



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

March 7, 2024

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

1. Title: 6 Carat Carwash Major Use Permit
Project Number(s): PDS2022-MUP-22-003
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: Daniella Hofreiter, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (619) 629-4431
c. E-mail: DaniellaT.Hofreiter@sdcounty.ca.gov
4. Project location:
28874 Valley Center Road, Valley Center, Valley Center Community Planning Area,
County of San Diego, CA 92082
Thomas Guide Coordinates: N/A
APN 188-231-36
5. Project Applicant name and address:
David Carattini
270 North El Camino Real #523
Encinitas, CA 92024
6. General Plan
Community Plan: Valley Center
Land Use Designation: General Commercial (C-1)
Density: N/A
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) N/A

7. Zoning
Use Regulation: Office-Professional/General Commercial (C30/C36)
Minimum Lot Size: N/A
Special Area Regulation: N/A

8. Description of project:

The project consists of a Major Use Permit to construct a 3,300-square-foot (sf) express carwash facility with an automatic carwash tunnel and vacuum stations in the Valley Center Community Planning Area within unincorporated San Diego County. Specifically, the proposed project site is located at 28874 Valley Center Road (APN 188-231-36), northwest of the intersection of Miller Road and Valley Center Road (Figure 1). The project is part of a previously approved project (Miller Road Development Project), which includes a gas station and convenience store, and previously included a fast-food restaurant where the carwash building is now proposed. The carwash structure would be enclosed and located immediately north of the previously approved convenience store associated with the Miller Road Development Project. Access to the site would be provided by Miller Road, a County maintained road. Zoning for the site is C30/C36 Office-Professional/General Commercial. Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance Section 1430, Automotive and Equipment Cleaning uses within an C30/C36 zone require a Major Use Permit (MUP). The carwash would be open from 7am to 10pm daily, with expected capacity of five cars per hour. The carwash would be fully automated using reclaimed water. The project would be served by the Valley Center Municipal Water District and fire service by Valley Center Fire Protection District. The majority of the project site is currently graded and paved for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project.

There are currently no structures requiring demolition prior to construction of the project. The site is currently vacant, and grading and paving of the site have already been completed as part of the Miller Road Development Project. Construction of the project and the previously approved gas station and convenience store are conservatively assumed to occur over a period of approximately 24 weeks. Given that grading and paving is already complete at the project site, construction of the proposed carwash would occur over a much shorter time period. The project does not propose any off-site improvements. The proposed project site is within the North 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).

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is located in the Valley Center Community Plan area. The community of Valley Center is characterized by its unique topographic features, agricultural activities and predominance of estate residential development. The project site is designated Office-Professional (C30/C36) by the Zoning Ordinance, and Commercial, Office, Mixed Use by the General Plan, which allow for administrative and professional offices, retail sales and services, and other limited commercial uses. Surrounding properties to the

north and east are also zoned Office-Professional (C30). The properties to the northwest and southwest (across Miller Road) are zoned Rural Residential (RR) and Rural Commercial (C40), respectively. The property to the south (across Valley Center Road) is zoned General Commercial (C36). Development surrounding the project site consists of commercial and office, low-density residential uses, agriculture, and undeveloped lands. The project site abuts a County-maintained road, Valley Center Road, to the south.

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

Permit Type/Action	Agency
General Construction Storm Water Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan	RWQCB
Fire District Approval	Valley Center 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Cultural Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Energy</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Geology & Soils</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Hazards & Haz. Materials</u> |

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Hydrology & Water Quality</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Land Use & Planning</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mineral Resources</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Noise</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Population & 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 & 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.

_____	March 7, 2024
Signature	Date
Daniella Hofreiter	Planning Manager
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 a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash immediately adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store (Miller Road Development Project) in the unincorporated community of Valley Center. Surrounding land uses consist of semi-rural residential and undeveloped land use types. Additionally, the proposed carwash would be adjacent to the previously approved gas station and convenience store that are currently under construction. The closest RCA to the project site is Lancaster Mountain – Keys Canyon – Lilac Creek (#21 of the Valley Center Community Plan) to the west, with the closest point approximately 0.2 mile away. This RCA is described in the Valley Center Community Plan as a long, narrow area that is mainly important for the riparian and oak woodland habitats that exist in the stream bottom. Lancaster Mountain contains mixed chaparral, wildlife habitat, and is a scenic landmark. Due to the intervening convenience store, gas station, and Valley Center Road, no impacts would occur to the Lancaster Mountain – Keys Canyon – Lilac Creek RCA. 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 |
|---|--|

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- 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.

According to the Valle De Oro Community Plan, Interstate 15 is the only scenic highway corridor in this community planning area.

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 closest State-designated Scenic Highway, SR-74, is approximately 35 miles northeast of the project site. Additionally, SR-76, approximately 5.5 miles northeast, is listed as eligible for designation as a State Scenic Highway. The County has also identified roadways in the Conservation Element of the General Plan that are considered County Scenic Corridors. The nearest County Scenic Corridor to the project site is Valley Center Road, which fronts the shopping plaza in which the carwash is located. However, given the position of the proposed carwash behind (immediately north) of the previously approved gas station and convenience store, these structures would intervene views of the carwash from Valley Center Road. As such, the project site is not visible within the composite viewshed of a County Scenic Corridor and will not damage or remove visual resources within a County Scenic Corridor. Therefore, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic highway or County Scenic Corridor.

- 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- 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.

Less than Significant Impact: The Valley Center Community Plan describes Valley Center’s community character as a rural and natural community with a rural residential pattern of

development and scattered agricultural uses located on the periphery of an urbanizing San Diego County.

The project site is located in a semi-urbanized area but has been previously disturbed and is surrounded by single-family residences and undeveloped lands. The project includes construction of a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash immediately adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store. Given the proposed carwash would be associated with the previously approved Miller Road Development Project, the project would be consistent with the adjacent uses. Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views.

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 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 is located within Zone A as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. Zone A is an area that is within 15 miles from the Mount Palomar or Mount Laguna observatory. The project includes a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash immediately adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store. No outdoor lighting is proposed associated with the proposed carwash. Therefore, 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). 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No 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.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and adjacent areas are zoned Office-Professional/General Commercial (C30/C36). The C30 and C36 land use allows for retail, automotive, medical, and food and beverage services. As described above in response II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources, a), while 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. The closest Williamson Act Contract or agricultural preserve to the project site is located approximately 1.95 miles west across Lilac Road. According to the Agricultural Guidelines, interface conflicts usually only occur within 300 feet. 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 Impact

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- 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 with a MUP, 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 Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site do 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- 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)?

