County Noise Ordinance states that construction noise shall not exceed 75 dBA at the property line during an 8-hour period between 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. It is unlawful to operate construction equipment between 7 p.m. and 7 a.m. and no work shall be done on Sundays and Holidays, per Section 36.408.

The project proposes approximately 550 CY of earthwork and would not include pile driving or explosive blasting. Construction equipment associated with the proposed grading would include dozers, excavators, and loaders. The Noise Report evaluated the construction noise based on a conservative scenario by assuming that the loader and dozer would operate simultaneously at the edge of the project site's property line closest to nearby residential sensitive receptors (110 feet away). At that distance, if the loader and dozer were to operate simultaneously, associated noise levels would be 73 dBA  $L_{eq}$  and 75  $L_{max}$  (i.e., highest root mean squared [RMS] sound pressure level). Therefore, the noise levels from these activities will not exceed an average sound level of 75 dBA for an 8-hour period. In addition, the project would be conditioned with "Good Practice Measures," to ensure compliance with the Noise Ordinance, Sections 36.408 and 36.409. Based on the results of the Noise Report, the noise levels generated from proposed construction activities are not anticipated to exceed the standards established in the County Noise Ordinance and therefore, would comply with the County Noise Ordinance, Sections 36.408 and 36.409.

Off-site construction activities would occur for the proposed concrete median on Paradise Valley Road, approximately 60 feet from the single-family residences to the west. The Noise Report determined that, at that distance, the concrete saw would generate a noise level of 81.0 dBA  $L_{eq}$  which exceeds the Noise Ordinance threshold of 75 dBA  $L_{eq}$  (8-hour). To mitigate the noise levels from off-site construction in compliance with the San Diego County the 75 dBA  $L_{eq}$  (8-hour) noise threshold, the project would incorporate MM NOI-1 as a condition of approval. MM NOI-1 contains several measures that may be implemented to reduce concrete saw noise impacts, such as by limiting the use of the concrete saw for no longer than 25 percent of an hour; temporary installation of a noise barrier to break the line of sight between occupied properties

and concrete saw; and/or placement of noise reduction enclosures in lieu of a barrier. Implementation of MM NOI-1 would ensure off-site construction noise impacts from use of a concrete saw would comply with the 75 dBA  $L_{eq}$  (8-hour) noise threshold, as a noise barrier or enclosure would reduce noise levels by approximately 9 dBA to 72 dBA  $L_{eq}$  (8-hour) or restricting concrete saw operation to 25 percent of an hour would result in a noise level of 75 dBA  $L_{eq}$ . Therefore, off-site construction noise impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

The project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from state regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Operation of the proposed project would not include any substantial groundborne vibration or groundborne noise sources. Thus, construction activities have the greatest potential to generate ground-borne vibration affecting nearby receivers, especially during grading and excavation of the project site. The greatest vibratory source during construction would be a vibratory roller used during paving. Neither blasting nor pile driving would be required for construction of the proposed project. Construction vibration estimates are based on vibration levels reported by Caltrans and the FTA (Caltrans 2013, Federal Transit Administration 2018). The "Occasional Events" threshold of 0.010 inches per second RMS velocity is used since project construction would not require the use of impact devices or blasting activities, and groundborne vibration would be primarily generated by typical construction equipment that would be mobile and would not operate continuously at a single distance. The noise analysis assesses the potential for vibration generated by a large bulldozer, which would generate the highest levels of vibration of all the construction equipment on-site and is therefore most likely to be felt at nearby residences. The analysis also assumes the shortest distance from the property line of the project site to the nearest residential property line (110 feet) for a conservative analysis.

According to the Caltrans *Transportation and Construction Guidance Manual*, a large bulldozer generates a peak vibratory wave of 0.022 inches per second RMS velocity at a distance of 25 feet (Caltrans 2013). Damping occurs in the vibratory waves as they propagate through the soil, resulting in a reduced vibration velocity being felt at further distances. The estimated vibration velocity that would be experienced at the nearest residence, a distance of 110 feet, would be 0.004 inches per second RMS. The 0.010 inches per second RMS contour would lie 50 feet

away from where the bulldozer is operating, which is less than the distance from the property line of the project site to the nearest residential property line. Therefore, groundborne vibration generated from construction activities would have a less than significant impact to the nearby residences.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located within an Airport Influence Area, Airport Safety Zone, Avigation Easement, Overflight area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface area. The closest airports are the John Nichol’s Field Airport, 8 miles to the southeast, and the Agua Caliente Airport, 9 miles to the northeast. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

**NOI-1:**

**NOISE#1–TEMPORARY NOISE IMPACTS**

**INTENT:** In order to reduce the sound level generated from project construction on the residential uses and to comply with the [County of San Diego Noise Ordinance 36.409](#) the following noise attenuation measures shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** As evaluated in the Noise Report prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. and [County of San Diego Noise Guidelines for Determining Significance](#), the temporary noise impacts from the off-site construction noise along Paradise Valley Road shall be mitigated below levels of significance. Noise levels from off-site conceptual median construction along Paradise Valley Road using a concrete saw shall not exceed the San Diego County the 75 dBA Leq (8-hour) noise threshold. Measures to comply with this threshold may include one of the following options:

- a. Option 1: Reduce the usage of the concrete saw to not be longer than 25 percent of an hour or approximately 15 minutes per hour and supply a statement and must be included in the grading plan. **OR**
- b. A temporary noise attenuation barrier shall be placed along Paradise Valley Road to break the line of sight between the occupied properties and concrete saw. The barrier shall be designed and placed to reduce construction noise that potentially will effect the adjacent residential use located 60 feet to the west of that roadway. The barrier shall be maintained for the duration of the construction activities that will create noise greater than 75 dB at the property line indicated above. The attenuation barrier shall comply with following requirements:



- i. The temporary construction noise barrier shall be 8-foot high with a minimum surface density of two pounds per square foot, consisting of masonry, wood, berm, plastic, fiberglass, steel or a combination of these material with no cracks or gaps through or below the wall. If wood is used, temporary barrier design shall be with a minimum thickness of 5/8-inch plywood, 5/8-inch oriented strand board, and hay bales.
- ii. Alternately, where placement of noise reduction enclosures are feasible, they may be used in lieu of a barrier. The enclosure shall be a minimum 10 feet wide by 10 feet long and of eight-foot height to block the line of sight from the pile head to the nearest residence and shall move along with the saw. A typical noise reduction enclosure frame shall be constructed of steel tubing and sound blankets. The sound blankets are required to have a minimum breaking and tear strength of 120 pounds and 30 pounds, respectively. The sound blankets shall have a minimum sound transmission classification of 27 and noise reduction coefficient of 0.70. The sound blankets shall be of sufficient length to extend from the top of the frame and drape on the ground or be sealed at the ground. The sound blankets shall have grommets along the top edge with exterior grade hooks, and loop fasteners along the vertical edges with overlapping seams, with a minimum overlap of 2 inches.

**DOCUMENTATION:** The contractor shall incorporate the noise mitigation measure(s) as indicated above. The contractor shall provide site photos, a statement from a California Registered Engineer, or licensed surveyor that the barrier has been installed to the [PDS, PCC]. OR the contractor shall provide a statement indicating the usage of the concrete saw cutting machinery shall not exceed 25% of an hour (15 minutes per hour). This statement shall be placed on the grading/improvement plans and verified by [PDS, PCC]. If a new analysis is performed to provide an alternative method, then submit the report to [PDS, PCC] for review. **TIMING:** Option 1: Prior to approval of any grading and/or improvement plans of any Grading; Option 2, prior to Preconference, the location of the walls a mitigation measure(s) indicated above must be incorporated. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PCC] shall review the photos and statement for compliance with this condition.

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:**

- a) Induce substantial unplanned 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"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash in a primarily residential neighborhood. The project would 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 including, but not limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or San Diego County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) annexation actions. According to 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 ten new employment opportunities and these positions are expected to be filled by those in the Spring Valley and neighboring communities. Project employment opportunities would account for 0.02 percent of the job growth forecast by SANDAG for the unincorporated County. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project would not displace any existing people or housing because the project would not demolish any habitable structures and would be limited to construction and operation of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and carwash. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash in a primarily residential neighborhood. The project would not result in the need for significantly altered public services or facilities including, but not limited to, fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed. Impacts would be less than significant.