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

Discussion/Explanation: An Air Quality Report was prepared for the project and Miller Road Development Project by BlueScape Environmental dated March 17, 2023. 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 and grading of the site has already been completed as part of the previously approved Miller Road Development Project. Therefore, no demolition or grading would occur as part of the project. The project would produce emissions during construction of the proposed carwash building. The project would produce any additional emissions associated with operation of the carwash, as described further in Section III(b).

The RAQS rely on population and projected growth in the County and project future mobile, area, and all other source emissions. Based on these emissions, the RAQS determine the 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 is consistent with the General Plan and the land use designations. The existing land use designation is Commercial/Retail, and the project's local retail, grocery, and car wash uses are consistent with such a designation. The project provides local retail uses within the Valley Center area. The project is consistent with the intended use of the site and, therefore, consistent with the regional growth projections by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and those used in the development of the RAQS and SIP. As part of its attainment planning process, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District 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 also will comply with any applicable rules and regulations that have been adopted as part of the RAQS and SIP by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation: The San Diego Air Pollution Control Distract (APCD) does not provide quantitative thresholds for determining the significance of construction or mobile source-related

impacts. However, the 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_{2.5}. 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_{2.5}, 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 ₁₀)	---	100	15
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	--- *	55	10*
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	25	250	40
Sulfur Oxides (SO _x)	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 (O₃) and state Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns and less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil);

solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ 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 emissions from project grading was completed using SCAQMD’s California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The construction schedule is based on default construction schedules included in CalEEMod. Although all necessary demolition, grading, and site preparation has already been completed per the previously approved project, these phases are still included to be conservative. In addition, the Air Quality Report conservatively estimated emissions from the entire Miller Road Development Project, including the previously approved gas station and convenience store as well as the proposed carwash. Additionally, CalEEMod grading operations associated with the project would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance and the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) 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 SDAPCD Rule 67.0.1 requirements. As shown in Table 2 below, project-related air emissions are not anticipated to reach screening-level thresholds identified in Table 1 as established by the SDAPCD. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial 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 ₁₀)	2.66	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	1.50	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	12.0	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO _x)	0.01	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	7.7	550	No
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	7.2	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 include impacts associated with traffic; additional emissions would be associated with area sources, such as consumer product usage; landscaping; and maintenance (e.g., architectural coating). Emissions are attributable to the following sources:

- Vehicles from trips generated by the Project. Trip generation rates for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project and the proposed project were obtained from the Traffic Impact Study (Darnell 2022). Because trip generation rates for the convenience market and car wash were combined in the traffic study, the total trip rates entered into

CalEEMod were assigned to the convenience market land use, with no trip rates assigned to the car wash.

- Architectural coatings application for maintenance purposes.
- Consumer products use.
- Landscaping equipment use.
- Energy use – natural gas.

Project operational emissions for the first year of operations (2023) were estimated using CalEEMod. Trip distances are based on the CalEEMod Model for a rural land use for conservative purposes.

Table 3. Estimated Operational Air Emissions (2023)

Pollutant	Project Emissions (Lbs. per Day)	Screening-Level Thresholds (Lbs. per Day)	Above Threshold?
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	1.39	100	No
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	0.38	55	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	1.44	250	No
Sulfur Oxides (SO _x)	0.01	250	No
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	12.1	550	No
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	2.39	75	No

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

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; impacts would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th 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 receptor is a residence located approximately 270 feet to the northwest of the project site.

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. Screening for elevated CO levels is recommended for severely congested intersections experiencing levels of service (LOS) E or F with project traffic where a significant project traffic impact may occur. Specifically, project-related traffic that would worsen the LOS at intersections operating at LOS E or F, would be subject to a detailed evaluation. If not, no further review is necessary. The traffic study prepared by Darnell & Associates, Inc. most recently revised on March 22, 2022, did not address LOS designations for nearby intersections, but it compared project-related traffic volumes with traffic volumes from the previously approved Miller Road Development Project and found that the proposed project would generate fewer trips per day than the previously approved project. Because of this, the LOS designation for nearby intersections with the proposed project would be an improvement over the previously approved project; an LOS evaluation is therefore not required for the proposed project. Thus, the project would not result in a CO “hotspot” due to its trip generation.

The proposed project does not propose specific stationary sources that would generate toxic air contaminants (TACs) that are not commonly associated with carwash development projects. If stationary sources with the potential to emit TACs were to be included as part of the project, or at a later date, those sources would be subject to SDAPCD Rule 1200, and would be subject to New Source Review requirements.

Due to the short-term construction duration, the limited construction emissions, and the industrial land uses surrounding the project site, there is very low potential for fugitive dust or diesel particulate matter (DPM) to impact sensitive receptors during construction. The total project construction DPM emissions are not of a magnitude and duration that could create significant air toxic risks to the nearest receptors during construction. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the County Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55, which would reduce potential emissions of fugitive dust. Grading emissions would be temporary and would not expose sensitive receptors to harmful concentrations of air pollutants. Compliance with the SDAPCD rules and regulations would reduce the fugitive dust emissions during project construction and associated impacts to sensitive receptors. The proposed project’s operating emissions would be even less than the previously approved project’s operating emissions and would not have the potential to impact sensitive receptors. Therefore, the proposed project’s construction and operation air pollutant emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and would result in a less than significant impact.

Vehicular traffic may result in emissions of TACs other than DPM. Minor amounts of TACs are found in light-duty vehicle exhaust; however, the main source of on-road TACs is from diesel-powered heavy-duty trucks. Because the previously approved Miller Road Development Project’s operational emissions are higher than the operational emissions of the gas station, convenience store, and proposed project, no increased risks to surrounding sensitive receptors would be anticipated from the proposed project operations. Therefore, the project would not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of identified sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant 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. 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.

During construction, diesel equipment operating at the site may generate some nuisance odors; however, due to the distance of sensitive receptors to the project site and the temporary nature of construction, odors associated with project construction would be less than not be significant. The project is not considered a source of objectionable odors from operations. Therefore, 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation: A Biological Resources Report was prepared for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project by Vince Scheidt, Biological Consultant, dated September 25, 2007. The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records and the Biological Resources Report prepared by Vince Scheidt, it has been determined that the majority of the project site has been historically disturbed. The site has been used as a borrow/rock quarry site during construction of various local roads and has served as a staging area for local construction and stockpiling of materials. A portion of the project site included coastal sage chaparral scrub. Grading and paving completed for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project have disturbed and removed 1.9 acres of coastal sage chaparral scrub habitat from the project site. As such, the previous project included offsite compensatory mitigation at a 1:1 ratio for all impacts to coastal sage chaparral scrub habitat. No special status plant or animal species were observed on the

site and none are likely to occur given the disturbed nature of the project site and surrounding areas. Given that the project site has been graded and paved as part of the previously approved project, the proposed project would not result in impacts to habitat or special status species onsite. The project would also be conducted in compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), which would require nesting surveys of vegetated areas adjacent to the site and other provisions if construction work must be conducted during the nesting season (January 15 to August 31) (MM BIO-1). Therefore, the impact is 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: Based on an analysis of the County’s GIS records and a Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Vince Scheidt, Biological Consultant, dated September 25, 2007, the project site previously contained coastal sage chaparral scrub habitat within the project boundaries. Grading and paving completed for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project have disturbed and removed 1.9 acres of coastal sage chaparral scrub habitat from the project site. As such, the previous project included offsite compensatory mitigation at a 1:1 ratio for all impacts to coastal sage chaparral scrub habitat. No drainage features or indicators of wetlands or “waters” were observed onsite. Given that the project site has been graded and paved as part of the previously approved project, the proposed project would not result in impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community. Therefore, the project would result in no impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations.

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 County’s GIS records and a Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Vince Scheidt, Biological Consultant, dated September 25, 2007, it has been determined that the proposed project site does not contain any 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. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County’s GIS records and a Biological Resource Letter Report prepared by Vince Scheidt, Biological Consultant, dated September 25, 2007, it has been determined that due to historical disturbance, the site had limited regional biological value prior to grading and paving for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project. As the project site is currently paved and there are no drainages onsite, it likely presents no biological value for wildlife movement. In addition, the areas north and south of the project site are undeveloped and provide more suitable cover for wildlife movement to surrounding natural canyons and Lilac Creek. As such, the proposed project would not be expected to impede the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites. 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
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated March 7, 2024 and Biological Resources Report dated September 25, 2007 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP). As described therein, the proposed project would

be conducted in compliance with all local, regional, state, and federal policies and regulations related to biological resources. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

BIO-1 To avoid the direct loss of nest(s) protected under the MBTA a pre-construction nesting survey of vegetated areas adjacent to the site will be required. If project brushing, clearing, grubbing, grading, or other construction activities are proposed with during the migratory bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified County-approved biologist shall conduct a pre-construction bird and raptor survey no more than three days prior to the scheduled operations to determine the presence/absence of nesting raptors and/or other migratory birds to ensure that active nests are not impacted. If an active nest is identified, a buffer would be established between the construction activities and the nest so that nesting activities are not interrupted. The buffer should be a minimum of 300 feet for migratory bird species and 500 feet for raptor species, be delineated by temporary fencing, and remain in effect as long as construction is occurring or until the nest is no longer active. No project construction would be allowed to occur within the fenced zone until the young have fledged and would not be impacted by the project.

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 Cultural Resources Report was prepared for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project by Tierra Environmental Services, dated October 2008. The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

No Impact: As part of the Cultural Resources Report prepared for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project, a records search and survey of the property were conducted. The records search and survey found no historical resources previously recorded within the 6.5 project area for the Miller Road Development Project, which encompasses the 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: The County of San Diego archaeology resource files, historic records, maps, and aerial photographs, as well as the database from the South Coastal Information Center have been reviewed and evaluated and it has been determined that the project site has been surveyed and cultural resources were present within the project site; however, they were mitigated as part of the previously approved permit (PDS2008-3500-08-013 (STP)). The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, Cultural Resources Report - Valley Center View Properties, Miller Road, Valley Center (2008) prepared by Patrick McGinnis. As a result of AB-52 Native American consultation, tribal monitoring will be required because the area has been identified as sensitive. With implementation of the monitoring program, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

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 records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Patrick McGinnis, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, Cultural Resources Report - Valley Center View Properties, Miller Road, Valley Center (2008) prepared by Patrick McGinnis.

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 construction of a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash immediately adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store. 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 and no offsite import or export of soil material is required. Construction would be conducted in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations (e.g., United States Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA] and the California Air Resources

Board [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, etc.). 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. Additional measures such as efficient water usage and efficient outdoor lighting would be employed by the project. GHG emissions associated with electricity use would be eliminated as California decarbonizes the electrical generation infrastructure as committed to by 2045 through SB 100, the 100 percent Clean Energy Act of 2018. Therefore, the project would contribute its “fair share” of what is required to achieve carbon neutrality of buildings by 2045. 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- 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 be conducted in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations (e.g., USEPA and CARB engine emissions standards, limitations on engine idling times, etc.). 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 above, the project would employ measures such as efficient water usage and efficient outdoor lighting in accordance with SB 100. 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.

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

Discussion/Explanation: A Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation was prepared for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project by GeoSoils, Inc., dated February 27, 2009. The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

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 Elsinore fault zone located approximately 7.5 miles north of the site. To ensure the structural integrity of the slope, the Miller Road Development Project included grading and site preparation in accordance with recommendations in the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation, including removal of the undocumented fill or loose colluvium exposed within the grading limits and replaced by compacted fill in layers. All earthwork was verified in the field by County Engineers and a licensed or registered civil engineer in the State of California. 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 construction of a 3,300-sf fully automated, enclosed carwash. To ensure the structural integrity of the site slopes, a Grading Plan and a Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation were prepared by a registered Civil Engineer and reviewed for approval by County Engineers for the Miller Road Development Project, which encompasses the project site. Grading completed for the Miller Road Development Project was 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. Therefore, the Grading Plan and the Geotechnical Evaluation prepared by the registered Civil Engineer and compliance with the Grading Ordinance, ensures the project will 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, the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation prepared for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project indicates that liquefaction potential is low due to the occurrence of dense to very dense, Cretaceous-age granitic bedrock underlying the site at relatively shallow depths. Furthermore, the site preparation completed for the Miller Road Development Project included the removal of the low-density surficial soils previously underlying the site and replacing of these soils with properly compacted fill. 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?