**XVI. RECREATION**

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash in a primarily residential neighborhood. The project would not 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. Therefore, no impact to recreational facilities would occur from the project.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur from the project.

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION** -- Would the project:

a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: The following technical studies have been prepared for the project:

- Traffic Study prepared by Urban Systems Associates, Inc., dated May 2, 2023 (Appendix M).
- Parking Evaluation prepared by Urban Systems Associates, Inc., dated May 2, 2023 (Appendix N).

The following responses have incorporated the analyses from these studies.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash. The project would not have a direct impact related to a conflict with any plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system. Project trips, or average daily trips (ADTs), associated with construction is estimated to include between 5 and 20 ADT for workers. Given that construction worker trips would be temporary and would be dispersed along different routes based on the origin of the trips, construction worker commuting is not expected to have a significant effect on the capacity of the transportation system.

Operationally, the project is calculated to generate a net increase of 893 primary average daily trips (ADT) with 71 AM (36 In / 36 Out) peak hour trips and 80 PM (40 In / 40 Out) peak hour trips. The project would not generate substantial vehicle trips to the project site (see Section XVII[b] below). The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including public 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 public transit. In addition, the project would include an off-site improvement to install a concrete-filled traffic median with a 6-inch-high curb located on the portion of Paradise Valley Road north of Elkelton Boulevard to the intersection of Paradise Valley Road and the SR-125 on-ramp. Implementation of the proposed concrete median would not interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, nor would it generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian, or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

b) Would the project conflict or be consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, *Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts*, land use projects should be evaluated based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT). In accordance with the County's Draft 2022 Transportation Study Guidelines, the requirements to prepare a detailed transportation VMT analysis apply to all land development projects, except those that meet at least one of the screening criteria. A project that meets at least one of the screening criteria below would have a less than significant VMT impact due to project characteristics and/or location:

1. Projects Located in a VMT Efficient Area
2. Projects located in Infill Village Area (in Transit Opportunity Areas and Outside of High/Very High Fire Severity Areas)
3. Small Residential and Employment Projects
4. Locally Serving Retail Projects
5. Locally Serving Public Facilities
6. Redevelopment Projects with Lower Total VMT
7. Affordable Housing

The project meets the screening criterion 4 (Locally Serving Retail Projects), as described in further detail below.

**Less than Significant Impact:** CEQA Section 15064.3, *Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts*, states that for many projects, a qualitative analysis of construction traffic may be appropriate. Since construction traffic is temporary and workers are either travelling to the project jobsite or another jobsite elsewhere, the impact on VMT is considered less than significant.

The project would develop a gasoline service station with a 2,318-sf canopy, a 4,713-sf convenience store, and an 855-sf fully automated, enclosed carwash. Pursuant to the County's adopted Transportation Study Guidelines, the project meets the CEQA VMT screening criteria for locally serving retail projects that are less than 50,000 sf and will not result in a significant VMT impact. 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 percent of their total ADT as primary trips with the remaining trips being related to diverted or pass-by trips. 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 project requires a minimal number of employees to operate the use 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. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to consistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project would not substantially increase driving hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. The project would develop a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash. Additionally, the project would include an off-site improvement to install a concrete-filled traffic median with a 6-inch-high curb located on the portion of Paradise Valley Road north of Elkerton Boulevard to the intersection of Paradise Valley Road and the SR-125 on-ramp. The proposed concrete median would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- |                          |  |                                     |                              |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project would not generate traffic volumes that would impede emergency access. The County Fire Authority has reviewed the proposed plans and are required to comply with the County’s emergency access requirements per the San Diego County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code, including turning radius and maneuverability of large emergency vehicles such as fire trucks and ambulances. Therefore, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts would be less than significant.

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of Historical Resources as defined in Public Resources Code §5020.1(k), or

- |                          |  |                                     |                              |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact                    |

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1, the Lead Agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: A record search request of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) held by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was made on May 24, 2019. The NAHC responded on June 10, 2019 that the record search of the Sacred Lands File was negative. The NAHC provided a list of 19 Native American individuals and organizations which may have additional information on the project area. Red Tail contacted the Native American groups and individuals provided by the NAHC, on June 11, 2019, to further investigate whether they have knowledge of Sacred Lands occurring within the project area. On June 12, 2019 Clint Linton, Director of Cultural Resources, Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, responded that he has no comments or concerns related to the project. On June 27, 2019, Ray Teran, Resources Management, Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians responded that the project site has cultural significance or ties to Viejas and they request a Kumeyaay Cultural Monitor to be on site during ground disturbing activities. As of August 22, 2019, no additional responses have been received (Appendix D).