- 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 not within a “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. The Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation also found no evidence of landslide deposits encountered onsite. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on the site reconnaissance, subsurface excavations, and review of the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation prepared for the previously approved Miller

Road Development Project, the site is mantled by a shallow layer of artificial fill soil underlain by granitic bedrock. The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because grading and paving of the site is complete and no ground disturbance would occur. Construction of the project would include construction of the proposed carwash building and installation of associated equipment. Therefore, 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project includes construction of a 3,300-sf fully automated, enclosed carwash. In order to ensure that project components are adequately supported, a Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation was prepared for the Miller Road Development Project, which encompasses the project site. The Geotechnical Evaluation determined that no soils supporting the project site are unstable or susceptible to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. According to the Geotechnical Evaluation, due to dense nature of the granitic bedrock onsite, liquefaction potential is considered “very low.” The Geotechnical Evaluation demonstrated that the site would be suitable for development with recommended remedial earthwork (i.e., removal of the undocumented fill or loose colluvium exposed within the grading limits to replace with compacted fill in layers) and compliance with the Grading Ordinance. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to response VII. Geology and Soils, 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 Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Lab testing included as part of the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation prepared for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project indicate that soils underlying the site are generally very low in expansion potential. 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 a 3,300-sf 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.

No Impact: A review of the County’s Paleontological Resources Maps and the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation indicates that the project is located entirely on granitic bedrock and has no potential for producing fossil remains. Given that the project site has been graded and paved as part of the Miller Road Development Project, the site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. No impacts would occur.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation: A Global Climate Change Evaluation was prepared for the project and Miller Road Development Project by BlueScape Environmental dated March 17, 2023. 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 15130(f) states that an EIR shall analyze GHG emissions resulting from a proposed project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

Less than Significant Impact: 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 Miller Road Development Project determined that construction of the project along with the approved gas station and convenience store is estimated to generate a total of 62.8 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_{2e}) during activities, based on the anticipated construction schedule to full buildout.

Operation of the project along with the approved gas station and convenience store is estimated to generate a total of 275 MT CO_{2e}, which represents 280 MT CO_{2e} fewer emissions than the previously approved Miller Road Development Project (including the gas station, convenience store, and fast-food restaurant). The operational emissions represent a minimal amount of GHG emissions comparative to standard construction projects. For example, construction of 50 residences is equated to generate approximately 900 MT CO_{2e}.

Given the project size and nature, the project would not be expected to result in a substantial contribution of GHG emissions to global climate change. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: 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.

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.

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).

As discussed in Section VIII(a), the project would result in GHG emissions from energy used in the carwash building. The facility would be designed to run on all electric energy sources, without the use of natural gas or propane fuels. The 2022 Scoping Plan calls for all new commercial buildings to have all electric appliances by 2029 (CARB 2022). By designing the project to fully utilize electric energy within the convenience store and car wash, the project would not conflict with the ultimate implementation of the Scoping Plan.

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. GHG emissions associated with electricity use would be eliminated as California decarbonizes the electrical generation infrastructure as committed to by 2045 through SB 100, the 100 percent Clean Energy Act of 2018. Therefore, the project would contribute its “fair share” of what is required to achieve carbon neutrality of buildings by 2045. 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:

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 and operational 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. 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 type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There are no schools located within 0.25-mile of the project site. The closest school to the project site is Valley Center Elementary School, approximately 0.5 mile away. Further, 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. Therefore, the project will not have any 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 type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: According to the database search of Envirostor and Geotracker, the project site is not identified as a hazardous materials site (Envirostor 2023; Geotracker 2023). Thus, the project site is not identified as being a listed hazardous materials site and is not located adjacent to an active listed hazardous site. Therefore, 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 carwash building 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- 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 Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan would not be interfered with because no grading is proposed on the portion of the project site that is located within a dam inundation zone. In addition, no sensitive receptors, such as a hospital, day-care facility, school, etc., are proposed as part of the project. Because no structures are proposed and project grading 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 With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project is not located within the Wildland-Urban Interface Zone but is within a very high fire hazard severity zone (FHSZ) in a state responsibility area (SRA), as with the majority of the County region. However, the Building Plan 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. 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 With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project includes a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash immediately adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store in the unincorporated community of Valley Center. 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.

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

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

- Priority Development Plan (PDP) – Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) prepared by Wynn Engineering, Inc., dated March 23, 2023.
- Hydrology Certification Letter prepared by Wynn Engineering, Inc., dated March 23, 2023.

The following responses have incorporated the analyses from these studies.

Less than Significant Impact: The Miller Road Development Project, including the area encompassing the project site, 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 March 23, 2023 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: hydraulic stabilization and hydroseeding 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, street sweeping and vacuuming for offsite tracking of sediment, 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 site has been paved for the Miller Road Development Project, the project would not 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 Rincon Area of the San Luis Rey Hydrologic Unit in the San Diego Region. The nearest impaired waterbody as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list is Moosa Canyon Creek, approximately 1 mile southwest of the project site. Due to distance and topography, the project site is not tributary to Moosa Canyon Creek.

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.

The project site has been previously graded and paved as part of the Miller Road Development Project. No additional earthwork or paving would be required for the proposed project. 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.). 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- 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 Rincon 903.16 Hydrologic Area of the San Luis Rey Hydrologic Unit that has the following existing beneficial uses for groundwater: agricultural supply, 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: agricultural supply, 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 response X. Hydrology and Water Quality, 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project includes construction of a 3,300-sf automated carwash. Limited water will be required during the construction phase for dust control and suppression and would be obtained from the Valley Center Municipal Water District. The project would not require additional restroom facilities or associated use of additional potable water. Additionally, the proposed carwash would be fully automated using reclaimed water. No groundwater would be used for any purposes during construction or operation phases of the project. In addition, given that the project site has been paved for the Miller Road Development

Project, no new impervious surfaces are proposed that would interfere with groundwater recharge. 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 site has been previously graded and paved as part of the Miller Road Development Project. No additional earthwork or paving would be required for the proposed project. Therefore, construction of the project would not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential 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: The project site has been previously graded and paved as part of the Miller Road Development Project. No additional earthwork or paving would be required for the proposed project. Therefore, 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: As discussed above in Section X(e)(ii), the project would not result in increased peak runoff flows. The project site has been previously graded and paved as part of the Miller Road Development Project. No additional earthwork or paving would be required for the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.

(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: As discussed above in Section X(e)(ii), the project would not result in increased peak runoff flows. The project site has been previously graded and paved as part of the Miller Road Development Project. No additional earthwork or paving would be required for the proposed project. 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 a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash immediately adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store in the unincorporated community of Valley Center. The project does not propose the introduction of new major infrastructure 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash to support a previously approved gas station and convenience store immediately adjacent to the project site. With the proposed MUP, the project would be consistent with designated 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 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 classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance.” The nearest active mine is the streambed/gravel bar skimming and pitting at the Pauma Valley Country Club. The project site is surrounded by developed office, commercial, and rural 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 likely 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation: An Acoustical Analysis Report was prepared for the project by Eilar Associates, Inc., dated August 5, 2022. The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less than Significant Impact: The project includes a 3,300-sf enclosed express carwash facility with an automatic carwash tunnel and vacuum stations to support a previously approved gas station and convenience store immediately adjacent to the project site. The previously approved convenience store will be serviced by two rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units. The future noise environment in the vicinity of the project site is

anticipated to consist of noise created by the proposed carwash equipment and rooftop HVAC units. The carwash equipment is proposed to be completely enclosed within a mechanical room of the carwash facility and the individual vacuum stations are not expected to generate a significant level of noise. Given that vacuum noise levels are expected to be negligent in comparison to the carwash equipment, they were not evaluated in the Acoustical Analysis Report prepared by Eilar Associates, Inc., dated August 5, 2022. Project-generated traffic noise impacts were also evaluated. No other equipment on site is anticipated to generate significant levels of noise, requiring evaluation in the Acoustical Analysis Report.

The project would be consistent with the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Ordinance, and other applicable noise standards for the following reasons:

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 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 230 feet to the northwest across Miller Road) exist in proximity to the project site. The primary source of noise at the nearest affected property line receiver is expected to be noise emanating from the western opening of the carwash tunnel, primarily from the tunnel dryer equipment. Project implementation would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial, or other noise in excess of the outside sound level threshold because the western opening of the carwash tunnel would be configured to open to the south, directing noise away from the nearest noise sensitive residential properties (refer to the Acoustical Tunnel in Figure 2). With the currently proposed tunnel exit as well as the specifications for the barrier and canopy outlined in the Acoustical Analysis Report, equipment noise levels are expected to meet applicable noise limits of the County of San Diego at all surrounding property lines. Therefore, the project is consistent with the General Plan – Noise Element and impacts would be less than significant.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

The County of San Diego Municipal Code states that noise levels from stationary sources shall not exceed 50 dBA between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. and 45 dBA between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. at residential properties zoned RR, and shall not exceed 60 dBA between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. and 55 dBA between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. at all commercial properties. The Acoustical Analysis Report found that with the currently proposed tunnel exit as well as the specifications for the barrier and canopy outlined in the Acoustical Analysis Report, noise from the operation of the proposed carwash and HVAC at the site would meet these standards. The highest noise level would be 50.9 dBA at the nearest commercial receiver to the east and 46.2 dBA at the nearest residential receiver to the northwest. As the proposed equipment is expected to operate only during daytime hours, operational noise levels should not exceed 50 dBA at any surrounding residential property line and 60 dBA at any surrounding commercial property line. In addition, project-generated traffic on Valley Center Road would not more than double the existing sound energy (an increase of 3 dB). Therefore,

the project is consistent with the Noise Ordinance Section 36.404 and impacts would be less than significant.

Construction noise for the project would be sourced from the equipment used for the proposed onsite construction. Non-transportation noise generated by the project would not exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project’s property line because the project would conform to construction equipment operation pursuant to Section 36.409 (see below).

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409 and Section 36.410

The project would not generate grading noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75 dB between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Thus, daytime construction would not result in significant noise impacts. In addition, no impulsive noise sources, such as blasting or rock crushing, are anticipated during grading operations. Therefore, the project is consistent with the Noise Ordinance Section 36.409 and 36.410; impacts would be less than significant.

The project’s conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) 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: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels:

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences, and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.

- 4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

In addition, as discussed in Section XIII(a), no blasting or rock crushing is anticipated during construction operations. Therefore, no impulsive noise sources are expected, and the project would comply with Section 36.410 of the County Noise Ordinance. In addition, the project does not propose any major, new, or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways, or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Potential for vibration and groundborne noise would be minimal and would substantially attenuate with distance such that impacts at sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

- 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- 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. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project includes construction of a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash immediately adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store. 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. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- 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 3,300-sf enclosed 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project includes construction of a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash immediately adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store. 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project includes construction of a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash immediately adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store. 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, less than significant impacts 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation: A Local Mobility Analysis (LMA) and VMT Report was prepared for the project by Darnell & Associates, dated March 22, 2022. The report also included the Traffic Study prepared for the Miller Road Development Project by Darnell & Associates, dated July 27, 2010. The following responses have incorporated the analysis from these reports.

Less than Significant Impact: The project includes an MUP to construct a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store. 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 would not generate substantial vehicle trips to the project site (see Section XVII[b] below) or not result in off-site changes to the circulation system. 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, implementation of the project would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, 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 construct a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store. Pursuant to the County’s adopted Transportation Study Guidelines, the project meets the CEQA VMT screening criteria for locally serving commercial projects that are less than 50,000 square feet and will not result in a significant VMT impact. 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)?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- 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 includes an MUP to construct a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash adjacent to a previously approved gas station and convenience store. Additionally, the project does not propose any changes to roadways, nor does it propose the construction of any new roadways and therefore, 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- 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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- 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.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Pursuant to AB 52, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. The Tribes identified that the area is sensitive and requested tribal monitoring during ground disturbing activities. As such, the project will be conditioned with a Tribal Monitoring Program.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project includes construction of a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash. The project is served by the Valley Center Municipal Water District and no new or expanded water or wastewater facilities are required for the project. The proposed carwash would be fully automated using reclaimed water. No natural gas or telecommunications facilities would be required. 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 Valley Center Municipal Water District. Minimal water would be required during project construction for dust control and suppression. The commercial use type is integrated into the Valley Center Municipal Water District's current and future water projections. Additionally, the proposed carwash would be fully automated using reclaimed water. 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 construction of a 3,300-sf enclosed carwash using reclaimed water. As such, the project would be served by the Valley Center Municipal Water District's Woods Valley Ranch Water Reclamation Facility for reclaimed water supply and wastewater treatment. The Woods Valley Ranch Water Reclamation Facility currently has wastewater treatment capacity of 275,000 gallons per day (gpd) and a planned expansion to 525,000 gpd (Valley Center Municipal Water District 2021). Therefore, the Woods Valley Ranch Water Reclamation Facility 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 a fully automated, enclosed carwash and does not propose any structures or use types that would result in 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 a fully automated, enclosed carwash and does not propose any structures or use types that would result in 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 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: A Fire Protection Plan (FPP) was prepared for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project by Firewise 2000, Inc., dated November 20, 2010. The following responses have incorporated the analysis from the report.