**Less than Significant Impact:** Pursuant to AB 52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians requested a Kumeyaay Cultural Monitor to be on site during ground disturbing activities due to the cultural significance of the project site and ties to Viejas. No other tribes requested consultation.

Additionally, the Cultural Resources Report reported no archaeological resources or indications of potential subsurface cultural resources during the field survey. The Cultural Resources Report further determined that the project site has been extensively modified from SR-125 freeway off-ramp construction. The substantial previous ground disturbance suggests that subsurface contexts that promote the preservation of cultural resources are unlikely to exist within the project area. Due to the lack of identified archaeological deposits, negative Sacred Lands File record search, and the probable lack of conducive subsurface environments, the Cultural Resources Report did not recommend cultural resource monitoring during ground disturbing activities or additional archaeological work.

Nevertheless, a Kumeyaay Cultural Monitor would be on site during ground disturbing activities as requested by the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians. Therefore the project would not result in a significant impact related to tribal cultural resources.

**XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** -- Would the project:

- a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash. The project is served by the Otay Water District and no new or expanded water or wastewater facilities are required for the project. Therefore, because the project would not require the construction of new or expanded facilities that could cause significant environmental effects, less than significant impacts would occur.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

- |                          |  |                                     |                              |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is served by the Otay Water District. Minimal water would be required during project construction for dust control and suppression. The industrial use type is integrated into the Otay Water District’s current and future water projections. Therefore, the project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

c) 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"/> | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash. As such, the project would be served by the e City of San Diego’s Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant for wastewater treatment. The Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant currently has wastewater treatment capacity of 240 million gallons per day (gpd) and currently only treats 175 million gpd (City of San Diego 2023). Therefore, the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant has capacity to serve the project, and the project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers service capacity. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?



- |                          |  |                                     |                              |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash, which would result in limited long-term operational solid waste generation. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity, including Borrego Landfill (111,504 cubic yards [cy] remaining capacity), Otay Landfill (21,194,008 cy remaining capacity), West Miramar Sanitary Landfill (11,080,871 cy remaining capacity), Sycamore Landfill (113,972,637 cy remaining capacity), San Onofre Landfill (1,057,605 cy remaining capacity), and Las Pulgas Landfill (9,503,985 cy remaining capacity). Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs and the project would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and impacts would be less than significant.

- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- |                          |  |                                     |                              |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project includes development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash, which would result in limited long-term operational solid waste generation. All solid waste facilities, including landfills, require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency, issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from CalRecycle 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 County requires recycling of 90 percent of inerts and 70 percent of all other materials from construction projects, per County Ordinance Section 68.508 through 68.518 (Diversion of Construction and Demolition Materials from Landfill Disposal). The project would be in compliance with County ordinances upon submission of a Construction and Demolition Debris Management Plan prior to the issuance of a building permit. Project operations and waste management methods would be consistent with the County’s Strategic Plan to Reduce Waste (2017) through the support of commercial composting programs to reduce organic waste and comply with established waste diversion requirements. The project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility, and therefore, would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**XX. WILDFIRE** -- If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: The project site is not located within a high or very high FHSZ; therefore, the project is not required to prepare a FPP.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project would be served by the San Miguel Fire Protection District Station 16, approximately 0.6 miles (driving distance) northeast of the project site. As described in Section IX(e), the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project would include construction and operation of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash, with no growth-inducing project components. Therefore, no substantial demand beyond current conditions is required for emergency response. Project access would be from a driveway along Paradise Valley Road. Project access would comply with County road standards (e.g., secondary access, road and street grade below 20 percent, paved streets with capacity to support up to 75,000 pounds, etc.). Therefore, the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation: The current USGS topographic map indicates that the project site is at an elevation of approximately 280 feet above mean sea level with topography sloping down to the east. The surrounding topography consists of hills and valleys. There are interspersed homes throughout this area, including the more rugged areas to the northwest and southwest of the project site. Climate is characterized by generally mild winters, with the bulk of the annual precipitation (8-10 inches precipitation per year) falling between January and March, frequent periods of extended drought, and long dry and hot spring, summer and fall seasons, which dry out the native vegetation making the native vegetation species surrounding the project site very flammable. Regional wind patterns are dominated by onshore sea breezes during the day, and winds generally slow or reverse direction toward the sea at night. The project site is located approximately 7 miles inland from the inner harbor of San Diego Bay.