Less than Significant Impact: The project would be served by the Valley Center Fire Protection District Station 1, approximately 0.74 miles southwest 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 3,300-sf enclosed carwash, and no additional use types or structures are proposed. Therefore, no additional demand beyond current conditions is required for emergency response. Project access would be from two driveways along Valley Center Road and Miller Road. Additionally, an FPP was prepared for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project, which assesses the potential impacts resulting from wildland fire hazards and identifies measures necessary to adequately mitigate those impacts. The plan specifically addresses access, including secondary/emergency access and impacts to emergency services. The primary access to the project site would be via Miller Road and Valley Center Road (public roadways). Access within the commercial development would be via three entrances (two from Miller Road and one from Valley Center Road). Project access would comply with County road standards and measures included in the FPP (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 type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation: The area surrounding the project site is generally within a sloping rugged topography that runs from the northwest to the southeast. Topography ranges from nearly level to 30 percent slopes with native and non-native vegetation. 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.

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project is listed as a very high FHSZ in a SRA. The majority of the County is in the high and very high FHSZ. Accordingly, 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 the two major highways on the western (Miller Road) and southern boundary (Valley Center Road) to the project site provide significant fire protection during an extreme northeast Santa Ana wind and strong non-typical prevailing winds from the south and southwest during late season. The fuels in the open space to the northeast (developable in the future) are lighter fuels. However, if this project site was left undeveloped and without any fire hazard abatement, the off-site and on-site vegetation would increase in fuel loading. An extreme fire threat would occur during unusually hot dry conditions, with Santa Ana wind conditions, and/or with any winds out of the northeast potentially gusting up to 60 miles per hour (mph). In this fuel model scenario,

the wildland fire behavior would be expected to produce 44.1-foot flame lengths and a rate-of-spread of 294 feet per minute.

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 mitigated for the Miller Road Development Project by landscaping with irrigated fire-resistant landscaping and constructing all buildings with non-combustible roofing and non-combustible or standard fire-resistive building materials, per the Valley Center Fire Protection District requirements. Fire-resistant landscape management is the act of converting native vegetative fuels from a highly flammable and high fire intensity state to a more fire resistant and low fire intensity condition. Fire-resistant landscaping has been proven to be the most effective treatment for minimizing structure losses due to wildland fire radiant heat. Comparing the expected wildland fire behavior projections of untreated vegetation against the proposed fire-resistant irrigated landscape vegetation within the development required 100-foot-wide fuel thinning zone demonstrates substantial reductions in the expected flame length and fireline intensity. 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, MM WF-1 would require the project to include irrigated fire-resistant landscaping and non-combustible roofing and non-combustible or standard fire-resistive building materials, per the Valley Center Fire Protection District requirements (as required for the Miller Road Development Project). 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 with mitigation.

- 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?

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project would include a fully automated, enclosed carwash and does not propose any structures or additional infrastructure that would exacerbate fire risk. In addition, MM WF-1 would require the project to include irrigated fire-resistant landscaping and non-combustible roofing and non-combustible or standard fire-resistive building materials, per the Valley Center Fire Protection District requirements (as required for the Miller Road Development Project). Therefore, based on project coordination with County staff, compliance with the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code, and compliance with the Valley Center Fire Protection District’s requirements, impacts associated with fire risk would be less than significant with mitigation.

- 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: As stated in Section X(e)(ii), the project site has been previously graded and paved as part of the Miller Road Development Project. No additional earthwork or paving would be required for the proposed project. Additionally, 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, the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation prepared for the previously approved Miller Road Development Project by GeoSoils, Inc., found that removing the low-density surficial soils previously underlying the site and replacing these soils with properly compacted fill in accordance with the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation and Grading Plan would ensure stable soil and geologic conditions existing on and supporting the site. The investigation demonstrated that the site would be suitable for development and in compliance with the Grading Ordinance. 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.

Mitigation Measures

- WF-1 The project shall include irrigated, fire-resistant landscaping only. Landscaping related to the project will be implemented in accordance with the measures listed below, as outlined in the FPP for the Miller Road Development Project.
- Landscaping materials will include plants from the approved plant list in Appendix A of the FPP or as approved by the Fire Marshall.