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project site is within a local responsibility area classified as "Urban Unzoned" and is not within an identified FHSZ. Given that the majority of the County is in the high and very high FHSZ, the County has implemented fire safety measures depending on specific factors, such as location, vegetation, etc. Homes near the project site and their compliance with fuel modification requirements lower the fire threat and risk to the proposed

project. It should also be noted that SR-125 adjacent to the east and south to the project site provide significant fire protection from the high and very high FHSZs east of the project site near Sweetwater Reservoir.

Structure ignitions from wildland fire fuels basically come from two sources of heat: convective firebrands (flying embers) and radiant heat. Convective firebrands, transferred during periods of high fire intensity and strong dry winds, have the capability of being transported over long (several hundred feet and up to several miles) distances. Construction requirements must meet all the current County Building Code and State of California Building Codes (Chapter 7A) requirements for construction in wildland areas. Ignition resistant building requirements found in the County Building Code (more restrictive than the California Building Code) will significantly reduce the threat of wildfire at the project site, especially the flying embers entering a structure, landing on a receptive fuel, and starting a new fire. For example, exterior walls of the enclosed carwash building would be constructed with one-hour fire resistant building materials and protected with two-inch nominal solid blocking between rafters at all roof overhangs and under the exterior wall covering. Portable fire extinguishers are required and shall be mounted on walls near exits with appropriate signage.

Convective heat will be minimized for the project by constructing all buildings with non-combustible roofing and non-combustible or standard fire-resistive building materials, per the San Miguel Fire Protection District requirements. By requiring all structures to be constructed of non-combustible roofing and building materials, the implementation of a defensible space around all structures adjacent to the fuels provides the most effective treatment for minimizing structure losses due to the projected flame lengths and associated radiant heat intensities.

The project does not propose any vegetation that would be considered flammable, and is required to meet applicable fire measures, such as fire apparatus access and access road requirements. To ensure the project does not exacerbate wildfire risks, the project would be required to include non-combustible roofing and non-combustible or standard fire-resistive building materials, per the San Miguel Fire Protection District requirements. Therefore, the project would not expose project occupants, such as employees, to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project would include development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash and does not propose any structures or additional infrastructure that would exacerbate fire risk. Development and operation of the proposed project would be required to comply with the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code, and compliance with the San Miguel Fire Protection District's requirements.

Therefore, based on project coordination with County staff and compliance with the County's and San Miguel Fire Protection District's requirements, impacts associated with fire risk would be less than significant.

- d) Expose people or structure to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

- |                          |  |                                     |                              |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project would include development of a gasoline service station, convenience store, and fully automated, enclosed carwash, including associated grading and paving activities on-site. As described in Section X, Hydrology, the project site is not currently prone to flooding; therefore, the project site would not be prone to onsite flooding following construction of the project. In addition, contaminated soils would be removed from the project site (refer to Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials), and MM HAZ-2 would require these soils to be replaced by compacted fill in layers to ensure the structural integrity of the gas station, convenience store, and carwash structures. Due to the aforementioned factors, the project site would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Impacts are less than significant.

**XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

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

- |                                     |  |                          |                              |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for significant cumulative effects. As a result of this evaluation, the project was determined to have potential significant effects related to biological resources, geology and soils (paleontological resources), hazards and hazardous materials, and noise. However, mitigation

has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes:

- Biological Resources: A pre-construction nesting survey of vegetated areas adjacent to the site if removal of vegetation is scheduled to occur in the fall and winter (between September 1 and January 31), after fledging and before the initiation of the nesting season. A qualified County-approved biologist shall conduct no more than 14 days prior to the scheduled operations to determine the presence/absence of nesting raptors and/or other migratory birds, and buffers should be identified around present nests;
- Paleontological Resources: A paleontological monitoring program during grading activities conducted by a qualified paleontologist;
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials: A soil remediation program and preparation and implementation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan for project operation; and
- Noise: Measures to reduce concrete saw noise impacts, such as by limiting the use of the concrete saw for no longer than 25 percent of an hour; temporary installation of a noise barrier to break the line of sight between occupied properties and concrete saw; and/or placement of noise reduction enclosures in lieu of a barrier.