- All undesirable non-native vegetation will be removed. Replanting will be with drought tolerant, fire resistive fire-resistant landscaping.
- Vegetation may include single or cluster of thinned fire resistant native and ornamental plants (e.g., oaks, sumac, toyon, etc.).
- Dense plant masses adjacent to the structures and at bases of trees and tree clusters will not be placed in this zone. Provide low growing, fire resistive, deep rooted, drought tolerant planting to maintain erosion control and soil stability, especially on manufactured slopes.
- Native or ornamental trees retained within fuel modification zones will be pruned to maintain a vertical separation of approximately 10 feet above underlying shrubs or groundcover. Pruning of the shrubs will minimize the impact of the tree pruning.
- Trees and large shrubs over 15 feet in height (oaks, sumac, toyon, etc.) pruned to provide clearance between plants of three times the height of understory plants, or 10 feet, whichever is greater.
- Large continuous masses of shrubs and understory less than 15 feet in height will be thinned to remove fuel and provide at least 10 feet between shrub masses, or individual shrubs. Thinning will reduce the overall canopy coverage of the area a minimum of 50 percent.
- If shrubs are located underneath a tree's drip line, the lowest branch shall be at least three times as high as the understory shrubs or 10 feet, whichever is greater.
- Trees may be planted and/or maintained as individual specimens, or clustered with no more than three trees in a single cluster with a minimum distance between mature canopies of 20 feet; avoid planting trees directly uphill of one another.
- Tree canopies will not be allowed to overhang the roof of any structure; the outer edge of the canopies of mature trees will be a minimum of 10 feet from the building eaves, and free of all dead or dying parts. All the dead material must be pruned out of all vegetation on an as needed basis.
- Mature heights of new shrub plantings will be a maximum of 36 inches.
- Mulches, chips and other small multi-cuttings (cut to less than two inches in diameter and four inches in length) shall be evenly spread over the area no more than 4 inches at least 50 feet from structures. This can be used to maintain soil moisture and prevent grass and weed encroachments within the treated areas. Regular maintenance, vegetation pruning, and continued irrigation are most important in this Zone.
- Firewood or other combustible materials will not be stored in unenclosed spaces beneath buildings or structures, or on decks or under eaves, canopies or other projections or overhangs. Storage may occur in the defensible space located a minimum of 20 feet from structures and separated from the crown of trees by a minimum of 10 feet, measured horizontally.
- Certain ornamental plants shall not be planted or allowed to become established within the zone unless otherwise noted in the recommended Plant List in Appendix A of the FPP or as approved by the Fire Marshal.
- As the native vegetation cover in Zone 1 is reduced, there is a very high probability that the openings will be dominated with non-native weed or grass species. Therefore, all grasses and weeds are to be mowed or weed-whipped to a 4-inch stubble height by June 1st of each year or when the fuels become cured, whichever

occurs first. Any vegetation biomass (debris and trimmings) produced by thinning and pruning shall be removed from the site or converted to

- mulch by chipping and evenly distributed to a maximum depth of 4 inches.
- Plants in this zone will not include any pyrophytes that are high in oils and resins, such as: pines, eucalyptus, cedar, and juniper species. Trees must be planted so that when they reach maturity their branches are at least 10-feet away from any structure. Refer to Appendix B of the FPP for a list of undesirable plantings.
- Thick succulent or leathery leaf plant species are the most fire resistant, while paper-thin leaves and small twiggy branches are the least fire resistant.
- If water for irrigation is limited, use more of the available water in Zone 1 than In Zone 2. Plants with high moisture content are less likely to burn. Non-flammable patios, walkways, rock, driveways, and gravel can be used to break up fuel continuity within this zone.

WF-2 The exterior walls of the proposed building shall 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 (in accordance with State Fire Marshal [SFM] 12-7A-1). Portable fire extinguishers are required for the proposed building and shall be mounted on walls near exits with appropriate signage.

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 and cultural resources. 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 and a pre-construction bird and raptor survey If project brushing, clearing, grubbing, grading, or other construction activities are proposed with during the migratory bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified County-approved biologist shall conduct no more than three days prior to the scheduled operations to determine the presence/absence of nesting raptors and/or other migratory birds; and
- Wildfire: Inclusion of irrigated, fire-resistant landscaping only, in accordance with FPP prepared for the Miller Road Development Project.

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)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated 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
Zenz Apartment Building	28532 CANYON RD	PDS2021-3300-76-004	1851413400
Weston Towne Center	No Address	PDS2013-STP-13-029 PDS2013-ER-14-08-001	1882311100 1882313000
VCVP Site Plan	No Address	PDS2015-STP-15-025 PDS2015-ER-15-08-022	1882605000 1882604900
Valley Lutheran Church	28330 LILAC RD	PDS2011-3300-86-042	1862105900
Valley Center View Properties Retail	No Address	PDS2008-3500-08-013 PDS2008-3910-0801008	1882313400
Valley Center Towing	28425 COLE GRADE RD	PDS2008-3500-08-005 PDS2008-3910-0808005	1882502200
Valley Center Storage Project	No Address	PDS2020-STP-20-011 PDS2020-ER-20-08-005	1890132000
Valley Center North Village Sewer Plant	No Address	PDS2009-3910-0908006	1882130400 1882310900 1882311000 1882312800 1882604900 1882605000
Valley Center Miller RD	No Address	PDS2011-3100-5027	1882313400 1882312800

			1882311900 1882310900
Valley Center Library	14185 HORSE CREEK TRL	PDS2004-3300-00-039 PDS2000-3910-0008058	1881806900 1881806800
Valley Center Energy Storage Project	29523 VALLEY CENTER RD	PDS2020-LDGRMJ-30307	1890132000
Valley Center Community Church	29019 Cole Grade Road	PDS2016-LDGRMJ-30070 PDS2019-LDGRMJ-30212 PDS2003-3910-0308034 PDS2003-3300-03-083	1882301300
Valley Center Cemetery District Major Use Permit	No Address	PDS2014-MUP-14-029 PDS2014-ER-14-08-010	1882304700 1882300200
THORNTON TPM	14429 HOGAN RIDGE LN	PDS2003-3200-20707 PDS2002-3910-0208065	1882407100 1882408400 1882408500 1882408600
SPRINT PCS-NORTH ESCONDIDO MUP	No Address	PDS2001-3400-97-007	1892107400 1892107500
Spring SD54XC453	No Address	PDS2019-ER-19-08-003 PDS2019-MUP-19-005	1892107400
SECTOR INC PRD TM4682	28599 OLD RANCH DR	PDS2011-3100-4682	1854410300 1854412300 1854412400 1854412500 1854412600 1854412700 1854412800 1854412900 1854413000 1854420100 1854420200 1854420300 1854420800 1854420900 1854421000 1854421500
Rite Aid-Cole Grade VC	28535 Cole Grade Rd.	PDS2018-LDGRMJ-30189 PDS2015-ER-15-08-021 PDS2015-STP-15-022	1882501900
Park Circle	27890 VALLEY CENTER RD	PDS2015-MUP-15-010 PDS2015-REZ-15-005 PDS2015-TM-5603	1862401100 1862401500
THOMAS IMPOUND YARD SRECKOVIC	28333 COLE GRADE RD 28512 COLE GRADE RD	PDS2011-3300-79-108 PDS2002-3500-02-071	1890131200 1882603500
RV Parking Expansion for Super Storage	No Address	PDS2021-ER-21-08-007	1890131800