As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation: The following list of past, present, and future projects located within a 1-mile radius of the project were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

| PROJECT NAME                          | ADDRESS  | PROJECT NUMBER       | APN        |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|------------|
| Discount Tire CAS 12222 Spring Valley | No Address                                       | PDS2021-STP-21-005   | 5845202700 |
| McDonalds Spring Valley               | 8730 Jamacha Blvd, Spring Valley, CA 91977       | PDS2021-STP-94-028W1 | 5845203000 |
| CAL02872 Paradise Valley Road         | 8555 Paradise Valley Rd, Spring Valley, CA 91977 | PDS2022-MUP-22-012   | 5861701500 |
| Aleman Santiago TPM (SB9-2 Lot)       | 233 Arran Ave Main, Spring Valley, CA 91977      | PDS2022-TPM-21309    | 5861905300 |

STP (3500) – Site Plan  
TM (3100) – Tentative Map  
MUP (3300) – Major Use Permit  
LDGRMJ – Major Grading permit  
ER – Environmental Record

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in Sections I through XX of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to Biological Resources, Paleontological Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Noise. However, mitigation has been included that reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance, as detailed in Section XXI(a).

As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

- |                                     |  |                          |                              |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in Sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VII. Geology and Soils, IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, X Hydrology and Water Quality, XIII. Noise, XIV. Population and Housing, and XVII. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be no potentially significant effects to human beings.

As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there would be adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

**XXI. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. <https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf>.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2013. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/TCVGM\\_Sep13\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/TCVGM_Sep13_FINAL.pdf).
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Division of Safety and Dams. Dam Breach Inundation Map Web Publisher. [https://fmds.water.ca.gov/webgis/?appid=dam\\_prototype\\_v2](https://fmds.water.ca.gov/webgis/?appid=dam_prototype_v2).
- City of San Diego. 2023. Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant. <https://www.sandiego.gov/public-utilities/customer-service/water-wastewater-facilities/point-loma>.
- David Kahler, County Landscape Architect. 2020. Conceptual Landscape Approval and Conditions Memorandum (Appendix A).
- Howes Weiler Landy. 2022. Priority Development Plan (PDP) – Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) (Appendix I).
- Howes Weiler Landy. 2023. Preliminary Drainage Report (Appendix J).
- Federal Transit Administration. 2018. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. [https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/researchinnovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123\\_0.pdf](https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/researchinnovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf).
- Nicolas Gustafson, County Hazards Specialist. 2021. Environmental Site Assessment Report (Appendix H).
- Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon Consultants). 2020. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) (Appendix F).
- Red Tail Environmental. 2020. Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report (Appendix D).
- Rincon Consultants. 2020. Biological Resources Letter Report (Appendix C).
- Rincon Consultants. 2020. Noise Report (Appendix K).
- Rincon Consultants. 2020. Phase II ESA (Appendix G).
- Rincon Consultants. 2022. Air Quality Report (Appendix B).
- Rincon Consultants. 2023. Greenhouse Gas Memorandum (Appendix E).
- San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). 2013. Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast: San Diego County Unincorporated Area.

[http://datasurfer.sandag.org/download/sandag\\_forecast\\_13\\_jurisdiction\\_unincorporated.pdf](http://datasurfer.sandag.org/download/sandag_forecast_13_jurisdiction_unincorporated.pdf).

Souphalak Sakdarak, County Environmental Planner. 2023. Noise Conditions and Comments (Appendix L).

Urban Systems Associates, Inc. 2023. Traffic Impact Study (Appendix M).

Urban Systems Associates, Inc. 2023. Parking Evaluation (Appendix N).

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2019. National Wetland Inventory Wetland Mapper.  
<https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html>

Veeder-Root. 2019. Advanced Vapor Containment Management.  
<https://www.veeder.com/us/automatic-tank-gauging-products/vapor-containment-management>.

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to [www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov). For County regulation refer to [www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com). All other references are available upon request.