REED AND GAUGHAN STP 12-005	28404 COLE GRADE RD	PDS2012-3500-12-005	1882603700
Parcel 2 PM2989 TM9957	28960 VALLEY CENTER RD	PDS2019-LDGRMJ-30224	1882310900
PALOMAR VISTA REAL ESTATE SIGNS	29143 VALLEY CENTER RD	PDS1998-3000-98-002	1882603100
PACKAGE SEWAGE PLANT	No Address	PDS2011-3300-77-096	1882300600
PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE SITE PLAN	28523 COLE GRADE RD	PDS2001-3500-01-068 PDS1999-3910-9908050	1882502000
ORCHARD RUN SPECIFIC PLAN	No Address	PDS2010-3810-87-008	1862104400 1862311900
Orchard Run	No Address	PDS2017-ER-95-08-033J PDS2018-ER-95-08-033B PDS2018-ER-95-08-033K PDS2004-3800-04-012 PDS2005-3910-9508033F PDS2005-3500-05-055 PDS2006-3000-06-019	1862108700 1862312100 1867630600 1862104400 1862311900 1862104400 1862311900
Mikhail Site Plan	No Address	PDS2015-ER-15-08-018 PDS2015-STP-15-012	1882603100
LIZARD ROCKS STORAGE	28407 LIZARD ROCKS RD	PDS2003-3500-03-026	1882504100
KINGDOM HALL-VALLEY CTR	29028 MILLER RD	PDS2002-3300-76-010	1852011300
JOSEF SCHELDEN	28629 CANYON RD	PDS2009-3200-20130	1851417400
JOHNSON TPM	13042 BETSWORTH RD	PDS2003-3200-20712	1862107600 1862108400 1862108500 1862108600
JOHNSON RANCH	28629 CANYON RD	PDS1996-3000-96-021	1890131900
JOHNSON AD	28359 COLE GRADE RD	PDS2003-3000-03-061	1890131900
Heim Agricultural Clearing	14027 CALLE DE VISTA	PDS2021-AD-21-022	1892201200
GREEN LEAF LOT AVERAGE	12894 ROCK RIDGE LN	PDS2011-3300-80-029	1852211400 1852211500 1852212000 1852212700 1852212800 1852213100 1852213600 1852213700 1852214200 1852214400 1852214600 1854410300 1854412300

			1854412400 1854412500 1854412600 1854412800 1862100400 1862101000 1862103700 1862104200 1862104400 1862104600 1862104700 1862104800 1862104900 1862105000 1862105700 1862105800 1862105900 1862106400 1862106800 1862107100 1862107200 1862107300 1862107500 1862108300 1862108400 1862108500 1862108600 1862311900
GOLDEN YEARS SENIOR CENTER	No Address	PDS2011-3300-86-061	1882407900
GENERAL PLAN PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS	No Address	PDS2012-3800-12-005	1882603700 1890131100 1890131200 1890131500 1890131600 1890132200 1890132700
EVANS COMM BLDG	28579 LILAC RD	PDS2012-3300-75-081	1852203400
CROSBY RESIDENCE	12826 ROCK RIDGE LN	PDS2006-3000-06-018 PDS2006-3910-870861A	1854410300
CRICKET COMMUNICATION	29277 VALLEY CENTER RD	PDS2009-3910-0908002 PDS2009-3300-09-006	1882501300
COTE FARMS TPM	No Address	PDS2009-3200-20017	1852012600 1852012700
COLE GRADE PUBLIC PARK	No Address	PDS2001-3910-9808044A PDS2002-3300-98-026	1882407800 1882407900

			1882408200
BRUCE POYNTER	13040 BETSWORTH RD	PDS2009-3200-20174	1862108300
BRECHT	14105 CALLE DE VISTA	PDS2007-3910-0708014 PDS2007-3300-07-014	1890126500
BOSE FRICKER CO	28511 COLE GRADE RD	PDS2012-3300-74-036	1882503600
BLUEBERRY HILL MANOR	13227 BLUEBERRY HILL LN	PDS1999-3300-99-020	1862104800
BECKER PRD TM5100	28765 JENNY JAY CT	PDS2011-3100-5100	1852012600 1852012700 1854700100 1854700200 1854700300 1854700400 1854700500 1854700600 1854700700 1854700800
AUTOMOTIVE SPECIALISTS SITE PLAN	28477 LIZARD ROCKS RD	PDS2003-3910-0308014 PDS2003-3500-03-021	1882501400
ARCO Major Grading	29155 VALLEY CENTER RD	PDS2020-LDGRMJ-30256	1882603100
2017 GP Clean Up	No Address	PDS2016-GPA-16-001	1852013400 1854511500
Valley Center Cemetery District	28953 Miller Rd	PDS2016-LDGRMN-20089	1882300200 1882304700
2015 General Plan Clean-Up	No Address	PDS2014-GPA-14-001	1851431600

- AD (3000) – Administrative Permit
- TM (3100) – Tentative Map
- TPM (3200) – Tentative Parcel Map
- MUP (3300) – Major Use Permit
- ZAP (3400) – Minor Use Permit
- STP (3500) – Site Plan
- REZ (3600) - Rezone
- GPA (3800) – General Plan Amendment
- SP (3810) – Specific Plan
- ER (3910) – Environmental Record
- LDGRMJ – Major Grading Permit
- LDGRMN – Minor Grading Permit

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 and Wildfire. 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

BlueScape Environmental. 2023. Air Quality Report.

BlueScape Environmental. 2023. Global Climate Change Evaluation.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2022. Final 2022 Scoping Plan Update.

<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ab-32-climate-change-scoping-plan/2022-scoping-plan-documents>

California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2015. Geologic Map of California.

<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/gmc/>

County of San Diego; (September 15, 2010), County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Biological Resources

Darnell & Associates. 2022. Local Mobility Analysis (LMA) and VMT Report.

Darnell & Associates. 2010. Traffic Study.

Firewise 2000, Inc. 2010. Fire Protection Plan (FPP).

GeoSoils, Inc. 2009. Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation.

Tierra Environmental Services. 2008. Cultural Resources Report.

Valley Center Municipal Water District. 2021. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan.

<https://www.vcmwd.org/Portals/0/PDF/UWMP/UWMP.pdf>

Vince Scheidt, Biological Consultant. 2007. Biological Resources Report.

Wynn Engineering, Inc. 2023. Hydrology Certification Letter.

Wynn Engineering, Inc. 2023. Priority Development Plan (PDP) – Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP).

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. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.